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Abstract

By 1855, most Māori still lived in a tribal setting, with little official Pākehā interference. This would have been as they expected, exercising their tino rangatiratanga, the chiefly rights guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi. However, their world was changing. In an effort to gain Pākehā goods, many Māori had entered the market economy. Most had converted to Christianity. Many could read and write. Some had sold land to accommodate the increasing numbers of Pākehā settlers. These trends gratified the government. It envisaged a New Zealand society dominated by Pākehā, in which European mores would be norm, and where its sovereignty, gained through the Treaty, would be substantive rather than nominal.

At this time, the government pursued the policy of iwi kotahi (one people) or “amalgamation”. This policy included the aim of elevating Māori socially and economically by extending to them the benefits of European civilisation. It sought too to encourage Māori to give up their “waste” lands for Pākehā settlement, and for Māori to accept the rule of English law, and government authority. Ultimately the two races would become one society – a Pākehā-style society. The government used newspapers for disseminating its message to Māori, publishing the bi-lingual Maori Messenger – Te Karere Maori from January 1855 to September 1863.

This thesis investigates the government’s newspaper, plus other Māori language newspapers appearing within the period, printed by government agents, evangelical Pākehā, the Wesleyan Church, and the rival Māori government, the Kingitanga. The thesis not only looks at the impact of newspapers upon Māori society and politics at this time, but also how the newspapers portrayed the major social and political issues to Māori, including the first Taranaki War, the Kohimarama Conference, and the impending all-out war with the Kingitanga in Waikato.

Using the newspapers as its major source, this thesis seeks to show how Māori might have understood the issues, and where possible, to allow them to respond in their own voices. We are fortunate that for almost a year the Kingitanga was able to publish its own views in Te Hokioi, thus allowing the anti-government Māori voice to articulate its stand. However, Māori opinion was hardly unitary. The Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers, through reports, reported speeches, and their correspondence columns, provide another set of Māori opinions, which show a variety
of opinions on political and social issues. Many histories of this period focus on the tensions and conflicts between Crown and Māori, thus marginalising pro-government Māori, the waverers, and those who merely wanted to keep trouble from their door. This thesis endeavours to illuminate the whole colonial discourse as it appeared in the Māori language newspapers, providing as wide a range of opinions as possible.
Preface

Academic research has only just begun into the corpus of Maori language newspapers which were produced between 1842 and 1932. I came to historical research into these newspapers, as a by-product of linguistic research work undertaken for Professor Moorfield of the University of Otago. My initial research was a 400-level dissertation on the early twentieth century Anglican newspaper, *Te Pipiwharauroa*. Beginning a PhD, it made sense to utilise the same corpus through which I was trawling for loanwords, for the subject of my thesis. New Zealand's history before the invasion of Waikato in 1863 had always fascinated me, and as there was a variety of interesting newspapers in this period, the choice of topic, a study of what messages these newspapers were delivering to Māori, and how Māori responded, almost picked itself. The time period also proved relatively easy to define – the span of the most important newspaper, the government's *Te Karere Maori*, from its revitalisation in January, 1855 to its demise, four months after the start of the Waikato campaign, in September, 1863.

**One thesis or two?**

*Te Karere Maori* was a bilingual journal, publishing parallel columns of Māori and English texts. Similarly, this thesis comprises two versions, one in Māori, the other in English. Māori Studies, the discipline within which this thesis was produced, is multi-disciplinary, with its scholars able to combine studies in anthropology, history, education, politics, and other fields. However, the language, *te reo Māori*, is its cornerstone, enabling the expression of Māori culture and thought within its own linguistic universe. While this thesis is essentially historical in nature, I could not ignore what had first attracted me to Māori Studies, and the medium of my primary sources, that is, the Māori language.

The Māori language newspapers sought to impart messages to Māori, and, to varying degrees, gave space to Māori to respond. Despite the bilingual nature of some publications, it was the articles in Māori that Māori read and responded to. The primary thesis text is therefore the Māori text through which the texts Māori were reading can be best represented. I also feel it is important that more academic work, particularly that produced within the field of Māori Studies, be written in Māori, not
only as a language resource, but to help Māori survive and grow as a living language in all contexts. However, because I appreciate that the research contained in this thesis may also interest readers who are not fluent in Māori, I have also produced an English language version. I have attempted to make the content of two versions as similar in meaning as possible.

Translations and Orthography

For the purposes of this discussion, the term "translation" refers to the English language text equating to a Māori language text, even if the English language text was the original text, and the Māori text are subsequent translation. Translations of the texts that Māori read are provided in the main text of the English version of the thesis, with the original Māori texts inserted into the footnotes. Where texts are taken from Māori language only newspapers, (i.e. Te Karere o Poneke, Te Waka o te Iwi, Te Whetu o te Tau, Te Haerata, Te Hokioi, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, or Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri) the translation is always mine. In the case of the bi-lingual newspapers, (i.e. Te Karere Maori, Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, or Ko Aotearoa) the original English text is used if it imparts the same meaning as the Māori text. In both cases, I do not identify the source of translation in the thesis. For example,

Friends, let us now direct our talk onto the Piikeha laws.¹

As the original Māori (in the footnote below) came from Te Karere o Poneke, a Māori language only journal, the translation is mine. However, in the following example, the translation comes from the bi-lingual newspaper in which the original Māori text also appeared.

In my opinion this is the punishment of God that the people may be brought to repentance. It is right that the Governor should punish our sins.²

However, as the English and Māori texts in the bi-lingual newspapers often did not correspond particularly well, I have at times used my own translations in the main body of the thesis, marked with the letters [LP] at the end of the translation. The contemporary English version is then added to the footnotes, followed by letters

¹ Te Karere o Poneke, 26/11/1857:2. 'E hoa mā, me whakahaere to matou korero inaianei ki runga i nga Ture Pakeha.'
² Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1860:32. 'Ki taku whakaaro na te Atua ano tenei whiu, kia mohio ai nga tangata ki te ripeneta. E tika na kia whiu te Kawana i o tatou hara.'
indicating which newspaper it has come from, that is, [TKM] for *Te Karere Maori*, [TMT] for *Te Mamuhiri Tuarangi*, and [KA] for *Ko Aotearoa*. For example,

Likewise, this is the second of the great treasures the Pākehā has brought here, and displayed for them to take hold of or to reject.\[LPJ\]^3

If the thesis uses bi-lingual texts which did not appear in the newspapers (for example, Māori letters printed in Māori and English in the *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*) then the contemporary English translation is marked [source].

On rare occasions, I have included an original English language text in parallel columns with my own translation. These are separated with a vertical line, with any source text on the left, and my translation on the right, with each text marked to indicate its source. For example,

> It would not be possible to write a book on this subject in the Māori language, which should tell every thing about the Laws of the Pakeha and be perfectly intelligible to the Maori reader.\[TKM\]

> It's not possible to write a book setting out these concepts in the Māori language, that a Māori person could easily read and understand. There are many laws, many words that cannot be translated into Māori, there are no Māori words for those concepts.\[LP\]^3

In Chapter 3, I discuss translation and the issue of "transparency", that is, the attempts of translators to render a text fluently from one language to another, providing natural sounding language so that the reader is unaware of the intrinsic foreignness of the text.\(^5\) However, in the case of the Māori language newspapers, the more transparent (i.e the better) the English translation, the greater the danger of losing the exact meanings or nuances of the original Māori. This was particularly the case with the contemporary English texts which employ the rather prolix prose Victorians were so enamoured with. Translations are compromises at best. With my own translations of Māori texts, I have endeavoured to ensure that the original Māori voice still speaks its own message, even if my translations appear somewhat literal at times. These translation issues do not arise in the Māori language version of the thesis as the original Māori texts are used in the main body of the thesis.

---

\(^3\) *Te Karere Maori*, 16/8/1858:2-3. 'Waahoki ko tenei, ko te rua o nga taonga nui a te Pakeha i kawe mai ai, ka whakaaria nei hei kapo mai mana, hei whakaparahako mai runei.'; 'As they were left free to receive or reject Christianity offered them by the Missionaries, so they are now free to accept or refuse this second boon.\[TKM\]'

\(^4\) *Te Karere Maori*, 16/8/1858: 1-2. 'E kore e ahei te tuhituhi tetahi pukapuka korero i ara nga tikanga ki te reo Maori, kia takoto noa iho te korero e te tangata Maori, matan tonu ake. He tini hoki nga Ture, he maha hoki nga kupu e kore e taea te whakamaori, he kore kupu maori hoki mo aua tikanga korero.'

All quotations of Māori texts appear as they did in the original newspapers. I have not commented on the language of these texts with the word *sic.*, except on rare occasions, where an obvious misspelling occurs. Neither have I added macrons to these quotations. In the English version of the thesis, I have macronised Māori words used as part of the main thesis text where appropriate. These words are also italicised to indicate their original Māori meanings, and to avoid any modern meanings that might be conferred by their use in modern New Zealand English.

In the Māori version of the thesis, I have followed the orthographic conventions established by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, with one exception. I retain proper nouns as single words (e.g. Te Waharoa) rather than hyphenise the elements of the word (Te Waha-roa), except if such hyphenisation occurred in the original texts, in order to maintain consistency with the newspaper texts.

**Newspaper Names and References**

The following Māori newspapers had both English and Māori names.

*Te Karere Maori* (The Maori Messenger)
*Ko Aotearoa* (The Maori Recorder)
*Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* (The Maori Intelligencer)

The thesis refers to the Māori name only. Several newspapers were given rather long names. In this thesis, the first appearance of such names will employ the full name but in subsequent appearances the following shortened versions will be used.

*Te Hokioi* (Te Hokioi e Rere atu na)
*Te Pihoihoi* (Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke i Runga i te Tuanui)

or Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke

Newspaper references include the shortened or Māori names, followed by the date and page numbers; for example, *Te Hokioi*, 15/6/1862:3.
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Introduction

Tā te rangatira tāna kai he kōrero...
The food of the chief is speech...

The first Māori language newspaper, *Te Karere o Nui Tireni*, appeared in 1842, less than two years after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Over the next 91 years, a multitude of these newspapers\(^1\) appeared. The government dominated the production for the first four decades. The decades 1880 to 1900 saw the rise of iwi based newspapers, while for the first three decades of the twentieth century consisted mainly of a series of publications by Anglican Māori. Many academics do not know the newspapers well. For example, *Book and Print in New Zealand*, while acknowledging that the newspapers from 1842 form ‘a substantial body of print of considerable historical merit’, yet contrarily states that ‘[u]p to 1850, virtually all the printed material available to Māori was of Christian doctrine’.\(^2\) As the editors of the only academic book devoted to Māori language newspapers attest, these newspapers are a valuable resource, in terms of Māori language in print, and as a window on Māori society in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, but ‘it is evident from our literature that they have been little used.’\(^3\)

**Thesis Aims and Methodology**

This thesis looks at an eight year span of the newspapers from the revitalisation of the government newspaper, *Te Karere Maori*, in January 1855, to its demise in September, 1863. This is a significant period in New Zealand history in which the relationship between Māori and the Crown had not yet formalised. For Māori, there was still potential for a bi-cultural society, and a partnership in managing the country. However, the desire of the government to extend effective rule over Māori, and increasing Pākehā immigration, threatened the *mana* and land that Māori still retained, and thus the possibility of partnership. The government (and church) also

---

\(^1\) N.B. For the purposes of this thesis, the term “newspapers” will refer to the Māori language newspapers 1855-1863 unless otherwise specified.


wanted to assimilate Māori into Pākehā lifestyles, politically, economically and socially. While modernity was attractive to Māori, it was also socially and politically unsettling. The events and trends within this period are particularly significant to New Zealand’s history because they helped shaped the subsequent relationships Māori held with the Crown. Given too the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi to much modern New Zealand history, this thesis adds nuances and shades of understanding to what can be a somewhat polarised debate.4

Besides Te Karere Maori, another eight newspapers emerged in this period, also trying to reach Māori, smaller publications produced by the government, the Wesleyan Church, the Kingitanga and individual Pākehā. These had varied life-spans, with only one, Te Waka Māori o Ahuriri, continuing to publish after 1863. Apart from the Kingitanga’s Te Hokioi, all other newspapers of this timeframe were controlled and produced by Pākehā. These newspapers provide the various viewpoints of their controllers. However, Te Karere Maori's contribution was overwhelming, in terms of its longevity, and the number of pages produced.5

In order to show the wealth of material, social, cultural and political, that these papers contain, this thesis surveys the newspaper content. Inevitably this content leads to a discussion which engages with the significant existing histories of the period. First, the thesis argues that all the Māori language newspapers of this time were used for propaganda purposes, in that each sought to influence the political or social thoughts and behaviour of their Māori readers. Second, that the Pākehā-run newspapers, despite possessing differing agenda, effectively spoke in one voice with regard to religious and social matters, and, with the exception of one editor, to political issues also. These newspapers wanted Māori to be more like Pākehā. However, this is not to suggest that the Pākehā voices in the newspapers were orchestrated as a single propaganda campaign: rather that the Pākehā of this time communicating to Māori through newspapers, that is government officials and evangelicals, shared similar backgrounds, educations, beliefs and attitudes.

4 The Waitangi Tribunal, for example, is predicated on the notion that the Treaty of Waitangi is a document the principles of which rightly influence the relationship of Māori and the Crown. However, this viewpoint is not held by all New Zealanders. For example, see Stuart C. Scott, The Travesty of Waitangi: Towards Anarchy (Dunedin: Campbell Press, 1995).
5 Of the approximately 2600 pages of text produced by the newspapers from January 1855 to September 1863, Te Karere Maori (also known as Te Manuhiri Tuarangi in 1861) printed 2059.
Third, that although the newspapers provide a valuable resource in terms of understanding the social, economic and political contexts of mid-nineteenth century Māori society, they also possessed agency in themselves, playing a role, sometimes significant, in that society, by informing and influencing readers. This was brought about by the effectiveness of literacy within Māori society, and the new ideas and language that Māori were imbibing. The newspapers also provided a platform for Māori voices, giving agency to Māori. One such voice was of course that of the moderate Kingitanga in Te Hokioi. Māori opinions also emerge in the Pākehā-run newspapers through the reporting of speeches, and the correspondence columns. As Timoti Kāretu states, ‘[w]ere it not for the nineteenth-century print culture much more knowledge of our ancestors’ lives and feelings would have been lost or controlled by a very select few and their versions, no matter if slanted.’ Some of these Māori voices in the newspapers reflected opinions that do not always sit comfortably with views of history in which (good) Māori tribes resist (evil) Pākehā colonialism. Such histories tend to marginalise those Māori who did not actively resist colonisation as having been duped or indoctrinated. As Michael King writes, ‘historians have the responsibility to reflect all the variegations of human behaviour in these islands, to follow evidence wherever it leads, and not write narratives that simply caricature one side or another.’ In addition, some recent Māori history, in Erik Olssen’s view, ‘ignores the Maori-ness of Maori’, that is, that Māori actions are represented in these histories without taking into effect Māori modes of thinking.

This thesis does not set out to denigrate the stand of those Māori who fought Pākehā colonisation in order to preserve their mana. However, Pākehā settlement offered both material and social advancement that attracted many Māori. The

---

6 Literacy is discussed in Chapter 2, while ideas and concepts of modernity are discussed throughout the thesis.


9 See Danny Keenan, “Kupapa – Saints or sinners?” in Mana, No 45, April/May 2002, pp 78-79.

10 King (2001) p 118.


12 Lyndsay Head is another writer who has been prepared to discuss loyalist viewpoints. For example, see Lindsay Head, ‘The Pursuit of Modernity in Maori Society: The Conceptual Bases of Citizenship in the Early Colonial Period’ in Histories, Power and Loss: Uses of the Past – a New Zealand
government had not, by the 1850s, managed to enforce its will on most Māori, and the nature of the relationship between Māori and the Crown, as portrayed in the newspapers, still offered Māori the potential for a meaningful participation in the government of New Zealand. Māori "kūpapa" were therefore not gullible fools, and often criticised Pākehā racism or inconsistency, but they still saw cooperation with Pākehā as the best opportunity for themselves, for their hapū, and for Māori as a whole at that time. It must be remembered too that Māori opinions sometimes altered as events unfolded. For example, in 1858 the mission educated Henare Wiremu Taratoa wrote letters to newspapers urging Māori to assimilate, yet died six years later fighting the British at Gate Pā.

Unfortunately some voices are not well represented within the newspapers of this period. Pākehā settlers seldom speak directly to Māori through the newspapers. Rather, it was the newspapers, run by the government and evangelicals, which sought to project settler viewpoints to Māori, so long as they did not conflict with their own aims. Māori women are one important group whose views remained unheard within the newspapers at this time. Women were largely invisible, and if present were represented through male voices. Notwithstanding this omission, this thesis seeks to give agency to the full range of voices, both Māori and Pākehā, empowered and powerless, which appeared in the Māori language newspapers of 1855-1863, not just to a select few, and allow them to be heard again through their own voices.

**Historical Overview.**

From 1840-1865, the "government" of New Zealand went through several transformations. It began as a Crown colony under the rule of a governor appointed by London. The British Parliament passed the New Zealand Constitution Act in 1852, but it was not until 1856 that the settlers achieved "responsible government". The governor, however, reserved for himself the responsibility for Māori affairs, and
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13 Te Karere o Poneke, 25/1/1858:2; 26/7/1858:3-4. See also, Te Karere Maori, 31/1/1860:11-13
14 These projected settler viewpoints are discussed throughout the thesis, but in Chapter Six in particular.
for defence. As seen in Chapter 3, Te Karere Maori encouraged Māori to believe that their relationship with the Crown was through the governor. While Māori were aware of the settler institutions, they still conceptualised “government” as being that of the governor. Because this thesis is concerned with how Māori understood the newspapers, it uses the term “government” to refer primarily to the governor and his agents.

During the 1855-1863 period the government attempted to ‘amalgamate’ Māori into Pākehā society. The policy was two-fold. Firstly it sought to assimilate Māori, in that it expected Māori to give up most of their own culture for the benefits of Western “civilisation”. Secondly, as the government’s mana did not initially effectively touch Māori society, it endeavoured to draw Māori under the political structures of government, that is, to convince them to accept its authority, and the introduction of English law. Law was but one of the ritenga pai (good customs) of the Pākehā that the government, missionaries, and other Pākehā agents were promoting as “civilisation” to Māori. Among other things, they were encouraging Māori to enter into commercial activity, despite the vagaries of the market economy. At the same time, the government was actively purchasing as much Māori land as it was able, as Pākehā settlers flooded into the country.

The government’s rhetoric of a united populace was threatened by two major events. Through the second half of the 1850s, some Māori, alarmed at the increasing loss of their lands and independence, met together to create a Māori kingdom. Pōtatau Te Wherowhero of Waikato was selected as the first king in 1858. The government saw the Kīngitanga as a direct threat to its aim of realising the Queen’s
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16 The settler government did not gain these responsibilities until the Weld ministry of 1864-65 which introduced the “self-reliant” policies.
17 The New Oxford Dictionary of English defines “assimilate” as ‘absorb and integrate (people, ideas, or culture) into a wider society or culture’. This definition does not quite fit with how the word is understood in a New Zealand historical context — that Māori were to be absorbed within the new society at the expense of their own culture. It is this latter understanding that is meant when I use the term.
19 The government wanted Māori subsumed within Pākehā society, but portrayed their aim as “unifying” the two races. For example the motto on Te Manuhiri Tuarangi's masthead read “Kia Whakakotahitia te Maori me te Pakeha” or “Let the Pakeha and Maori be United”. See Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/3/1861:1.
sovereignty over the whole country. In 1860, the Crown was at war with Te Rangitāke and his Te Ati Awa tribe over the proposed sale of land at Waitara in Taranaki. Governor Browne mistakenly interpreted Te Rangitāke's veto of the sale as an intrusion upon the rights of the rightful sellers, and thus a challenge to governmental authority. The war escalated, drawing in other Taranaki tribes and some Kingitanga warriors. In order to bolster support from "friendly" tribes and to allay Māori fears, Browne called Māori chiefs to a month-long conference at Kohimarama. The war ground to a halt after a year's hostilities, leaving the problems in Taranaki unsolved and a strained relationship between the government and Kingitanga. The new governor, Sir George Grey, maintained the cold war against the Kingitanga, while promoting a system of law and self-government within Māori districts. When war re-erupted in Taranaki in 1863, the government decided to enforce its claim of sovereignty, by invading the Waikato to crush the Kingitanga.

**Literature Review**

A few historians have used some of the Māori language newspapers as a resource, but most are no doubt constrained by a lack of Māori language skills. *Te Karere Māori*, with its parallel bilingual texts, is perhaps the most accessible newspaper resource, however, there is a danger if historians believe, as Sinclair seems to do, that the English text corresponds exactly to its accompanying Māori language text. Neither should they assume that nineteenth century Māori must share the historian's own secular educated twentieth century prejudices, an assumption that has lead the few historians who do mention the newspapers to dismiss them as irrelevant, and even offensive, to Māori.
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20 See Chapters 7 & 8.
22 See Chapter 7.
23 See Chapter 8.
25 See Keith Sinclair (1976), p 41. See also my comments in Chapter 3.
Although few historians have taken advantage of this resource, it cannot be said that writing on Māori within this period of history is scarce. Māori have always been of primary importance to New Zealand’s first decades of political history because ‘Europeans at first resided in New Zealand on Māori sufferance’, and because Māori possessed the land required for Pākehā colonisation.27 Māori hold centre stage until war and the Native Land Court see them ushered to the wings, and settlers allowed to get on with the task of creating the new nation. Race relations certainly deteriorated during the second half of the 1850s.28 As seen below, historians have preferred two main causes for this deterioration: sovereignty and land, and, like the chicken and the egg, have debated which came first. Were Māori concerned about the loss of their land, and therefore became resistant to accepting government authority, or did they fear losing their tribal mana in the face of the Crown’s sovereignty and thus decide to stop selling land. Such a debate assumes that Māori understood “sovereignty” in some manner similar to its English language meaning. In Chapter Seven, I reinterpret the debate in terms of mana: whether mana kāwanatanga was compatible with mana whenua.

**Contemporary commentators**

In the 1860s, the government and some contemporary Pākehā commentators believed the racial conflict revolved around sovereignty. For example, the government considered the Waitara dispute not ‘as a question of Title’ but ‘in fact a question of Sovereignty’.29 A number of clergy and officials began publishing even as events were unfolding, generally reflecting a partisan position. For example, by 1860, the Wesleyan church had aligned itself with the government over Taranaki and the Kingitanga, so it is not surprising that an account detailing meetings held by the Kingitanga written in 1860 by Thomas Buddie, one of its missionaries, reflected pro-government views.30 Other prominent Pākehā opposed the government’s actions. Octavius Hadfield, an Anglican missionary, and Sir William Martin, former Chief
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28 Sinclair (1976), pp 10, 194.
Justice, wrote pamphlets attacking the government’s actions over Waitara. Sir William Swainson, former Attorney-General, was another critical observer. Hadfield in particular was grounded in early Anglican evangelism, which saw Pākehā colonisation as deleterious to Māori advancement. However, he (and Martin) eschewed the sovereignty argument, portraying Waitara as a land issue, as they sought to portray Te Rangitāke as a loyal subject driven to resistance by an unjust governor, rather than a chief thumbing his nose at the Queen’s authority. In 1864, the politician Henry Sewell, now out of office, published a pamphlet also attacking the government’s martial actions, this time in Waikato.

A variety of contemporary opinions also appeared in the new Parliament’s Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR). There are letters from Māori and Pākehā, reports on Māori from government officials, and other official correspondence. Similar material can also be found in the British Parliamentary Papers. Like those who published the above material, the writers of this correspondence were agents within this history and were influenced by various factors, which undoubtedly affected what they wrote. Other texts, written privately at the time, or deposited in archives, have since been published. For example, Harriet Browne, the Governor’s wife, composed the Narrative of the Waitara Purchase and the Taranaki War in 1861, but it was not published until 1965. Like other commentators of the time, she takes a partisan view, criticising the clergy for inflaming the situation.

Other journals, letter books, and the like are housed at various archives throughout New Zealand. The Alexander Turnbull Library, for instance, contains collected papers from Donald McLean, the Native Secretary and the Governor, Sir George Grey, to name a few. While these give insights into events of the time, they also provide a little information on Māori language newspapers. However, some

33 Hadfield, p x; Martin, p 1.
collections, surprisingly, bore no fruit. For example, despite Rev. Thomas Buddle publishing *Te Haeata* for two years on behalf of the Wesleyan mission, no mention of these activities appear in either the *Wesley Missionary Society Letter Collection* or the *Thomas Buddle Letterbooks*. The best and most prolific of the contemporary resources, of course, are the Māori language newspapers themselves.

As a commentary of events, one contemporary publication is particularly valuable. In 1864, John Gorst published the book, *The Maori King*, about his experiences as Resident Magistrate for Waikato, encouraging Waikato Māori to abandon the Kingitanga and accept the government’s authority over them. Gorst was no doubt disappointed with the failure of his mission, and wanted to distance himself from the policies which led to war and land confiscation by a government, increasingly controlled by settler politicians whom he saw as hypocritical and venal. His book, he declared was a protest against the theory that ‘whenever the brown and white skins come in contact, the former must disappear’. Gorst saw the Kingitanga as comprising two camps, the militant wing under a warlike, reckless Rewi Maniapoto, and the moderates under the peace-loving and intelligent Wiremu Tamihana Tarapīpī. Had the government been prepared to work with the latter, then, Gorst posits, the subsequent war would not have occurred. Notwithstanding Gorst’s subjectivity, inevitable given his direct involvement in events, his account is perceptive, detailed and a valuable resource.

**War Books**

The time period covered by this thesis includes the Taranaki War, and ends with the advent of the Waikato War. The actual conflicts spawned their own subset of books. These tend to be more interested in military events rather than their political and social underpinnings. Tom Gibson’s *The Maori Wars*, for example, gives a mere four pages to the rise of the Kingitanga and the Waitara Dispute. Similarly, Cowan’s *The New Zealand Wars* is primarily concerned with descriptions of fighting, but does describe the political events leading to it. For example, he details prior
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Taranaki Māori resistance to land selling and subsequent feuding, and gives opinions on why the Kingitanga was established. He judges Browne responsible for Waitara, but in no way applies the same critical eye on Grey’s actions, content with Grey’s assertions that the Kingitanga would have attacked Auckland had not the government invaded Waikato first. James Belich’s *The New Zealand Wars* admits to only attempting a “brief and limited treatment” to the causes of the Taranaki and Waikato wars. Belich rejects settler land hunger as the primary cause for war, preferring a British desire to gain real, rather than theoretical, sovereignty over all New Zealand. However, Belich’s aim with this book appears to be to prove Māori skill in strategy and warfare against Pākehā forces.

General political histories

General histories take in a wide sweep of history, commonly from the arrival of either Māori or Europeans to New Zealand to the present day, and fall into two groups; those that recount a New Zealand history, and those that recount a Māori history. The former are many and varied: from school texts, such as *Our Country*, to tomes worthy as a rite of passage for senior historians. For these histories, race relations are the major issue (or problem) of the pre-wars period, with many of the earlier histories of New Zealand implying that a collision of the two races was inevitable. As primary school children were told in *Our Nation’s Story*, ‘[i]t grieved Sir George [Grey] sincerely that he should be compelled to make war on his old friends; [in Taranaki and Waikato, 1863] but he owed a duty to the settlers as well as to the natives.’ For these histories, once Māori are defeated militarily, they are no longer relevant to the real story of successful Pākehā colonisation. William Pember Reeves’ *The Long White Cloud* states ‘had the colonists known it [in 1870], the great native difficulty was destined to melt fast away.’ Apart from ‘a prophet named Te

41 Cowan, pp 154, 239-241.
Whiti' who merited half a page, Māori then disappeared from his history of New Zealand.46

Earlier New Zealand historians see the Taranaki dispute and the emergence of the Kingitanga as a “sovereignty”, rather than a “land” issue. For example, while Reeves acknowledges the “land-league” nature of the Kingitanga, he also stresses the desire for political separation on the part of the kingmaker, Tarapipipi.47 Dom Felice Vaggioli’s history, suppressed when released in Italian in 1896, blamed land hunger for the Taranaki War, but he attributed the subsequent Waikato War to the simple desire of Grey to crush the Kingitanga.48 Later histories, emerging in the 1950s and 60s, tend to stress the “land” aspect of the dispute, perhaps not wishing to credit Māori aspirations for mana motuhake (separate authority) at a time that Pākehā themselves were formulating their own myths of nationhood.49 As the Māori struggle for mana motuhake became more visible in the last quarter of the twentieth century, historians have become more willing to acknowledge the earlier struggle against British sovereignty. For example, in Making Peoples, James Belich asserts that “the wars were about sovereignty”, and that Pākehā had plenty of land to colonise in 1860, without demanding more from Māori. Relations deteriorated between the Kingitanga and the Crown due to “myths of empire”; the Pākehā belief that non-whites must live as inferiors under the political control of colonising whites.50 Similarly, Belich’s essay in The Oxford Illustrated History of New Zealand portrays a country made up of zones: either under government control or independent Māori mana, and the subsequent conflict resulted from the government’s desire to spread its dominion over

46 William Pember Reeves, The Long White Cloud: Ao Tea Roa, 4th Edition (London: Horace Marshall & Son., 1898: reprint, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950) pp 224-5. Recent histories, such as the Oxford History of New Zealand and its illustrated younger brother, are now prepared to accept a continuing Māori role in New Zealand’s history but tend to compartmentalise this subsequent Māori history, or give attention only to Māori, such as the prophet movements, whose activities clash with the Pākehā mainstream.

47 Reeves, p 197.


the whole country.\textsuperscript{51} In \textit{The Oxford History of New Zealand}, two historians grapple with race relations within this period. M.P.K. Sorrenson, not wanting to suggest a single cause for racial conflict, blames the increasing Pākehā population for Māori disquiet, which caused both confrontation over land, and a contest for \textit{mana}.\textsuperscript{52} Ann Parsonson, whilst detailing Pākehā enthusiasm for acquiring land, unequivocally states Pākehā colonisation was a ‘challenge to [Māori] political and cultural autonomy’ and the government initiated the wars ‘to destroy mana motuhake’.\textsuperscript{53}

General histories with a focus on Māori are a rarer breed. Ranginui Walker’s \textit{Ka Whawhai Tomu Matou}, catalogues Pākehā injustices against Māori up to the late 1980s. Walker blames the establishment of the settler government, and ‘institutionalisation of racism’ as ‘the root cause of the conflict between Maori and Pakeha in the North Island’. While acknowledging the Pākehā hunger for land, Walker looks beyond the possession of land itself, defining the alienation of Māori land in Māori terms, that is, the take over of \textit{mana whenua}.\textsuperscript{54} Walker tends to portray the role played by those Pākehā who interacted with Māori, missionaries and government officials, as part of a monolithic colonising conspiracy. However, while these individuals appear to be acting in concert, it is more likely that it was due to their common views and prejudices rather than pre-conceived plan.

Some books take a more selective view of nineteenth century Māori history. In 1888, G.W. Rusden published \textit{Aureretanga: Groans of the Maoris}, which meticulously details ‘infractions of a solemn Treaty’, the Treaty of Waitangi, which dishonoured England’s name.\textsuperscript{55} Rusden also blames the wars on Pākehā greed for land, but his focus is squarely on the Treaty, motivated by the failure of King Tāwhiao’s petition to London in 1882. Alan Ward’s \textit{A Show of Justice}\textsuperscript{56}, which first appeared in 1974, perhaps also falls into the category of a generalised Māori history, as it covers the political aspects of the government’s policy of ‘amalgamation’

\textsuperscript{52} Sorrenson, pp 141, 148.
\textsuperscript{53} Parsonson (1997), pp 167, 185.
throughout the nineteenth century. However, Ward touches little on the social aspects of ‘amalgamation’, and by concentrating on legal and constitutional matters, posits agency firmly with the Crown and settler governments. With the amalgamation of Māori into the political structures of the colony as his theme, Ward naturally tends towards the “sovereignty” camp of historians, while also stressing the importance of land to Māori.  

Sinclair and Dalton

Two historians stand out in their investigation of the political developments in the time period covered by this thesis. The title of Keith Sinclair’s *The Origins of the Māori Wars* describes the fruit of his research. This book appeared in 1957 at a time of growth in prosperity and population, and an awakening post-imperial identity. It was an identity/nationalism that needed to incorporate Māori, who had shared victory with Pākehā in the second world war, and, migrating to the cities for work, were now socially interacting with urban Pākehā as never before. Thus, Sinclair deems the wars as ‘a necessary prelude to the growth of a nation which embraces two races.’ Sinclair defines the major interaction of the 1860s as a struggle between the government and Kingitanga, thus effectively losing the voice of loyalist Māori. Sinclair allows Māori antipathy towards Pākehā, due to a fear of swamping and being excluded from the emerging political processes as further causes of discontent, and that Grey’s order to invade the Waikato in 1863 was motivated by a desire to ‘enforce his will upon the disaffected Maoris’. However, he stresses the principal cause of division was land, with Māori resistance to Pākehā land hunger fuelling the Kingitanga. As Ward points out, other historians adopted this argument, even coining the term “Land Wars” to describe the subsequent conflicts. Ward, in a
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“Reconsideration” of Sinclair’s work in 1967, cannot agree to one cause being more significant than another. While he acknowledges land as cause for conflict, he suggests other factors such as Māori antipathy and fear, and Grey’s unwillingness to accept the Kingitanga.63

Dalton’s War and Politics in New Zealand 1855-1870 shares the same conclusion as Sinclair, that land was the cause of racial tension.64 However, it appears that Dalton’s main goal is to describe the flow of responsibility for Native Affairs from the governor to the settler politicians, which left Māori increasingly marginalised from political and economic power. However, in pursuing this argument, Dalton himself allows Māori ideas and motivations to become peripheral because his history has the main action occurring between the Pākehā factions.

Other relevant works and issues

Sinclair has also written a number of essays on the political situation prior to the advent of war. In The Maori Land League, he argues that Māori resistance to land sales, ‘though wide-spread’, was not successfully organised until the Kingitanga.65 Edward Hill subsequently disputed this argument, suggesting that Taranaki Māori had organised sufficiently to be termed a “league”, but his objections appear to be mostly semantic.66 Although Sinclair discusses these events of Taranaki in subsequent works, his essay is a valuable exposition on Māori attitudes to land sales.

In the mid-nineteenth century Māori entered into commercial agriculture, taking produce to market for sale to European settlers in New Zealand and abroad.67 The government newspaper, Te Karere Maori, gave considerable attention to encouraging Māori into growing food for sale, at least before 1860. Sinclair’s “Maori Nationalism and the European Economy. 1850-60” investigates the links between commerce and nationalism, particularly the rise of the Kingitanga. The slump after 1855 was not the cause of Māori nationalism, he suggests, as the trend was apparent
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66 Edward Hill, There was a Taranaki Land League (Wellington: Wellington Historical Association, 1969).
67 See Chapter 6.
before the slump. Rather it was the preceding boom, which encouraged Pākehā immigration and demands for Māori land, that fuelled Māori feelings of antipathy towards Europeans, and stimulated nationalistic sentiment. Sinclair argues that this, rather than any slump, discouraged Māori from continuing to participate in the Pākehā economy.\(^{68}\)

R.P. Hargreaves acknowledges Sinclair’s assessment,\(^{69}\) but is more concerned with describing the rise and fall of Māori agriculture during this period, and is one of the few historians to use data from the bilingual Te Karere Maori extensively. Hargreaves finds practical reasons for Māori agricultural decline: poor farming practices, and technical problems with the new flour mills.\(^{70}\) Ann Parsonson, in contrast, considers that Māori expansion into the market economy was merely an extension of a competitiveness inherent in Māori society, where hapū sought to gain possessions, be it a horse, a mill, or a missionary, that other hapū lacked. Once all hapū possessed the item, its value (and attractiveness) disappeared. Money and food were also employed for competitive and ostentatious gifts and feasts.\(^{71}\) She does not dwell on the Māori withdrawal from the market, but the inference must be that Māori were attracted to some other new enthusiasm. Ballara critiques Parsonson’s argument, and suggests that Māori became involved in commerce because of an attraction to the material benefits of Pākehā goods, and, once trade slumped, many Māori resorted to selling land to maintain the lifestyle that had become accustomed to.\(^{72}\)

The Treaty of Waitangi hangs heavily over modern scholarship on nineteenth century Māori history. In her discussion of the Kohimarama conference, and in her subsequent book on the Treaty, Claudia Orange stresses the importance of the Conference to Māori understandings of the Treaty, and their subsequent use of the


Treaty to challenge the government’s mana. Her work is significant because it provides insights into how the mainly pro-government chiefs present at Kohimarama viewed the Treaty. Their view has been marginalised in most histories which have tended to accentuate the anti-colonial struggle. The Kohimarama Conference is important to this thesis as its proceedings are a part of the newspaper content. However, as discussed below, I consider the Conference to be much more than a “Treaty” matter, and I hope to provide a more balanced view on its proceedings.

This thesis looks at more than purely political events. Because the newspapers were propaganda devices, the thesis discusses a number of techniques identified by propaganda theorists, and then identifies examples within the newspapers which conform to these techniques. The reading of newspapers also requires some degree of literacy. I therefore survey a variety of opinions on how literate Māori might have been, and how important this might be for its propaganda purposes. I look at several theoretical views on the impact of literacy: whether, as Jack Goody and W.J. Ong suggest, literacy in itself causes cognitive change, but veer to B.V. Street’s findings that education, rather than literacy, is more relevant. I also survey the available evidence on Māori schooling at the time, which leads to a critique of writers, such as Kuni Jenkin and Judith Simon, who imply that Māori minds had, by 1860, already been subjugated by literacy, and the Pākehā-run education system.

Works Related to Māori language newspapers

As indicated above, work specifically discussing the Māori language newspapers are rare. Bare and incomplete details of these newspapers and their

74 For example, historians such as Sinclair, Belich and Walker have generally marginalised pro-government Māori opinion.
editors can be found in the Hocken and Williams bibliographies,78 in Scholefield’s Newspapers of New Zealand,79 as well as in the notes accompanying the fiche collection of Māori language newspapers, and commentaries attached to the website collection.80 The Kingitanga’s Te Hokioi is thought sufficiently strange to rate a brief entry in Grayland’s Unusual Newspapers of New Zealand and Australia.81 The dearth extends to broader academic writing. For example, Patrick Day, in The Making of the New Zealand Press completely omits Māori language newspapers.82 Galbreath discusses Te Karere o Poneke in his biography of Walter Buller, but confines himself mainly to the organisational side of this work, rather than the content.83

Theses are rarer still: Yvonne Sutherland has completed a master’s thesis, “Te Reo o te Perehi: Messages to Māori in the Wesleyan Newspaper Te Haeata 1859-62”84 in which she explores a metaphor of “conversion” in that the newspaper was seeking to convert Māori not just religiously, but politically and socially as well. While she examines Te Haeata’s content well in the historical and social context, it is essentially limited to one publication which, as the title of her thesis suggests, was more concerned in projecting its own views on Māori than allowing Māori viewpoints to be seen within its pages.

Excerpts from Māori language newspapers have appeared in Māori language teaching materials,85 collected writings,86 and in works of translations and

85 For example, Te Māreikura (Te Whanganui-a-Tara: Huia Publishers, 1994); John C. Moorfield, Te Whanake 4 Te Köhure (Kirkiriroa: Te Whare Wīnanga o Waikato, 1996).
86 For example, Mohi Tūrei, Ana Tuhinga i Roto i te Reo Maori, ed. Wiremu Kaa & Te Ohorere Kaa (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1996); Apirana T. Ngata, Ana Tuhinga i Roto i te Reo Maori, ed. Wiremu Kaa & Te Ohorere Kaa (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1996).
Academics at the University of Auckland have undertaken the task to write abstracts for the multitude of articles within the newspaper corpus and have also published several articles related to their work. Recently, the book *Rere Atu, Taku Manu!*, was devoted to discussing and analysing the newspapers as a phenomenon in their own right, and may spur more interest in the field. This book contains a diverse range of essays, some specific to one or a range of newspapers, and others discussing the newspapers more generally. Only two of the essays relate directly to my research period: one by Sutherland entitled “Church and Identity in the Wesleyan Newspaper, *Te Haeta*”, and the other by myself, how issues of “race” and “civilisation” were portrayed in the newspaper, a subject that I reiterate in the third chapter of this thesis.

**Chapter Outline.**

While investigating a relatively short time period, this thesis is nevertheless broad in the areas covered. The newspapers, of course, reported on land and political concerns, but also discussed trade, religious, social, and cultural matters. These topics are interrelated, in that they are all parts of a wider discourse of “civilisation” through which the government and missionaries sought to assimilate Māori into European modes of living. However, for ease of discussion, the chapters are arranged thematically.

The first chapter provides background information on which newspapers were printed in the time period, and what is known about their production and editorial staff. It also reviews how the few historians who discussed the Māori language newspapers of this period, have tended to marginalise the impact of the newspapers. The chapter then argues that newspapers were relevant to Māori for a number of
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90 Lachy Paterson, “*Kiri Mā, Kiri Mangu*: The terminology of Race and Civilisation in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century Maori-Language Newspapers” in *Rere Atu, Taku Manu!: Discovering History,*
reasons: for example, providing Māori with source of a variety of information, and a forum for discussing their own views.

Chapter Two discusses literacy issues, because the newspapers can have little historical importance if they lacked readers or sufficient dissemination. The chapter defines literacy, then presents a range of scholarly opinion on the extent of Māori literacy at this time. The chapter then discusses the communal nature of Māori society that would have also allowed non-literates access to newspaper information. Some academics propound a model in which literacy, *per se*, leads not only to societal change, but even to individual cognitive processes. Brian Street has critiqued this “autonomous model” of literacy, suggesting instead that individuals are affected less by literacy than by formal schooling. This chapter challenges the view that literacy and education, at least before 1863, somehow robbed Māori of their critical faculties. Literacy did have an impact on Māori. However, I argue that for many Māori, the links of literacy to education were weak, and that although education was an assimilating tool, the mission schools, to whom it was entrusted, were not particularly effective. Māori could think critically for themselves.

Chapter Three considers the difficulties of translation, and the techniques that writers used in order to make the text more natural to the Māori reader. *Te Karere Maori*, the most prolific of the Māori language newspapers, was a bilingual publication, and much of its material was translated from English. Similarly, other Pākehā-run newspapers contained “translations” to the extent that its content would have been imagined in English before being rendered into Māori. Translators often had to bend the meanings of existing words in order to discuss concepts which had not previously existed in Māori thought. This chapter investigates how Pākehā translators used a set of indigenous Māori words to discuss the concepts of “race” and “civilisation”, reflecting the power and hierarchical relations in which colonial ideology was expounded, and how Māori responded to this new lexicon.

The early New Zealand newspapers did not pretend to be anything more than a mouthpiece for the views of their proprietors. Māori language newspapers were no exception. Their role was one of propaganda, that is, they were consciously attempting to change and influence the thoughts and actions of their Māori readership.

Chapter Four surveys the techniques of propaganda, giving examples where they are employed by the newspapers. It also looks at the role of *Te Karere Maori*, as the government’s primary print-propaganda weapon, then provides a case-study of that newspaper’s battle with the Kingitanga’s *Te Hokioi* over the relevance of Haiti as an independence model for Māori.

The following two chapters deal with *nga ritenga pai o te Pakeha*, the good customs of the Pākehā, a euphemism for the European concepts of “civilisation” and “progress” that all the Pākehā-run newspapers were promoting to Māori. Chapters Five and Six not only detail how these customs were portrayed to Māori, but also how some Māori responded. These customs related to more than just social concerns: they concerned *mana*. For Māori, accepting English law, or the building of roads, or the sale of land, entailed also accepting the Queen’s *mana*, and the prospect of increased Pākehā settlement. Chapter Five looks specifically at the issue of law, which the government was keen to get Māori to adopt, as part of its strategy to impose its *mana kāwanatanga* over the whole country. The government chose to portray the Queen’s law as complementing the law that Māori had already accepted, the law of God; law would bring life. Māori reacted to the introduction of law in a similar way to the acceptance of Christianity twenty years earlier. This chapter details aspects of this earlier conversion, and finds parallels with the new conversion to the ideals of law and order.

Chapter Six details other aspects of *ngā ritenga pai*. These form what appears at first sight a disparate group of customs: Māori involvement (or not) within the emerging Pākehā political institutions; the sale and individualisation of land; engaging with the market economy; building European-style housing, wearing European-style clothing; and the acquisition of English. However, both Pākehā and some Māori saw these collected customs as elements of a wider whole, of a civilisation that both races needed to share in order to ‘amalgamate’ as a single people. These *ritenga* were also popular with many Māori, particularly before the Taranaki War of 1860. The chapter also discusses the many letters written by Māori to the newspapers, particularly *Te Karere o Poneke* of Wellington, to discuss their desire to enter into the new ways. However, adopting these new practices impacted on social structures and *mana whenua* of Māori. For example, involvement in trade changed the Māori economy

---

91 See in particular, Jenkins, p 7-8.
and meant associating more with Pākehā. Also discussed is how Māori regarded race relations; and how the changing social structure affected relations between hapū, and between classes within hapū.

The final two chapters chronicle political developments as they were reported to Māori by the newspapers. In September 1855, Thomas Gore Browne arrived to take the post of governor of the colony, coinciding with European settlers achieving responsible government for themselves. However, the newspapers relay little of the affairs of Pākehā politics to Māori. Little had changed for Māori: the governor retained responsibility for their affairs, although in practice most Māori lived outside of the pale of British law, neither fearing its punishments, nor enjoying its protections.

Two major political developments occurred, which drew the Crown into collision with some Māori tribes. First, feuding between or within hapū, often fuelled by the actions of government land purchasing, occurred in a number of Māori districts. The desire of some Māori in Taranaki to sell land, and of others to hold it caused four years of warfare, culminating finally in the Taranaki War of 1860-61. Second, the desire for a legal system, coupled with a wish to hold their land and mana, saw the rise of the first pan-Māori organisation, the Kingitanga. Seeking an independent Māori state, the Kingitanga elected the Waikato chief, Pōtatau, as its first Māori king in 1858. The government cohabited uneasily with this nascent Māori nation, until 1863, when it invaded its domains and confiscated millions of acres of land for Pākehā settlement.

Pākehā of the time, and early historians, saw both developments as an issue of sovereignty: whether the Queen's law and sovereign power would prevail over the whole of New Zealand, or whether Māori would continue to live outside governmental authority. As seen above, in the second half of the twentieth century, historians tended to suggest that the issue was not sovereignty, but of land: the Māori had land, and Pākehā wanted it. I argue that, for Māori, the issue was mana. The Treaty of Waitangi had created a new mana kāwanatanga to be exercised by governors on behalf of the Queen. Māori retained their tribal mana, unchanged, over their lands until they sold them. Some Māori, loyal to Queen Victoria, did not see any contradiction between their mana whenua, and the somewhat nebulous mana kāwanatanga of the Crown. Those tribes that aligned themselves to the Kingitanga,
did perceive the contradiction, and preferred a Māori king to be the custodian of their tribal *mana*.

Chapter Seven covers the period 1855-1860, concluding with the Kohimarama Conference. The concept of *mana*, and how it relates to the Treaty of Waitangi, and to late 1850s, is discussed first. The chapter then describes how the newspapers, at this time all Pākehā-run, reported the establishment of the Kingitanga, and events in Taranaki, which most Pākehā and many Māori considered to be a single issue. These difficulties induced the government to invite a large number of “friendly” chiefs to a month-long conference at Kohimarama. The Conference is an important event within this thesis, as its coverage represents a sizeable number of newspaper pages,92 it reflected the viewpoints of a significant number of Māori chiefs on a number of issues, as well as serving the political purposes of the Crown. Many general New Zealand histories do not mention the Conference, and Sinclair, in his *Origins of the Māori Wars*, dismisses it in a paragraph.93 In her article on the Kohimarama Conference, Claudia Orange describes it as a ‘Ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi’. In her *Treaty of Waitangi* she also give the impression that the Treaty was a major focus of the Conference. While not disagreeing that the Conference discussions are pertinent to Treaty history, I argue that the government used the Treaty there as a tool for criticising the Kingitanga, and promoting its own sovereignty. However, the Treaty was not the main theme of the Conference, and this thesis also covers the wide range of discussions that the chiefs pursued.

The final chapter completes the survey of political reporting after Kohimarama, beginning with the conclusion of the Taranaki War, and Browne’s vision for future Māori governance. Browne’s vision, however, required the precondition of the Kingitanga abandoning their king, and returning to the governmental fold. Realising that this was unlikely, Browne meanwhile prepared for war to force their acquiescence. There were a number of voices, Māori and Pākehā, who attacked Browne’s stand. This chapter discusses Renata Kawepō’s criticism, not because the newspapers gave it space, but because Kawepō himself had his opinions printed privately. It also details Charles Davis, the editor of several short-lived Māori language newspapers, who
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92 The proceedings of the Conference were printed in *Te Karere Māori* over four months, comprising 218 pages out of a total of 2059 pages that were produced during that newspaper’s life of eight and half years.
93 Keith Sinclair (1976), pp 230-231.
attacked Browne in his last publication, *Ko Aotearoa*. In 1861, Sir George Grey returned, replacing Browne as governor. Grey’s aims were essentially the same as Browne’s: to eliminate the Kingitanga, and to establish *mana kāwanatanga* over Māori. He instituted the *Tikanga Hou* (New Institutions), a system of courts and self-government in Māori districts, which he hoped would wean support from the Kingitanga. Grey decided to leave war as a final option,\(^\text{94}\) instead moving carefully against the movement, and installing a magistrate in the Upper Waikato district.

By 1862 the Kingitanga was producing its own newspaper, *Te Hokioi*, in order to disseminate its own propaganda. The final chapter also explores the themes pursued by *Te Hokioi*, in particular its concepts of *mana*, and whether the Kingitanga can be described as a nationalist movement. Such was *Te Hokioi*’s success that in 1863 Grey ordered John Gorst, the Waikato magistrate, to publish his own newspaper, *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke*, to counteract the Kingitanga invective. For several months a “newspaper war” raged between the two papers: cold war like propaganda preceding actual hostilities. *Te Pihoihoi*’s diatribes against the Māori King sufficiently enraged Ngāti Maniapoto, amongst whom Gorst was stationed, that he and his press were sent packing back to Auckland. Grey’s maladroit handling of affairs in Taranaki caused conflict to resume there. With the prospect of war in Waikato, the Kingitanga removed its press, causing the demise of *Te Hokioi*, and leaving *Te Karere Maori*, and the newly established regional paper, *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, as the only Māori language newspapers still publishing. *Te Karere Maori* survived several months after the invasion of Waikato by government forces, with the last issue devoted to justifying the Crown’s aggression.

**Contribution**

With the exception of one master’s thesis, and the book, *Rere Atu, Taku Manu!*, there has been little academic analysis of Māori language newspapers, neither of their content, nor of their impact. These newspapers were published for over 90 years, and this thesis, covering merely eight years, is an attempt to fill a small part of this large gap of knowledge. As shown above, a number of scholars have chosen to write about events and trends occurring during the period surveyed by this thesis. Some have

94 Dalton, p 142.
occasionally used the newspapers as historical evidence in their writings, generally through translation.

However, gaps remain. First, apart from Sutherland’s MA thesis on a single newspaper, *Te Haecata*, no academics have attempted to investigate the use of newspapers to spread propaganda at a turbulent time: when Māori society was undergoing rapid change; when relations between Māori and Pākehā were worsening; when the Kingitanga was attempting to establish a form of Māori nationalism; when war was raging in Taranaki, and soon to erupt in Waikato. Second, this thesis is not concerned with debating whether Māori ended up fighting Pākehā over “land” or “sovereignty”: for Māori the issue was *mana*, a concept which encompasses both land and power. This thesis explores the political tensions between the races through the concept of *mana*, that is, whether the newly created *mana kāwanatanga* could take precedence over the already existing *mana whenua*.

Third, most historians who have written about the political affairs of the time have focused on the conflicts between Māori and the government. This has effectively pushed a large portion of Māori (perhaps the majority) from the centre of the historical debate because they did not choose to oppose the government. The newspapers are a valuable resource because they leave a record of more than one perspective. The title of this thesis, “Ngā Reo o ngā Nūpepa 1855-1863” (The Voices of the Newspapers), indicates more than one voice. I seek to allow all the representative voices within the newspapers to be heard, Māori and Pākehā, Kingitanga and Kuinitanga, on the wide range of issues, political, social, commercial, and religious, that they considered important. For this reason, this thesis uses extensive quotes, so that the reader can “listen” to observers and participants “speaking” in their own voices. Lastly, a large amount of the newspaper content, that of *Te Karere Maori*, was published as two parallel bilingual texts. What monolingual historians of the past have read has not always been an exact replica of the Māori text as the tone, and sometimes the content, of the two texts often differed. This thesis endeavours to portray to the reader as close as possible the spirit and flavour of what Māori actually read and said in the newspapers.
Chapter 1: the newspapers and their relevance

Introduction

1855 and 1863 were selected as the parameters for this study for several reasons. It is primarily a study using the Māori language newspapers, and these two dates saw the reappearance and final demise of Te Karere Maori, the government’s principal propaganda newspaper. In terms of politics, the period begins with the period following Grey’s first governorship, starting with Wynyard as acting governor, followed by the governorship of Gore-Browne, and Grey’s return, culminating with the invasion of the Waikato. It was also a time which saw the advent of government by Pākehā colonists, as the racial balance swung in their favour, and as Māori tried to accommodate the social and political implications of this inflow of settlers. Tribes and individuals sought different pathways to this accommodation, and this coloured how the process was viewed. Hence we have both the formation of the anti-government Kingitanga, and the meeting of pro-government chiefs at the Kohimarama Conference. However, race relations in this period can generally be described as sliding from optimism to increasing pessimism, with growing distrust.

In this chapter, I intend to make a summary of the different publications which may be labelled as “newspapers” (niupepa, nuipepa or nūpepa) between the years of 1855 and 1863.1 In particular, I seek to answer the following questions: when and how often they appeared, and who produced them, whilst leaving the content largely to later chapters. The term “newspaper” might appear to be a misnomer when attempting to describe the publications below. Most resemble journals or pamphlets when compared to newspapers today and most would struggle to fit the modern dictionary definition.2 However, to Māori of that time, distinctions such as these were meaningless. A pukapuka (book) could be any piece of paper with words on it, and niupepa covered a variety of printed works.3 Both Māori and English language

---

1 See appendices for a summary of details, and timeline, of these newspapers.
2 The Oxford Concise Dictionary and Thesaurus (1995) defines “newspaper” as ‘a weekly or daily publication consisting of folded sheets and containing news, features and advertisements.’ Most of the niupepa were bi-weekly or monthly; their physical size varied, but many were “magazine” sized; “news” was often months old.
3 For example, when speeches of Rēnata Kawepō and Fitzgerald were published, the document was entitled He Nuipepa tenei, hei whakaatu i nga korero i korerotia ki te Hui ki te Pa whakairo t e 7 o ngā ra o Nowema, 1860 (This is a newspaper, to reveal the speeches spoken at the meeting at Pāwhakairo on the 7th November, 1860.) The date and publisher are not stated, see Williams, p 70.
newspapers tended to have few pages because printing was slow and expensive, and with mails running only once a week, there was little point having more frequent newspapers.\(^4\)

The publications described below,\(^5\) included in the fiche collection, *Niuepepa 1842-1933 Māori Newspapers* produced by the Alexander Turnbull Library, were all considered *niupepa* in that their controllers intended them to be ongoing productions, even when they died soon after birth.\(^6\) Nine of these publications appeared during this research period (although there were never more than three publications being produced at any one time), comprising almost 2600 pages. Pages could differ greatly in size (and therefore in the amount of text they contained) from the larger *Te Waka o te Iwi* (450 x 320mm) to the diminutive *Ko Aotearoa* (210 x 140mm).\(^7\) Published letters show that even regional papers were often read far from their point of printing, but given the nature of transportation and the small print-runs it is unlikely that all Māori had access to all publications as they were produced.

### The Newspapers

*Te Karere Maori*

*Te Karere Maori* (Maori Messenger) was the government’s principal Māori language newspaper, and was produced by staff of the Native Office.\(^8\) Notwithstanding its diminutive dimensions and the duplication of content due to its bi-lingual form, it was the most significant of the newspapers, comprising the principal part of the corpus investigated by this thesis,\(^9\) and appearing as a monthly or bi-monthly with few exceptions throughout my entire research period. I have not, as some scholars have done, divided this publication into three distinct entities: *Te

---

\(^4\) Scholefield (1958), p 22.

\(^5\) The details of each newspaper are tabulated in the appendices.


\(^8\) It is likely that various members of the Native Department helped with the production of *Te Karere Maori*. For example, MS Copy Micro 137 [Alexander Turnbull Library] shows hand-written drafts of articles for *Te Karere Maori* in which grammatical errors were corrected by a second person.

\(^9\) In the 1855-1863 period this thesis covers, *Te Karere Maori/Te Mamahiri Tuarangi* produced over 2059 pages of the approximately 2593 produced by all nine newspapers.
Karere Maori January 1855–February 1861; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi March 1861- November 1861; and Te Karere Maori December 1861-September 1863. Perhaps the most significant difference between Te Karere and Te Manuhiri was its temporary change of name, but in reality its content and management formed a seamless continuity. Like some other Māori language newspapers, Te Karere Maori forms part of a larger genealogy, having descended from the government’s original Te Karere o Nui Tireni which first appeared in 1842.

The full details concerning the editorship of the Te Karere Maori are uncertain. Various officials of the Native Office seem to have acted as the paper’s editor. According to Williams, ‘[t]he greater part of this series [1855 onwards] was edited by Mr. C.O. Davis. Mr. D. Burn and Mr. Walter Buller were also editors during part of this period.’ Dr. Morland Hocken offers a similar opinion, but later adds, ‘Mr David Burn supplied the shipping news and market prices.’ Davis was probably editor when he placed an advertisement for religious literature in 1855, but his involvement with the newspaper ceased when he resigned from the Native Office in 1857. Davis, when questioned by Parliament’s Waikato Committee in 1860 about his resignation, replied that ‘I felt it to be an intolerable burden to continue in it any longer...being constantly annoyed by the under-clerks of the Native Department in various ways.’ However his departure coincided with a court case in which he was sued by a Māori, Horopeta, over a vessel. He informed the Committee that he had won, claiming that Horopeta subsequently told him that other Pākehā had encouraged him to sue. Davis considered that he would have suffered punishment from the Native Department had he lost, but had already made the decision to leave. He claimed that just prior to his resignation, McLean offered him the position of Resident

---

10 This publication has been divided thus in the fiche collection, Niupapa 1842-1933 Māori Newspapers, as well as in New Zealand Digital Library, Waikato University website.
12 Scholefield actually considers the whole 1842-1863 Māori language output as one publication.
13 Williams, p 61-62.
14 Hocken, pp 96, 542.
15 Te Karere Maori, 1/11/1855:17.
Magistrate at Whaingaroa, but he refused on the grounds of inexperience. Davis’s enemies still viewed his departure in a negative light. For example, the Governor’s wife, Harriet Browne labelled him ‘a disgraced employee of the Native Department’ in 1861. In the following year the Taranaki Herald claimed that ‘this person was dismissed [from] the public service, some years since, for an alleged attempt to defraud a native of money and deeds; and that no subsequent inquiry has been held to clear him of the charge.

A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography states that Burn, at one time part­proprietor of the New Zealand Herald, ‘edited the Maori Messenger in 1849 and again in the period 1855-63. However, this newspaper was generally run by officials in the Native Department. Burn was an early editor of the Southern Cross, then edited the Auckland Weekly Register and Commercial and Shipping Gazette from 1857 to at least 1862, and soon after became the first editor of the New Zealand Herald. While he could have supplied commercial information, these commitments to the settler newspapers suggest that it was unlikely he was employed in the Native Office for any length of time. Buller, as the secretary of the Kohimarama Conference, prepared the minutes of that meeting which formed the content of several large editions in 1860, so it is possible that he became editor in the latter part of 1860. It has been suggested that ‘[g]iven the similarity of style of The Maori Messenger to later editions, of which Walter Buller was editor, it seems likely he also edited Te Manuhiri which existed in 1861’.

Te Karere Maori noted the appointment of Charles Davis as its editor and interpreter within the Native Department in February 1862. There were mixed feelings about his loyalty to his fellow colonists due to the content of his own private
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18 AJHR (1860) F3, p 34.
19 Browne, p 47.
22 Scholefield (1958), pp 77, 81, 83.
23 In September 1860, Buller wrote to McLean that his father, Rev. James Buller, had forwarded several articles about Maori meetings in Canterbury which he hoped would ‘be inserted in the "Messenger"’. See McLean Papers, Folio 190 [Alexander Turnbull Library].
25 Te Karere Maori, 25/2/1862:16.
newspapers published in the interim,\textsuperscript{26} and suspicions that he was too close to the Kingitanga.\textsuperscript{27} Harriet Browne considered him ‘a traitor’.\textsuperscript{28} In May of that year the Parliament debated ‘the person now in charge of the paper [who] was a person who had stood in a very peculiar and equivocal attitude towards the Government and the Natives of late’. Carleton, an independent member, defended the honour of an unnamed individual (almost certainly Davis), stating that ‘[h]e had the very strong conviction that he was previously removed from the editorship, not for any fault, but, rather, to make a berth for a partisan.’\textsuperscript{29} Fox defended the appointment as a way of enlivening an otherwise dull paper.

The most logical sequence of editors, therefore, for this period was Davis, then perhaps Burn either as full editor or supplying commercial information, followed by Buller, with Davis returning again. It is less clear how long Davis continued in the position, once the Fox Ministry fell. It appears that the new Native Minsister, Francis Bell, was keen to employ Arthur Atkinson, one of the influential Richmond-Atkinson family of Taranaki, to take the position, Atkinson, however, thought the salary too low, and did not consider that he could work under Grey.\textsuperscript{30}

Not all Māori had ready access to the paper and many wrote letters to the Native Office requesting it. There was a list of ‘[p]arties entitled to’ the newspapers, but notices that they should contact the editor if not receiving it regularly points to circulation problems.\textsuperscript{31} It is likely that, at least in 1856, 500 copies of \textit{Te Karere Maori} were printed. This was the figure mentioned by John White, an interpreter in Northland to the Board of Enquiries on Native Matters in 1856. He regarded this number as being ‘insufficient for the use of the natives’, an opinion shared by John Rogan, a District Land Commissioner in the Waikato.\textsuperscript{32} Davis, described as an “interpreter” (a position that perhaps took precedence in the Native Office over

---

\textsuperscript{26} These are discussed below.

\textsuperscript{27} In his evidence to the Waikato Committee, Davis consistently denied being involved with the establishment of the Kingitanga, or with politics in general. See \textit{AJHR} (1860) F3, pp 18-20. However, A.S. Atkinson, brother-in-law to the Native Minister, C.W. Richmond (1858-60), considered Davis to be a major promoter of the Kingitanga, as did the Waikato missionary, John Morgan. See \textit{Richmond-Atkinson Papers}, pp 288, 751.

\textsuperscript{28} Browne, p 48.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{NZPD} 1861-1863, p 522. [delete first quote]


\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Te Manuhiri Tuarangi}, 15/4/1861:1. ‘...nga tangata kua whakaaetia nei kia tukua...’ A similar notice also appears, \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/6/1860, p 1.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{British Parliamentary Papers Relative to New Zealand 1854-60} Vol 10, Shannon: Irish University Press, 1969, pp 558, 577.
editing), also gave evidence to the enquiry, but refrained from mentioning the government’s newspaper. 500 copies spread around approximately 56,000 Māori was obviously too few, and the first editorial of the Te Mamuhiri Tuarangi claimed that ‘arrangements have been made to secure a better circulation of it than has hitherto obtained.’ 33 Unfortunately, whether such an arrangement occurred could not be ascertained.

Regional Māori newspapers

The next most prolific publication was Te Karere o Poneke (233 pages in total) produced by Walter Buller, a young Native Office official in Wellington, who later became the editor of Te Karere Maori. Parkinson describes Te Karere o Poneke as a ‘Government paper’, perhaps due to Buller’s position of interpreter and to the use of the Crown’s coat of arms in the masthead. 34 However, Buller assembled the paper in his own time assisted by his father, a Wesleyan missionary, and friends in the Independent newspaper office. 35 He did attempt to get financial backing from the Government, eventually receiving £40. He was disappointed with such a small sum as it was insufficient to keep the paper afloat. 36 Buller set subscriptions at £1 per year, payable half-yearly, and in January 1858 he claimed 120 Māori and 20 Pākehā subscribers, and by July was suggesting that the number had reached 200. 37 However, newspapers were expensive undertakings and Buller resorted to printing the names of Māori who did not pay their subscriptions in the hope of shaming them into payment, and he continued calling for more subscribers to the end of the paper. 38 The paper was an individual philanthropic effort on Buller’s part, perhaps motivated to advance his career prospects within the Native Office. However, it could be described as a de facto Wesleyan organ as much as a government one. Despite financial constraints, Buller produced four pages weekly (the only weekly Māori language publication in this period) for sixteen months, plus occasional supplements; a remarkable achievement at that time. Buller went on to edit Te Karere Maori, and

34 Parkinson, p 16.
36 Galbreath, pp 35-37.
37 Te Karere o Poneke, 25/1/1858:2; 12/7/1858:2.
38 Te Karere o Poneke, 17/5/1858:2; 29/11/1858:2; 27/12/1858:2.
later became a magistrate. He had success as a lawyer, as an ornithological writer, and was knighted in 1886.

*Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri* was a significant Māori language newspaper, but within the parameters of this research study, it was in its infancy, having published only eight issues (36 pages) by the time *Te Karere Maori* was wound up. It continued to be published until 1871, when it was moved to Wellington, reborn as *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tireni*, and according to Hocken ‘placed entirely under government control’.\(^{39}\) Like *Te Karere o Poneke*, *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri* was a regional paper sporting the Crown’s arms, but focusing on the Hawkes Bay and Wairarapa regions. The paper named James Wood, of the *Hawkes Bay Herald*, as the printer, and, according to Scholefield, Wood took on the printing for the provincial government in 1858 with “the Herald [becoming] its official organ.”\(^{40}\) His involvement in *Te Waka Māori o Ahuriri* may have been similar. However, the editorship of the newspaper is less certain. Parkinson states that Donald McLean, the superintendent of the Hawkes Bay province, the Crown’s Chief Land Purchaser, and later the Native Minister, was ‘for much of the time the de facto editor’.\(^{41}\) Waikato University’s Māori newspaper webpages suggests that McLean was the editor, because some issues were delayed due to the editor’s land purchasing activities.\(^{42}\)

*Te Waka* was published fortnightly, with subscriptions set at 10 shillings per year. As the paper noted, ‘the Pākehā pays for his newspaper. We think that the Māori should for pay for his own as well’, suggesting that at least ten Māori pā collect five pounds each in return for ten communal subscriptions.\(^{43}\) This would be supplemented by money from the government, the words ‘the Government will also [provide] fifty pounds, making [the total] up to 100 [pounds]’, thus suggesting that government money was readily available.\(^{44}\) The editor justified the expense by explaining the extra procedures required due to using Pākehā printers. For example
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39 Hocken, p 543.
40 Scholefield (1958), p 141.
41 Parkinson, p 25.
43 *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 13/6/1863:2, ‘He mea utu na te Pakeha tana nupepa. E mea ana matou ki te maori ko tana nupepa hoki me utu.’
44 *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 13/6/1863:2, ‘Ma te Kawanatanga hoki etahi pauna erima te kau, ka taea te rau[.]’
all the letters had to be carefully written out, and the proofs had to be corrected by an interpreter.45

*Te Waka* also had access to official sources. For example, the first issue contained a letter from local chiefs to Governor Grey regarding Waitara, and other letters addressed to McLean in his capacity as Superintendent of the Hawkes Bay province appeared in later editions. However, McLean’s influence was sufficiently ambiguous that some correspondents also wrote letters to James Wood, the printer.46 Given the financial problems encountered by other independent Māori language newspapers of this era, it is relatively clear that *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, if not an official government organ, was definitely supported by government monies allowing Donald McLean, as government official and colonial politician, to communicate to Māori through print.

*Te Haeata*

The third largest publication (144 pages) of this period was *Te Haeata*, a four page monthly which appeared regularly for two years from April 1859. This was the only “official” religious paper of this time, and was authorised by ‘the committee of the ministers of the Wesleyan Church’,47 with the prominent missionary, Thomas Buddle of Onehunga, as its editor. Williams states that Buddle was ‘the first editor’.48 However, no evidence exists of any other editor. Although other Wesleyan missionaries contributed articles to the paper, correspondents were instructed to write ‘ki te Kai-Tuhi o Te Haeata, ara ki a Te Patara’ (to the editor of *Te Haeata*, namely, Buddle) from the first issue to the last. Buddle does not mention the numbers of subscribers, but it is likely to have attracted mainly Wesleyan converts, although the Anglican missionary, Maunsell, distributed the paper to his monitors.49 The paper was somewhat cheaper to subscribe to than *Te Karere o Poneke*, at only three pence a copy, or two shillings for a year’s subscription. Given the enduring financial problems of the non-governmental newspapers, it is likely that funds were provided by the Wesleyan Church: only once does Buddle actually call for subscriptions. This support naturally extended to the collection of subscriptions.

45 *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 13/6/1863:2.
46 For example, see *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 11/7/1863:2.
47 *Te Haeata*, 1/4/1859:1. ‘...te komiti o nga Minita o te Hahi Weteriana...’
48 Williams, 68.
My friends, the subscribers of Te Haeata, collect together your half-crowns to pay for Te Haeata for the year, to also pay the printer for his work on our newspaper. You should give it to your monitors, and they will give it to their minister. "Maru eats out, Maru eats in; all is agreeable."50

As seen below, Buddle acted as an unofficial government agent at Māori meetings. It is not surprising that his paper was generally pro-government in its views. Buddle, at least on one occasion, asked McLean to approve the publication of a letter.51 There does not appear to be any discussion of Te Haeata in Buddle's voluminous letterbooks, nor in The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography's entry on Buddle. Even a tribute document written by his descendants fails to mention his newspaper activities.52 Obviously, Te Haeata was just one duty amongst many for a short time in the long life of a busy missionary.

The newspapers of Charles Davis

C.O.B. Davis attempted to establish newspapers on three occasions in the years he was not employed in the Native Office. The first was Te Waka o te Iwi (8 pages in total) which was issued twice, in October and November of 1857. This was followed the next year by Te Whetu o te Tau (totalling 12 pages) which appeared three times. Two annuals, named Ko Aotearoa, were also printed in January 1861 and 1862. The former was made up of about 25 pages of bilingual text, while the latter comprised 16 pages of English followed by another 16 pages of Māori, only a small portion of which was the same content. Davis's private publishings ceased on his regaining the editorship of Te Karere Maori in 1862, until the 1880s when he edited the long

49 Te Haeata, 1/7/1859:4. Monitors were Māori Christians who assisted missionaries in their work.
50 Te Haeata 1/1/1860:1; 'E hoa ma e nga kai korero o Te Haeata kohikohia a koutou hawhe karana hei utu mo Te Haeata nei mo te tau, kia utua hoki te kai ta mo tana mahi i ta tatou niupepa nei. Me hoatu ki o koutou monita, ma ratou e hoatu ki tona minita. "Ko Marukai atu, ko marukai mai, ka ngohengohoe."' The meaning of saying is ‘When one gives as well as takes, all are happy’, see H. Moko Mead & Neal Grove, Nga Pepeha a nga Tupuna, Vol3 (Wellington: Victoria University, 1994) p 111.
51 Buddle wrote to McLean that '[w]hen I [??] home I found a letter from Rev. R. Maunsell on the subject of his Waikuku speech which he requests me to publish in 'Te Haeata' and which is intended by him to correct the misrepresentations of the natives. I thought it well to allow him to set himself right and therefore sent his letter to press. Mr. Hobbs has seen it and rather demurs to its publication. Would you be kind enough to read it and tell Mr. H. tour whakaaro ifyou think it would do harm then I will have the letter left out.’ See McLean Papers, Folio 189 [Alexander Turnbull Library]. Buddle also had a close relationship with Governor Browne. Brown wrote a “confidential” letter to Buddle in 1856, asking his advice on whether the settler government should take responsibility for native affairs. See MS-Papers-4449-23 [Alexander Turnbull Library].
52 Frank Glen, 'Buddle, Thomas' (B45) in The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Vol 1, 1769-1869; Jessie Arthur, Rev Thomas and Mrs Buddle: Pioneer Missionaries to New Zealand 1840 to 1884, A Tribute to their Memory by their Descendants, 7th May, 1940, [ATL].
running *Te Korimako* with the support of American benefactors, Mr. and Mrs. Snow. 53

Arriving in New Zealand as a teenager, Davis was initially involved in the Wesleyan Mission in Hokianga. 54 Although Davis’s publications were not connected with any particular sect, evangelism was his primary motivation for producing newspapers. As he stated in *Te Waka o te Iwi*, ‘ko te whakapono te tuatahi’ (the faith is first), seeing his newspaper as giving voice to the Christian message.

This is the word of Scripture. “Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors. For whosoever findeth me findeth life, and shall obtain the favour of the LORD.” Proverbs 8:34-35. 55

Davis’s second paper acknowledged his first newspaper in its introduction, albeit with a little apprehension about its future.

“*Te Waka o te Iwi*” has been pulled to shore…. So! This is a star which will rise in the firmament. Great are the stars, Venus of the morning, Venus of the evening, Antares, the Pleiades and other multitudes, but this one, “*Te Whetu o te Tau*” has been bustled in. When it will disappear cannot be known. 56

Davis, at this time, had no support for his newspapers other than what he could get from Māori. He spent much of his time in this period writing letters to Māori, or visiting villages, collecting money for a “Maori press”. Given his background, some Pākehā viewed his activities with suspicion. As F.E. Maning reported to the Native Minister in 1860, Davis was seeking support in Northland for his press ‘to advocate what sort of principles is easily supposed’. 57

Support came from a wide range of Māori. A great deal of the content of *Te Waka o te Iwi* consists of letters of reply to Davis agreeing to his plans, pledging to collect money for him, or detailing how many pounds had been raised, or lamenting their inability to contribute due to poverty. Only Wi Tako Ngatata and Te Honiana Te Puni of Wellington actually wrote objecting to a Māori press, perhaps because they...
considered it a threat to Buller's paper.\(^{58}\) In 1858, Davis wrote an account modestly titled 'The Journey of Rewi and Te Waitere and their Pâkehā', detailing his fundraising efforts in the Taupo and Waikato regions accompanied by these Ngāti Maniapoto chiefs.\(^{59}\) They left Auckland in the newly acquired Ngāti Maniapoto vessel, *Aotearoa*, with a man named Patara on board. It is quite possible that this was Patara Te Tuhi, who later became the editor of the Kingitanga's own newspaper.

1858 was the year that Pōtatau was crowned and support for the Kingitanga was at its height, and not unnaturally, some commentators linked Davis's fundraising activities to this movement. For example, Buller, in *Te Karere o Poneke*, when discussing the Kingitanga stated:

> They collected money to [use to] raise up the *mana* of their king, raising £1800. That money was then laid before the king. The collection has also been completed to buy a press from Auckland. Perhaps Charles Davis will run that press.\(^{60}\)

Davis aimed to raise £1000, half of which would purchase the press to produce a newspaper and religious books. The other half he intended to spend on some land in Auckland on which to house the press as well as provide space for out-of-town Māori to erect their own stores to sell their produce. Davis was not able to realise enough cash to purchase the land, but in 1860, he told the Waikato Committee that he did have the materials to print.\(^{61}\) However, he declared himself 'fearful of publishing anything lest the Government should be embarrassed, the Native mind being in so excited a state.' Stating that Māori (presumably the Kingitanga) had asked that he send them the press to manage the press in order to 'publish their own opinions'. He refused, 'being fearful of their making a bad use of it', keeping them to the agreement that Auckland would be the base for publishing.\(^{62}\)

Times were still turbulent in January, 1861, with war in Taranaki, when Davis published *Ko Aotearoa*. He portrayed the paper as the culmination of the fund raising

---

\(^{58}\) *Te Waka o te Iwi*, 1/10/1857:3. There may be other reasons why these two chiefs were against Davis’s project. There may have been religious motivations. Davis’s resignation from the Native Department (and supposed disgrace) may have been a factor, or they may not have liked him personally. Politically, Wi Tako Ngatata was a Kingitanga supporter, so Davis’s leanings towards that movement should not have offended him. Te Honiana Te Puni, however, did not support the Kingitanga.

\(^{59}\) *Te Whetu o te Tau*, 1/6/1858:2; 1/7/1858:2; ‘Te Haerenga a Rewi raua ko Te Waitere me te raua Pakeha’. Also reprinted in *Te Karere o Poneke*, 26/7/1858:2-3; 2/8/1858:4.

\(^{60}\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 9/8/1858:2. ‘Kohikohia ana e ratou nga moni hei hapai i te mana o to ratou kingi, puta ana, kotahi mano e waru rau nga pauna. Takoto rawa aua moni i te aroaro i te kingi. Kua oti hoki te kohikohi moni hei hoko mai i tetahi perehi i Akarana. Ma Hare Reweti pea taua perehi e mahi.’

\(^{61}\) *AJHR* (1860) F3, pp 17, 34.
efforts, the visible achievement of ‘te Perehi Maori’ (the Māori Press) which had been supported by Māori, great and small. 63 The paper consisted mainly of homilies, including general calls for peace, and a complimentary article on the second Māori king. One page of ‘Sundry Items of Intelligence’ displayed Davis’s opposition to the government’s actions in Taranaki. 64 The 1862 annual was used to publicise ‘Teira’s confession’ over the ownership of Waitara and, in the Māori text, to directly blame Gore Browne for the war that followed his purchase of that land.

Just look at his deeds from the time of his installation as governor up till his departure: the mind can’t think of a single great good that he did . . . It was ignorant and evil-hearted Pakeha that he liked, and they twisted his thoughts, and, the result of his mistaken actions was the flowing of Pakeha and Maori blood upon Taranaki. [LP] 65

Later in 1865, Davis was charged with seditious libel (but found not guilty) for a pamphlet he helped publish, but the words above, printed in 1862, were relatively free of consequence. Davis’s attack on Browne was also accompanied by short panegyrics on Grey and Fox, the new Governor and Premier. 66 Naturally, some Pākehā were offended at his partisan stand. For example, the Taranaki Herald was appalled that by showing Māori the political divisions in Pākehā politics, Davis was ‘doing what he can do to bring our institutions into contempt with his readers’ and was ‘sapping the only possible foundation...on which a scheme of government for the native race can be based’. The Herald also hoped that reports were untrue that Davis ‘has been lately a not infrequent visitor at Government House, and is said to have employment under the new system among the natives’. 67 The Herald finished its attack on Davis, with a letter from Teira and others refuting their “confession” over Waitara printed in Ko Aotearoa, and suggesting that Davis was ‘descended from an enslaved fish [source]’. 68

However, Governor Browne had departed, and his successor, Grey, was taking the credit for a pacified Taranaki at the expense of his discredited predecessor. Davis’s fulsome praise of Grey and the new Premier, William Fox, in the same publication was no doubt appreciated, as he returned as editor to Te Karere Maori in

---

62 AJHR (1860) F3, pp 34.
63 Ko Aotearoa, 1/1861:3.
64 Ko Aotearoa, 1/1861:24
65 Ko Aotearoa 1/1862:2, 18, 31. ‘Titiro noa ki ana mahi i tona orokokawanatanga taenoatia te ra o tana haere, kihai rawa i kitea e te whakaaro tetahi pai nui ana, kia kotahi ... Ko nga Pakeha kuare me nga Pakeha ngakau kino i paingia e ia; na ratou i whakariioiake tona whakaaro, a, te mutunga o tana mahi poaau, ko te rewanga o te toto Pakeha, Maori hoki, ki runga o Taranaki.’
66 Ko Aotearoa, 1/1/1862:17-18.
67 Taranaki Herald, 8/2/1862:2.
68 Taranaki Herald, 8/2/1862:2-3. ‘He uri rānei no Ika-kua-mau.’
the following month. The politician, J.C. Richmond, was perhaps correct in saying that Grey was merely buying Davis's silence. Nevertheless, with Davis's return to official favour, it was to be the Kingitanga who took up the challenge of running a truly Māori press.

*Te Hokioi* and *Te Pihoihoi*

The two Waikato papers, *Te Hokioi* and *Te Pihoihoi*, despite their small output, are perhaps the most interesting of the newspapers, and had a greater political significance than their few pages would suggest. In 1858 and 1859 the Austrian warship, *Novara*, visited New Zealand on a scientific mission. *Te Karere Maori* informed its Māori readers:

The Commodore wants some of the Māori people of New Zealand to also board this warship, and return to their home. When the Novara sails from New Zealand, it will head for Tahiti, Hawai`i and some of the ports on the east and west of the southern end of America, then after return to Europe. Her meanderings to the places of the world will finally be completed in the following year.[LP]

Two Māori chiefs from the Waikato, Hemara Rerehau and Wiremu Toetoe of Ngāti Apakura, agreed to join the *Novara*, and sailed to Europe in 1859. While in Vienna, the two chiefs were taught, among other things, aspects of the printing trade, and were given a printing press by the Austro-Hungarian emperor. Toetoe already had a good understanding of the power of the print media. In 1857 he advertised hospitality and guiding services around Rangiaohia for five shillings per day; and in 1858 he wrote an account, published in *Te Karere Maori*, about a meeting he attended.

---

70 *Te Karere Maori* 31/12/1858:5-6. "E hiahia ana a Te Komatoa kia eke atu hoki etahi o nga tangata Maori o Niu Tirani ki runga ki tenei Manu- wao, a hoki noa ki to ratou kainga, Kia rere atu te "Novara" i Niu Tirani, ka ahu te rere ko Tahiti, ko Hawai, ko etahi o nga waiapu o te taha ki te Marangai, o te taha ki te Auru o te pito whakarunga o Merika, muri iho ka hoki ki Oropi. Heoiano ka whakatia tana kopikopiko ki nga wahi o te ao, i roto i te tau kotahi e haere ake nei.; 'The Commodore is anxious that some Natives from New Zealand also should accompany the expedition on its onward voyage and return. On leaving New Zealand, the "Novara" will visit Tahiti, Hawaii, then some of the South American ports on the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, and finally return to Europe, completing her tour of circumnavigation in about a year from this time. [TKM]' 71

71 An account of the visit of these two chiefs to Vienna has been published, based on the diary of Hemara Rerehau. See Helen M. Hogan, *Bravo, Neu Zeeland: Two Maori in Vienna 1859-1860* (Christchurch: Clerestory Press, 2003).

72 This is acknowledged in *Te Hokioi* 15/6/1862:4, 'Teperehi, aroha mai o te Kingi o Atiria.' (The press, [an act of] love from the King of Austria [LP]). Parkinson attributes the gift to the Austrian emperor, as do other sources: see Parkinson, p 21; Eugene Grayland, *Unusual Newspapers of New Zealand and Australia* (Auckland: Colenso Press, 1969) pp 7-8; Scholefield (1958), p 258. However, the gift has also been attributed to Archduke Maximilian: see Chane1 Clarke, *Report on the Recent Trust Waikato Collection Acquisitions* (Hamilton: Waikato Museum of Art and History, 2000) p 2.
to discuss roads and the carriage of mail in the Taupō district. Both chiefs wrote letters to Governor Browne which were subsequently published in *Te Karere Maori*. The press, of English manufacture, was shipped to Auckland where it was assembled, and then sent to Waikato. This printing press became the means of a truly Māori press, and was used by the Kingitanga to produce their newspaper, *Te Hokioi o Nui Tireni* under the editorship of Wiremu Pātara Te Tuhi, a relative of Tāwhiao, who had been instrumental in getting Pōtatau to accept the crown. A “hokioi” was an unseen mythical bird with supernatural powers, although this was sometimes seen in a more sinister light.

*Te Hokioi*’s output was sporadic at best, the size and layout were inconsistent, and compared to the Pakeha produced newspapers the print quality was poor. This is acknowledged rather illegibly by the editor. “It is not [known?] [we] didn’t go to a printing school, but are [still] learning”, suggesting also that Toetoe and Rerehau were no longer involved in printing. The press was responsible for some other printed matter, but is known to have produced eight issues proper, totalling 23 pages, between June 1862 and May 1863. Most of these issues carried the purchase price of three pence.

The Government’s attitude to the Kingitanga had hardened by the 1860s, and as the official organ of the movement, *Te Hokioi*, was naturally perceived as an anti-government propaganda weapon, despite Pataia’s adherence to the moderate wing. Grey decided not to counteract it through the Auckland based *Te Karere Maori*, perhaps because that paper was directed at Maori of all regions and he did not wish to

---

74 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1860:9-10; 15/12/1860:5-6.
76 This masthead of this paper sometimes read ‘Te Hokioi e Rere atu na’.
78 Gorst for example claimed it ‘was an omen of war or pestilence’. See Gorst (2001), p 138. The bird itself may have been the extinct New Zealand eagle, *Harpagornis moorei*. See Desmond Hurley, ‘The Mysterious Hakuwai and the Ancient Harpogornis’, *NZWords*, August 2000, pp 5-6.
79 *Te Hokioi*, 8/12/1862:1. ‘E hara nei i te mof??? kihai nei i tae atu ki te kura mahi Perehi, engari e ako ana’. In a letter dated 27/4/1862 to John White, Toetoe states that he was urging the chiefs and rūnanga to allow Gorst, the Native Commissioner for the Upper Waikato, to preside over court cases. This suggests that Toetoe at this time was pro-Government, if not anti-Kingitanga. See McDonnell AF Papers 1845-1938, Folder 1 [ATL]. Cowan suggests that a nephew of Charles Davis gave the Kingitanga some instruction in printing, but this does not appear to be supported by any other source. See Cowan, p 238.
80 Scholefield states the first issue appeared on the 1st June 1861. Scholefield (1958), p 258. However *Te Hokioi* starts at 15th June, 1862 in the *Niupepa* fiche collection.
increase the *mana* of the Kingitanga by attacking its newspaper directly. In addition, according to Gorst, *Te Karere Maori* was not well distributed within the Waikato.\(^{81}\) Instead, Grey instructed Gorst, the Native Commissioner for the Upper Waikato, to establish a rival publication, *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke i Runga i te Tuanui*, at the government’s school at Te Awamutu, deep within Kingitanga territory.\(^{82}\) Although the “pihoihoi” is a native bird, the newspaper’s title, reflecting Gorst’s rather isolated position, came directly from Psalm 102:7, as the ‘sparrow alone upon the house top.’ Four issues were published in February and March of 1863, totalling 18 pages. The first, containing the article “Te Kino o te Mahi Kingi” (The evil of Kingite activity), was revised by Grey himself.\(^{83}\) The two “birds” then engaged in a contest with each other, which the Government newspaper appeared to be winning, if only because it was more prolific than *Te Hokioi*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Sequence of issues of <em>Te Hokioi</em> (H) and <em>Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke</em> (P) in 1863.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The arrow (→) indicates the issue of *Te Pihoihoi* impounded by Ngāti Maniapoto warriors.*

Anger towards the content of the new newspaper was expressed by Kingitanga supporters, including the King’s Council at Ngāruawāhia.\(^{84}\) Rewi, the Ngāti Maniapoto chief hostile to the government, acted upon this anger and sent a group of warriors to shut the offending newspaper down.\(^{85}\) Four pages of the fifth and last issue of *Te Pihoihoi* were proofed, but were not printed or circulated. Gorst and his entourage were ordered to leave the districts under the King’s authority or suffer

---

\(^{81}\) Gorst (2001), p 23. *Te Karere Maori* did not ignore *Te Hokioi* completely. See for example the discussion below on the issue of black rule in Haiti.

\(^{82}\) Scholefield implies that the newspaper was printed on a press at the C.M.S. mission at Te Awamutu. Scholefield (1958), p 259. However, this is misleading as the mission buildings had been given to the government by the church for their own school and more buildings were added. See Gorst, pp 121-123.


\(^{84}\) Gorst (2001), pp 138-139.

\(^{85}\) Gorst (2001), pp 139-141.
death.\textsuperscript{86} With the approval from the Governor in Auckland, they agreed to remove themselves from the district. There appears to have been little acrimony between the editors of the two newspapers, Pātara hosting Gorst on his return to Auckland.\textsuperscript{87} Te Pīhoihoi’s press was returned to Auckland while Te Hokioi continued for a few more issues. However, with war between the Crown and the Kingitanga threatening, the Māori press was sent to Te Kopua for safekeeping, but was eventually abandoned.\textsuperscript{88}

Summarising this early period of Māori language newspapers, a later Māori-run newspaper stated:

But one could say about all those other newspapers, other than that of Ngāruawāhia which was destroyed in the war, that from their names they belonged to the Māori. But they belonged to the Pākehā, it was they who ran them to bring about their own desires. Sometimes their desires were good, other times bad. But all of them that disseminated the Pākehā’s thoughts, were used for their own purposes.\textsuperscript{89}

Prior to the government’s invasion of Waikato in 1863, a separate Māori state within New Zealand remained a realistic possibility, at least to the Kingitanga and its newspaper, Te Hokioi. Unlike later Māori-run newspapers which tended to operate within the mainstream, Te Hokioi presented a direct challenge to the government of New Zealand predicated on the notion of separate Māori power. It therefore stands as unique, not only amongst the other Māori language newspapers of its own time, but also among other Māori-run newspapers.

All the other Māori language newspapers in this research period were run by Pākehā, whether official government publications, church newspapers, or private operations. The dominant publication was the government’s Te Karere Maori, in terms of duration and the number of pages printed. Because the Pākehā population was relatively small at the time, and those Pākehā with an interest in Māori matters an even smaller number, it is not surprising to see a cross-over in personnel involved in niupepa production. The effort involved and the marginal returns suggests that people such as Buller and Davis were motivated by altruism, or religious zeal, in their private endeavours, even if their editorship of Te Karere Maori was part of their

\textsuperscript{86} Gorst (2001), pp 143.
\textsuperscript{87} Gorst (2001), p 146.
\textsuperscript{89} Aotearoa, 4/6/1892:1. ‘Otira ko ena niupepa katoa, haunga ano te niupepa o Ngāruawahia i whakangaromia e te whawhai, ko nga ingoa kau e kia a ana na te Māori. Engari na te Pakeha, nana ano i whakahaere ki puta ai ona hiahia. I tetahi takiwa he pai ona hiahia, i tetahi takiwa he kino. Engari ko nga mea katoa kua puta mai i te whakaaro o te Pakeha i mahia mona ano.’
official functions. Each of these Pākehā-run newspapers possessed unique features, but the motivations of the controllers overlapped to some extent. How much will be seen later in the thesis.

How relevant were the newspapers?

Some opinions

Did the messages promulgated in the Māori language newspapers add to the intellectual discourse of their readers in the pre-war period, or was much of the content dismissed by readers as irrelevant? Certainly the latter is suggested by some commentators, but I hope to show that for nineteenth century Māori, the newspaper was a taonga for a variety of reasons. The government’s Te Karere Maori: The Maori Messenger, the only paper which appeared regularly throughout my research period, was the most prolific newspaper of the pre-war period, and having bi-lingual texts has been the most accessible to Pākehā historians. However historians have tended to interpret this newspaper with present day biases rather than taking into account the contexts within which they were produced. Alan Ward described Te Karere Maori as ‘tawdry’, and to Keith Sinclair, it was ‘a hotchpotch of sloppy piety, dull moralizing, and condescending didacticism’ possessing the single merit of giving valuable agricultural and commercial knowledge.90 That Māori would see value in market information is certainly easy to align with the notion of mid-nineteenth century Māori-as-successful-entrepreneur (which certainly has some merit), just as their denigration of Pākehā moralising corresponds with the modern historical trend of stigmatising missionary and official endeavours, and secularising the nature of Māori-Pākehā race relations.91

There were also contemporary Pākehā observers who held Te Karere Maori in low regard. John Gorst, for example, lamented its ‘dull idiocy’ in his book, The Maori King.92 However, Walter Brodie suggests that, at least in the early years of publication, Māori travelled especially to Auckland to get their newspaper on the

91 John Stenhouse defines the cauterisation or denigration of religious influence that appeared within New Zealand history during the last thirty years of the twentieth century as the “secularization thesis”. In particular, he identifies Sinclair as one of the leading secularising historians. See John Stenhouse, “God’s Own Silence: Secular Nationalism, Christianity and the Writing of New Zealand History” in NZJH, Vol. 38, No 1 (April, 2004) pp 52-3, 58-60.
publication day. At the “Board of Enquiry on Native Subjects” held in 1856, a few Māori, and some Pākehā who had dealings with Māori, provided an array of different opinions on the newspaper. Mr. Joseph, a Kāwhia merchant, asserted that “[t]he natives take little notice of the tales or anecdotes published [but] ... [m]atters of trade and prices for produce they value.” By contrast, Riwai te Ahu, the Anglican deacon at Ōtaki, stated that “[t]he newspaper is beneficial to the native race; they learn many things therefrom.” Similarly, Mr. A. Campbell, a trader on the East Coast, declared that “[a]nything that appears in the “Maori Messenger” they believe; they read it; there is not a corner of the “Maori Messenger” they do not read.” Other respondents were generally positive about the nature of the paper, although they felt it was in need of improvement, and considered the 500 copies printed as insufficient for the whole Māori population. However, two years later, C.W. Richmond, the Colonial Treasurer, informed Parliament of his desire ‘to increase the efficiency of the Maori newspaper (hear!): he and all connected with it were well aware it required improvement; but he would like all those hon. members who called out “hear”, to try their hands at the leading article!’ At least one tried. In 1859, a W. Crompton forwarded an article for Te Karere Maori. Richmond noted it was meant to be ‘a specimen of an improved style of article for the Maori Messenger.’ However, he added “I confess I do not consider it a very successful attempt.” Improvement was obviously not an easy task.

The differing Māori attitudes to Te Karere Maori noticed by contemporary observers might have been influenced by that individual’s attitudes, or by the people that he was acquainted with. For example Joseph, as a merchant, was probably more interested in quoted market prices than the ‘tales and anecdotes’ himself. He also lived in an area which was heavily involved in the Auckland trade. While Campbell was also a trader, his East Coast Māori customers were distant from any large Pākehā

94 BPP, Vol 10, pp 551.  
95 BPP, Vol 10, pp 552.  
96 BPP, Vol 10, pp 559.  
97 BPP, Vol 10, pp 532, 550-580  
98 The New Zealand Spectator and Cook’s Strait Guardian, 10/7/1858:4.  
settlement and were possibly more curious about what Pākehā had to say. Having converted to Christianity at a reasonably late stage, they may have better tolerated the more moralistic articles than a more religiously jaded community. Ōtaki was, according to William Fox, a ‘separate system’ under missionary influence,¹⁰¹ and Riwai Te Ahu, as a clergyman living there, would also have appreciated the moral tone of the newspaper. Gorst’s opinion on the paper, published after he had left New Zealand, was no doubt coloured by his disillusionment with Governor Grey and his Māori policies.

There is also a tendency to assume that because the Māori language is seen by some today as an oral language (when the print market is dominated by English language), therefore nineteenth century Māori would not have related to newspapers; or as Parkinson suggests, ‘Hui rather than “niupepa” were the preferred medium of Maori’.¹⁰² Such attitudes tend to ignore the extent to which the dominant traditional oral discourse, such as whaikōrero, interacted with written and printed material, breaking down the distinctions between spoken and written texts, so that rather than forming a static dichotomy, the two forms would diverge and converge in a hybridising process.

Māori use of the newspapers

Indeed, many of the texts were about hui, often written by Māori themselves. If not necessarily providing whole whaikōrero, they often gave the names of speakers, and significant fragments of their speeches, sometimes with the accompanying waiata. This gave the orators a wider audience, far beyond those people within physical earshot, and for a longer period of time. Indeed for important occasions, there was an expectation that speeches should be reported, as intimated by the Civil Commissioner for the Bay of Islands, George Clarke.

The Ngapuhi chiefs have expressed themselves disappointed by not seeing in print an account of the meeting with His Excellency the Governor in November last at the Waimate, and at Hokianga. They say that everything said and done by the disaffected Natives at Waikato is printed in the Maori paper, [Te Hokioi] but their loyal speeches and conduct have been unnoticed.¹⁰³
The divergence and convergence of print and speech can be seen quite clearly in several accounts of meetings held in 1862. On Grey’s return to New Zealand he introduced a new system of (Pākehā managed) self-government for Māori districts, called “Ngā Tikanga Hou” or the “New Institutions”. Te Karere Maori published details of the new system. These were then discussed by a rūnanga in Aotea.

On the 2nd of March 1862 that Runanga searched out the meaning of the words in that “Messenger.” The words were read aloud. They occur at the 12th page of the “Messenger” published in February 1862.104

The printed text became spoken words at the meeting, which were then discussed. When the Aotea rūnanga had reached agreement to support the planned reforms, a letter was composed, paraphrasing certain speeches, and concluding with a request that the letter be printed.105 An even more convoluted process involved a meeting called in Taranaki to discuss a conversation which had occurred elsewhere months earlier, and was likely only known to the rūnanga through the newspaper. It started on 112th December 1861 when Governor Grey met local Māori at Kohanga in Waikato. Also present were Tipene, Herewini and Te Whi Panawaka, chiefs loyal to the Kingitanga, whom Grey engaged in a public debate.106 Notes of what was said were taken, most likely by a government official, which were later printed verbatim in Te Karere Maori. We cannot know whether the Kingitanga chiefs knew they were being recorded, or indeed how accurate the printed record actually is, but their words were discussed at various marae, including one at Puketawa in Taranaki.

When your newspapers arrived here in Taranaki, we saw the story coming out of your trip to Waikato. Then we carefully investigated those words spoken by you and the Waikato people. Then we met together at the village of Porikapa Tukutuku on Saturday, 114th of March. On Monday the 3rd, the meeting started. Porikapa rose and preached the word of God, as a way of explaining and making known the thoughts of men. When he had finished, he talked of the words of the newspaper [and asked] which rūnanga would redeem the Governor’s words. [LF]

104 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:17-18. ‘I te 2 o nga ra o Maehe, 1862, ka rapua e taua Runanga aua kupu o taua “Karere.” Panuitia ana. Kei te 12 o nga whika o taua “Karere,” i taia i a Pepuere, 1862.’ The Maori Messenger was the English name for Te Karere Maori.


106 Grey’s encounter with these Kingitanga orators is discussed in Chapters 4 and 8.

107 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:13, ‘No te taenga mai o au nupepa ki Taranaki nei, ka kite iho matou i nga koreror o roto i tou haerenga ki Waikato. Katahi matou ka ata rapurapu ki aua kupu i koreror nei kontou ko te hunga o Waikato na, katahi matou ka huihui ki te kainga o Porikapa Tukutuku, i te Rahoroi, i te tahi o nga ra o Maehe, 1862. I te Manei ka turia taua huihui, i te toru o nga ra o Maehe. Ka tu ko Porikapa ki runga, ka kauwhau i te kupu o te Atua, hei whakamarama hei whakamohio i te whakaaro o te tangata; ka mutu era, ka koreror ia i te kupu o te nupepa, ma te hea runanga ranei ma te hea runanga ranei e whakaora te kupu a Kawan). [TKM]’; ‘When your newspapers arrived at Taranaki. We saw an account of your visit to Waikato, and considered the subject of your conversation. We met together at Porikapa Tukutuku’s place, on Saturday, the 1st March, and on Monday, the 3rd of March
The whole process followed an oscillating path: a discussion which was converted to text, then became the topic of more discussion, only to be converted into text again, perhaps to be discussed at a later time.

Māori also used the various newspapers as a forum through the medium of letter writing. Most Pākehā-run newspapers were happy enough to print correspondence from Māori, and the *Te Karere Maori* actively sought it.\(^{108}\) When its alter-ego, *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, appeared it invited its Māori readers 'to write in, to fully disclose your thoughts on each and every matter that pleases or concerns you.'\(^{109}\) However, as the following notice shows, the editor was prepared to exercise what he considered to be judicious censorship to ensure that 'good thoughts' were getting across.

**NOTICE!** We are wishful that men of understanding should write letters to us, for insertion in the newspaper. But only let things of importance be written, such as anxious thoughts of the heart in regard to the measures required to promote the well-being both of the Maori and the Pakeha. Let them be sent to the Editor of the Manuhiri, and he will look at them; and if the letter is proper, he will insert it in the Paper. We are willing for one portion of it to be employed by the Maori in the expression of his good thoughts, but the letters of the words be fairly written that all our time may not be spent in searching them out.\(^{110}\)

The following year *Te Karere Maori* later asked that letters be 'brief and to the point' and that Māori should avoid their habit of repetition.\(^{111}\) Once Māori started to report the meetings of their *rūnanga* established under Grey's 'New Institutions', it informed its readers that it was no longer able to print every letter and would print excerpts instead.\(^{112}\) Hundreds of letters also appeared in *Te Karere o Poneke*, some of them critical, but only occasionally did Buller refuse to print letters and inform the correspondent that their letter was unsuitable.\(^{113}\)

Porikapa addressed us from the Word of God, to give us understanding; he then told us what he had read in the newspaper, and asked which Runanga would support what the Governor had said.' [source]

\(^{108}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855:1.

\(^{109}\) *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 1/3/1861:3-4. '...ki te tuhituhi mai ki te whaki nui mai i a koutou na whakaaro ki tena mea ki tena mea ki nga mea katoa e ahurekaitia ana e matenuitia ana e koutou'; '...a medium for the full and free expression of your opinions on all questions that may concern or interest you.' [source]

\(^{110}\) *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* 15/5/1861:13. 'RERE! E hiahia ana matou kia tuhituhia mai nga tangata mohio i a ratou pukapuka, kia maka iho ki roto ki te niupepa nei. Otira, ko nga kupu numui anake e tuhi mai, ara, ko nga whakaaro taimaha a te ngakau ki nga mea e tupu pai ai te tangata Maori raua ko te Pakeha. Tukua mai ki te "Kai-tuhituhi o te Manuwhirini," mana ano e titiro: a, ki te pai te reta, ka panga e ia ki roto ki te Pepa nei. E pai ana matou kia waiho tetahi taha mo te Maori, hei whakaputanga mai mo ana whakaaro pai: otira, kia ata ririte nga reta o nga kupu, kei pau katoa nga ra i te kimihanga iho.'

\(^{111}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/5/1862:17. '...me hori pu te koreora ina tuhituhi mai te Maori, kia poto hoki...'

\(^{112}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 20/8/1862:11.

\(^{113}\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 25/10/1858:4; 27/12/1858:2.
The marae is a place where men (and sometimes women) can stand and address those assembled. The newspapers provided a far greater audience for Māori “speakers”. Whereas Pākehā editors might have wanted short, clear letters, many Māori correspondents treated the exercise as if it were an extension of whaikōrero. The language employed had to fit the confines of a written letter, but was more oral than written in style. Consider the following letter, thanking the Governor for a copy of Te Manuhiri Tuarangi.

Tahurikotua,
March 30th, 1861.

FRIEND, THE GOVERNOR,
Salutations to you, and to that people who understand what is good. The “Manuhiri Tuarangi” has reached me, and now I cry – “Welcome thou Manuhiri Tuarangi! It was my son who fetched you from the distant horizon, and brought you hither. Welcome! Come and sit you down in our kainga, that I may stand forth and address you: - Welcome! Welcome, my elder brethren! Welcome on shore! There are no people left to welcome you. Yonder are the people wasting their time, that is to say, they are doing evil.” Let me recite a song to you.

Restless is my sleep at midnight.
Many nights we slept together,-
Now distant art thou Hura,
But thy spirit is still near me.
Long I watched, looking for thee,
Thinking thou wast yet alive.
Though art my beloved,
Precious as the Kahurangi,
It was I who paddled for you.
Come thou now with me,
That together we may traverse
The windy mountain ridge
Of Totara, bearing South,-
That we may clearly view
The setting of the sun,
departing like a spirit!
Then standing up, repeat aoud.
The prayer to Unahiroa,
Who sendeth us the omen.
Then departing, leave me here!

Enough. Send this to the press. From your friend,

HEPATA TURINGENGE.\(^{114}\)

---


E HOA E KAWANA,-
Tena koe! Tena kora ka te iwi mohio tikanga pai. Kua tae mai a “Manuhiri Tuarangi” ki a, na, ka karanga a – “Haere mai, e te ‘Manuhiri Tuarangi.’ Na taku potiki koe i tiki atu ki tua o te rangi kukume mai ai, e! Ka tae mai, haere mai aku tuakana! Haere mai kiuta! Kahore he tangata hei karanga mo koutou. Tena te tangata kei wiwi kei wawa, ara, kei te he.” Ka waiata atu a ki a koutou:- Turuawaiho,
Kia moe huri a,
Ko te moe I au ra,
Many letters that appeared in *Te Karere Maori* were written directly to the governor or an official, and in the letter above Turingenge first addresses the Governor, but also the wider audience. He then “calls to” the newspaper, explaining that he got the paper through his son. This *karanga* is in response to newspaper’s own metaphor of being welcomed onto a *marae*, as *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* (a visitor from afar). He then stands to *whaikōrero*, welcoming the guest as if having arrived on a canoe, a common metaphor for arriving guests.\(^{115}\) He notes that there is no one (but him) to welcome the newspaper, as they are involved in some unnamed nefarious activity, perhaps involvement in the Kingitanga, or fighting Pākehā in Taranaki. He slips between the roles of narrator and the actor, telling what will happen and then doing it. Then to embellish his speech, he recites a love song about an absent lover, a metaphor for his own attachment to the Crown. Finally, to make it clear that the letter was intended for a wider audience, he asks that it be printed.

Letters written to officials often requested that they be inserted in the newspaper, so that other Māori (or Pākehā, friends, relatives, others, millowners or all people) might know.\(^{116}\) There was an expectation that news or opinions printed in *Te Karere Maori*, even with its relatively small circulation, would eventually be made

---

I nui o rangi ra,
I tawhiti Hura,
Tenei to wairua.
Whakarika rawa ma!,
Ka hewa au kei te ao.
He kahurangi te tau.
Naku koe i hoe atu.
Hoatu, kia reia
Nga puke kainga hau,
O Totara i runga.
Kia marama te tītīro
Te tonga o te ra,
E rere wairua ana.
Tohitutia ra,
Te kawa o Unahirona,
Nana te whai tohu.
Waiho nei, whanatu na!

Heoi ano. Mau e tuku ki te perchi. Na to hoa, Na HEPATA TURINGENGE.


known to large numbers of Māori. Conscious of this, Turingenge adapted traditional spoken techniques in the above letter to the new written communication tool, enabling his message to be broadcast widely without losing the oral form natural to him.\textsuperscript{117}

There were a variety of reasons why Māori wrote letters to newspapers: to give their views, or to tell about what they had done, or to make requests. Parsonson states that in the nineteenth century, the traditional pursuit and maintenance of mana was sustained by acquiring religion or modern material goods.\textsuperscript{118} However, just as chiefs spoke for their hapū, they often wrote for them also. Getting letters to the editor published, in effect as an extension of a good whaikōrero performance, also meant that the writer acquired mana.

It is not unnatural to assume that Māori correspondents also liked to see their names and deeds in print, which Te Karere Maori declared itself happy to gratify when appropriate.\textsuperscript{119} Māori no doubt were keen to participate in the new medium. However, that Māori were merely writing in order to aggrandise their name was deemed to be an issue in Te Karere o Poneke. While Buller tactfully asserted that fewer letters would be better, in order to make the space available for more interesting material, the Rev. Hutton was much blunter, stating that some letters ‘were just written by the man who wished to see his name printed inside the newspaper, despite there being no substance to his letter’ so that ‘his name will be celebrated by the people of his pā.’\textsuperscript{120}

In some cases letters to newspapers were used for more political reasons. In 1858, the local rūnanga at Te Hautōtara in Wairarapa settled a land dispute at Whakawhirinaki between the descendants of two ancestors. The rūnanga defined the boundaries and, invoking the authority of God and the Queen’s law to back their judgement, sent their decision as a letter to Te Karere o Poneke. They also asked the editor ‘if you have any words of reply to these words, they should be printed so that we might see them.’ Under their letter was a reply from the descendants humbly

\textsuperscript{117} Styles of Māori letter writing is further discussed in Chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{118} See Parsonson (1980), p 59.
\textsuperscript{119} Te Karere Maori 20/8/1862:2.
\textsuperscript{120} Te Karere o Poneke, 22/2/1858:4, “...he mea tuhituhi noa e te tangata e hiahia ana kia kite i tono ingoa kua oti te ta l roto i te nupepa, ahakoa kahore he tikanga i roto i tana reta.” “..."na reira e whakanuia ai tono ingoa e nga tangata o tono pa."
agreeing to the terms. The decision, thus, not only had tribal sanction with divine
and legal support, but also a fixed printed record.

In this period, a war broke out amongst Ngāti Kahungunu over land sales, the
principal antagonists being Te Hāpuku, of the land selling faction, and Moananui, of
the land holding faction. On 14 December, Te Hāpuku wrote a letter to the
Wellington chiefs Wi Tako Ngatata, Honiana Te Puni and Ihaia Porutu, accusing his
enemies of murder and lawlessness, and inviting them to join him in chastising them.
Wi Tako rejected the offer, saying,

Friend, I have sent your letter to be printed in Te Karere o Poneke, so that people might
see it. Lest it be said [that I do not join you] out of fear. No, it is because I have these
great possessions that my eyes look at below, that is, peaceful living, industriousness,
greeting travellers, growing food, kindness and love.

Through his use of the newspaper Wi Tako, the pacifist, exposed Te Hāpuku as a
belligerent at odds with the Christian values he cherished. As a leader of his people
Wi Tako was able to justify to them, and to other Māori through print, that his refusal
to join a traditional call to arms (although in the modern form of a letter) was not from
fear, but resulted from his rejection of such practices of the past.

Māori attitudes to the newspapers

The examples above show that Māori welcomed the platform provided by the
Pākehā-run newspapers for their own purposes. But what did they actually think
about the rest of the content in the papers, and was that content as unattractive as
some of the commentators above have suggested? There were certainly numerous
letters to the Native Office requesting Te Karere Maori, and several letters were
published showing appreciation of the newspaper. It was, as Aperahama Tamaiparea wrote to McLean, ‘a sign of your love for me’. When Te Mamuhiri Tuarangi appealed to be called into the kāinga of Māori, there were a number of
Māori who wrote in to welcome it. One correspondent cited Titus 1:8 on hospitality

121 Te Karere o Poneke, 30/8/1858:3-4. ‘Ki te whai kupu mai koutou hei whakahoki mai i enei kupu,
me tuhi mai ki te perehi ki a kíte iho ai maout.’

122 Te Karere o Poneke, 24/12/1857:2. ‘E hoa, ko tau reta ka tukua e au kia taia ki te Karere o Poneke
kia kítea ai e nga tangata. Kei mea mai he wehi noku, kaore, he whiwhinga ake noku ki enei taonga pai
e tirohia iho nei e aku kanohi, ara, te noho pai, te ahuwihenua, te mihī atu ki te tira haere, te mahi kai, te
atawhai, te atora.’

123 Te Karere Maori, 1/6/1855:10; 15/9/1857:4-5;
124 Te Karere Maori, 31/8/1857:6. ‘he tohu arohatanga mai tenei nau ki ahau’
and suggested that ‘if I do not sound the welcome, my settlement may not be visited by it.’

As for the other newspapers, the bulk of the content of Te Waka o te Iwi as well as some of Te Whetu o te Tau is made up of letters from Māori in favour of Charles Davis running a “Māori press”, many of whom were actively collecting money for it. As Takerei te Rau and Panapa Ngaumu informed Davis, ‘the talk inside [your newspaper] is fine.’ Readers in Hawkes Bay were also prepared to write to Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri to ask for newspapers or promised to pay the subscription. This desire for newspapers and a willingness to help fund them shows that Māori did see some value in them.

However, it is in Te Karere o Poneke that we find the most reflection on the value of newspapers to Māori. The extent of such comment on the newspapers reflects, firstly, the amount of space that Buller gave to correspondence. Secondly, despite operating for only 16 months, the paper produced more pages than all other publications, other than Te Karere Maori, due to its weekly appearance and occasional supplements. There were some correspondents who wrote with general approval, with one suggesting that lowborn Māori also derived benefit from it. Others liked the news articles and general information. The paper, like Te Karere Maori, listed market prices which was popular with readers. The act of printing these prices gave them a validity that they perhaps did not deserve, as seen when Te Naera Te Angiangi of Waikawa wrote complaining about not receiving the quoted price for his pigs, even when he showed the newspaper to the merchant. Wiremu Kingi and Tutepakihirangi of Wairarapa had a similar problem when selling wheat to a Pākehā, and stated that the newspaper was a waste of time.

However, the newspaper was treasured especially for its ability to promote the new way of life, often referred to as ‘nga ritenga pai’, to which many Māori aspired.

125 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/4/1861:12-14; 15/7/1861:13-14; Te Karere Maori 16/12/1861:16. ‘Ki te kore hoki au e karanga, e kore te kainga e pekaina.’
126 For example, see Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:1; 1/11/1857:1; Te Whetu o te Tau, 1/6/1858:1.
127 Te Whetu o te Tau 1/6/1858:2. ‘E pai ana nga korero o roto.’
128 Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri. 11/7/1863:2
132 Te Karere o Poneke, 15/11/1858:2-3.
133 Te Karere o Poneke, 13/12/1958 (suppl):2.
Ngā ritenga pai comprised an interconnected collection of new social institutions and activities (including newspaper publication) with a corresponding rejection of many Māori traditional practices, which the newspapers vigorously promoted. To many Māori correspondents of Te Karere o Poneke, reading about ‘ngā ritenga pai’ was the most valued aspect of the paper.

On one occasion Māori did criticise Te Karere o Poneke about its value, but that criticism was not directed at the content, but at the price. The issue surfaced in the 12 July 1858 issue when Riwai te Ahu wrote a letter of complaint: ‘Am I the only one who is fed up with the small size of this newspaper, and the increased price? Now, the Pākehā paper is bigger than the one we buy, with three large pages at the same price as ours, sixpence.’ The editorial of the same issue addressed this question stating that the English language paper had four times as many subscribers, and that Māori was a ‘reo ngaro’ (hidden language) to the Pākehā printers. Despite these protestations, Te Ahu’s argument found favour with Rauhihi of Rangitikei who wrote a letter supporting his views to the paper. The issue may have quietly disappeared but for a letter from ‘He Hoa Aroha’ (A Loving Friend) of Ngāmotu, who was almost certainly a Pākehā, possibly connected with the Wesleyan Church. Using a metaphor of gold, silver and copper, he suggested that although Te Karere o Poneke was small, it was gold whereas much of the Pākehā paper was copper. He then suggested that the printing was like sawing soft and hard timber, that it was harder for the printers to produce a Māori paper. As a rejoinder he added, that if Māori went to school and learnt English, they might have a larger paper for themselves in English.

Riwai Te Ahu was a regular correspondent to the paper on a number of issues and continued this argument. The English language, he said, was all right for young people but not for him. He extended the metaphor on the value of metals: ‘it is my

134 These ‘ritenga pai’ are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
136 Te Karere o Poneke, 12/7/1858:2. ‘Ko au nei anake e hoha nei ki te iti o tenei nupepa a ko ngā utu i whakanui? Na, nui noa ake i ta tataou nupepa e hoko nei te nupepa Pakeha, e toru nga wharangi nui, ko te utu, rite tahi ki te utu o ta tatou, ki te hikipene.’
137 Te Karere o Poneke, 12/7/1858:2. ‘Ko au nei anake e hoha nei ki te iti o tenei nupepa a ko nga utu i whakanui? Na, nui noa ake i ta tataou nupepa e hoko nei te nupepa pakeha, e toru nga wharangi nui, ko te utu, rite tahi ki te utu o ta tatou, ki te hikipene. [LP]’
140 Te Karere o Poneke, 13/9/1858:2-3.
opinion, that although this newspaper is small, some of the words inside are copper',
citing a number of articles written by the editor, his father Rev. Buller, Rev. Hutton
and "He Hoa Aroha" to illustrate examples of the inferior metal. However, Riwai
te Ahu was not against the newspaper itself. He had written in favour of it earlier,
requesting more material out of the Pākehā papers. He had also written about the
wastefulness at Māori funerals, so that he was probably an advocate of "nga ritenga
pai". He was a pillar within the Anglican church, and may have extended the fight
in order to score points against the Wesleyan ministers. The discussion above shows
that his attitude towards the newspaper was not dismissive. He valued the Māori
language newspaper but he wanted it to work better for its Māori audience.

Conclusion

As Book & Print in New Zealand notes, much of the content of early printed
material provided to Māori 'is, in retrospect at least, not very attractive.' The key
words, of course, are 'in retrospect'. It is clear that we should not judge the content of
Te Karere Maori, or other Māori language newspapers, as modern commentators are
prone to do, by the sensibilities of our own time, nor ignore the keenness of Māori to
see their language in print. What might appear as 'dull moralizing' to modern
readers was actually reflecting the changes that many Māori themselves were trying to
effect, or cope with, in their society. Māori attended church sermons regularly which
were probably just as dry as anything seen in the newspapers, and they were
themselves, just as capable as any Pākehā of producing what we today might describe
as 'dull moralizing'.

Māori were interested in European knowledge and stories. As John White
noted, after recounting the destruction of Jerusalem to Māori listeners in 1847, they
responded 'What a pity but some European would translate and print such things as
those.' Māori did not have access to large amounts of printed material in their own

---

141 Te Karere o Poneke, 29/11/1858:2-3. 'Taku hoki. He ahakoa, he iti tenei nukepa, he kapa ano etahi
korero i roto'
144 Jane McRae and Tony Deverson, 'Transitions' in Book & Print in New Zealand: A Guide to Print
Culture in Aotearoa, ed. P. Griffith, R. Harvey & K. Maslen (Wellington: Victoria University
145 John White, Personal Journal, 22/6/1847, cited in Michael Reilly, "Secret Writers in Foreign Lands:
language and much of what was available was of a religious nature. The newspapers were one of the few non-verbal sources of secular information, and insufficient copies of these were printed. It is likely therefore that this paucity of reading matter would have led Māori to be less selective in their reading tastes than readers of other languages with greater access to printed material.

As the evidence above shows, Māori did use the Pākehā controlled Māori language newspapers for their own purposes through letters and reports, and used newspapers as evidence within their own rūnanga. There are also indications that Māori even appreciated the newspapers in their own right. We know what Māori thought of one newspaper, *Te Karere o Poneke*, where they were quite specific about what they liked, appreciating not only the market column, but also the improving articles. The Pākehā editing the newspapers all had close relations with Māori in other aspects of their lives, and no doubt had a reasonable idea of what might appeal to Māori. It is perhaps not surprising that significant numbers of Māori requested newspapers, and that many were prepared to pay for them, or to collect money to establish them. It would be reasonable to conjecture therefore that the Māori language newspapers had a greater impact on, and value to, Māori social and political life, and can provide greater insights into nineteenth century New Zealand life, than earlier historians have been prepared to admit.
Chapter 2: literacy and schooling

Introduction

Conferences, such as that at Kohimarama in 1860, were seen by some Māori chiefs as a way they could be brought into the political decision making of the country.1 Tamihana Te Rauparaha, of Ngāti Toa, gave a speech agreeing to the proposal that the conference become an annually event. In his speech he said,

"Our proceedings will be published in the newspaper that all the world may see them and that the children may see what the old men have said. When the Maories speak, their words are on the lips only; they have no books, they have no newspaper."

Te Rauparaha was aware that this conference was an important political event, and that the actions of chiefs were being recorded in history differently than in the past – but what did he mean exactly? A quick perusal of the two translations above will show that where the source text has placed the last sentence in the present, I have opted for the past. In the Māori text, no tense is expressed. Māori certainly did have access to books and newspapers in 1860, so perhaps the inference of the official translation was that Māori were yet to produce their own printed material. However, Te Rauparaha certainly did not feel estranged from print literacy. It is ‘they’ not ‘we’ who have no books and I believe that he was acknowledging that literacy had changed the Māori world. Unlike oral history where words are of the here and now, to be retold in different ways for different contexts, Te Rauparaha knew that his words were to be fixed in print, to be ‘looked at’ in different places and in different times.

Newspapers are texts that need literacy, and as both are post-contact phenomena, some discussion of literacy must figure in this thesis on Māori language newspapers. Literacy issues are particularly relevant to how newspapers impacted on the history of Māori-Pākehā interaction, and the newspaper content itself can also be used to reflect upon the discussion of literacy. As discussed in Chapter 6, reading and writing, along with such things as roads, newspapers and education, were

---

1 The Kohimarama Conference is discussed in depth in Chapter 7.
2 Te Karere Māori, 3/8/1860: 70. ‘Ko tenei tikanga he mea ta ki te pukapuka nunui ki te nupepa hei titiro ma te ao katou, kia titiro ai hoki nga tamariki ki nga korero o a ratou kaumataua. Ko ta te Māori korero he mea korero ki te ngutu kau, kaore a ratou pukapuka, kahore ano hoki a ratou nupepa.’
considered integral instruments, of the colonial effort to ‘civilise’ Māori. As noted above, Māori themselves also saw great value in newspapers.

This chapter will define what ‘literacy’ means in terms of this thesis. It will also investigate the extent of Māori literacy in the mid-nineteenth century, then explore how much literacy Māori needed to access the newspapers. This chapter will also discuss some relevant theories on literacy, both as an autonomous agent of change, and in relation to education, in assessing how effective literacy may have been to the civilising mission at the time. It will also look at other social contexts in which literacy was practised.

**What is ‘literacy’?**

The terms ‘literate’ and ‘literacy’ themselves are open to debate. The *Reed Dictionary of Modern Māori* gives ‘mōhio ki te kōrero pukapuka’ (knowing how to read) as its equivalent for ‘literacy’, and similarly Ngata’s *English-Maori Dictionary* renders ‘literate’ as ‘kōrero, tuhi pukapuka’ (reading and writing). W. J. Ong sees ‘literacy’ as the reading and writing of scripts which can be equated to ‘sounded words’. For Ong there is a rigid divide between purely oral communication and communication involving writing: for example, oral texts may be described as ‘verbally organised material’ and not as ‘oral literature’.

However some Māori writers are prepared to interpret the concept more liberally. Hirini Melbourne, for example, states ‘The ancient Māori were surrounded by writing in their daily life: the carvings on the houses, the marks on cloaks, the very architecture of the great meeting houses’. Similarly, Kuni Jenkins includes oral texts, kōwhaiwhai and tāmoko as alternative forms of literacy. Words and ideas can be expressed and read through various kinds of signs, and it is clear that Māori were familiar with abstract symbols. While accepting and valuing these inclusive forms of literacy, in the context of the use of Māori language newspapers, I define literacy as
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5 Ong, pp 11-13.


7 Jenkins, p 7-8. *Kōwhaiwhai* are rafter paintings; *tāmoko* is tattooing.
the acquisition of skills in the alphabetic symbolic system that the newspapers employed.

**Māori Literacy and Education**

How literate were Māori in their own language?

Anecdotal evidence about Māori literacy before 1840 is not conclusive. Many historians have accepted the missionaries' assertions that the acquisition of literacy by Māori in this period was extensive, but D.F. McKenzie has since thrown doubt on these claims in his book *Oral Culture, Literacy & Print in early New Zealand: the Treaty of Waitangi*. His argument is based primarily on counting how many signatures were appended to the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 as compared to other techniques of “signing”, such as the drawing of tāmoko. Because ‘only one type of literacy is directly measurable – the ability or inability to sign a signature’ he suggests ‘a maximum literacy level of about 12 per cent or 13 per cent’. I have doubts about his methodology. Signatories to treaties cannot, necessarily, be said to represent a whole population. If the sons of the chiefs had signed the treaty would the figure have been higher? Some chiefs might also have chosen to place their moko on the document as a sign of mana; while others might have had skills in reading but not writing. If McKenzie’s formula is applied to a similar sample, such as the 74 chiefs whose names are appended to Tamihana Te Rauparaha’s petition at the Kohimarama Conference, where only 30 of the signatories are indicated as signing with an X, a 60% literacy rate perhaps can be claimed for 1860.

McKenzie also quotes official sources for Māori literacy in Wellington in 1850. He states ‘[a] general summary of the Māori population ... taken in 1850 records (under ‘Moral Condition’) a total of 4711, of whom 1148 or some 24 per cent were said to be able to read and write, and 414 able to read only.’ While acknowledging
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8 For example, in 1840 Hadfield stated, ‘vast numbers learn to read and write by possessing themselves of a book or a part of a book and spelling it over until they are fully acquainted with it.’ See H.T. Purchas, *History of the English Church in New Zealand* (Christchurch: Simpson & Williams, 1914), p 62.
11 McKenzie, p 34n.
13 McKenzie, p 34n.
doubts about literacy in earlier years, Sinclair asserts that Māori literacy was extensive in the 1850s. This claim is based on his perusal of many letters written by Māori to the Native Office and drawing upon Parr’s essay, ‘Māori Literacy 1843-1867’. Parr uses mainly missionary sources that point to a high Māori literacy rate in the late 1840s and early 1850s in a number of localities, and suggests that in the 1850s ‘about half the adult Māoris could read Māori, and about one-third could both read and write it’. Parr does, however, indicate that Māori enthusiasm for learning varied throughout his research period, and that in the early 1860s some ‘children of literate parents had grown up illiterate’.

It is likely that some groups within Māori society had higher literacy rates than others. Swainson, discussing Māori labourers from a variety of tribes employed in Auckland in the 1850s, was able to say ‘that of the one hundred and four then employed by the Engineer Department, all were able to read the New Testament (in their own language), and that all but two could write’. From these accounts one can see that an accurate figure for literacy cannot be easily defined, ranging anywhere between a quarter and nearly all the Māori population, with the quality of these skills unknown. Despite this uncertainty, it is reasonably clear that Māori literacy rates were probably higher than some segments of the English population at the time, and that while some areas may have had higher concentrations of literate people, there were individuals able to read and write in most Māori communities.
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16 Parr, pp 212, 219, 221-229.
18 ‘According to the Rev. J. Whiteley, after 30 years’ work through these [mission] schools, “three-fourths of the adult population could … read, and two-thirds could write their own language”’. Barrington & Beaglehole, p 40, quoting W. Morely, The History of Methodism in New Zealand (Wellington: McKee, 1900), pp 120-21. Moon does not attempt to quantify literacy in the mid-nineteenth century, but does suggest that ‘there was no rapid literacy acquisitions by large numbers of Māori’ in the early period, but that ‘a strong base of Māori literacy existed by the turn of the century.’ See Paul Moon, Māori Transition to a Literate Society in the Nineteenth Century (Wellington: Department of Education, Victoria University, 1997), pp 20-21.
19 About one third of men and a half of women in England and Wales could not sign their name in 1840, although literacy increased through the nineteenth century. However, the scale of illiteracy for agricultural labourers was twice as high. See Harvey J. Graff, The Legacies of Literacy: Continuities and Contradictions in Western Culture and Society (Bloomington: Indiana University press, 1987) pp
The access of nonliterate Māori to written and printed texts

Whatever the percentage of the nonliterate Māori population, those who could not read still have access to the newspapers, and other printed texts. Graff, describing partially literate communities, states, '[t]he written and printed word were spread to many semiliterates and illiterates via oral processes; information, news, literature and religion were thereby spread far more widely than purely literate means could have allowed.'\(^{20}\) In British India, Bayly notes that 'written media [was used] in complex and creative ways to reinforce oral culture and debate', with newspapers being publicly read to large groups.\(^{21}\) It is likely that Māori read aloud even when alone, as silent reading was 'not valued as a pedagogical tool' until the mid-nineteenth century.\(^{22}\) Given the close tribal nature of Māori society at that time, it is not surprising that in Māori society written and printed material was read out to those unable to read themselves. For example, when books first arrived on the East Coast, Ngata states 'few people possessed them, most people encouraged the individuals who owned the book to read the words out to them. The Māori are still like this. ... this is a custom of the Māori since time immemorial: one speaks, and the many listen.'\(^{23}\)

It is likely, given the collective nature of nineteenth century Māori society, that reading newspapers out loud to people in small groups for social reasons was relatively common. Brodie describes the scene after Māori in the early 1840s had picked up their copies of Te Karere o Niutirene.

One native of the party is generally selected to read the news aloud. When he takes his seat upon the ground, a circle is then formed, and after the reader has promulgated the contents, the different natives, according to their rank, stand up and argue the different

---

313, 319. According to Parr, 'one-quarter of the adult European population [of New Zealand were] illiterate', Parr, p 222.


22 Graff (1987), p 326. While "pānui" is often used now to mean "read", the nineteenth century term for reading was "korero pukapuka", literally, "speak books".

23 Sir Apirana Ngata, 'The Maori and Printed Matter' in History of Printing in New Zealand 1830-1940, ed. R.A. McKay (Wellington: R.A. McKay/Wellington Club of Printing House Craftsmen, 1940), p 49. 'Otira he tokoitii nga mea i whiwhi, ko te nuinga ano i whakamanawa ki nga tangata takitahi, whiwhi pukapuka, hei "panui" i nga korero ki a ratou. Kei te mau tonu tena ahu i te Māori. ...he kawa tonu no te Māori mai onamata; kotahi hei korero, ko te nuinga hei whakarongo atu.'
points contained; which being done, they retire home, and answer the different letters by writing to the editor.[.] 24

During this research period, it is known that on several occasions Māori read the contents of newspapers out to public meetings called for political reasons, to discuss the Kingitanga, the Taranaki War, or Grey's 'New Institutions'. 25 By publicly reading the contents of newspapers and discussing them, a consensus of meaning and agreement in decision making could be reached, as would be expected given the nature of Māori tribal society. This is also evident in letters printed in the newspaper, many with large numbers of names appended to them. The individual who actually put pen to paper would have possessed good writing skills, yet may have merely been an anonymous scribe. In one case, Kepa of Waipapa did manage to be acknowledged as the 'writer', although the letter was attributed to two named chiefs 'and all the people of Waipapa, Wahikainga, and Kaikoura. 26 From this information it is reasonably clear that significant numbers of Māori were literate in their own language, and Māori, literate or not, were able to access the Māori language newspapers.

The effects of literacy: the ‘autonomous’ model

Newly acquired literacy is often seen as having ‘impacts’ on individuals and on society. 27 Those behind the ‘civilising mission’ certainly believed that literacy was important in their quest to change Māori society, and some subsequent writers, such as Jenkins, see literacy’s agency in subjugating Māori. 28

Some anthropologists believe that being able to read and write changes not only an individual’s use of language but also their cognitive processes, that is, how they think, and that ‘[i]t is only with a written language that analytic and logical skills can arise’. 29 Brian Street has termed this the ‘autonomous model’ of literacy because it assumes ‘that the acquisition of literacy would (in itself, autonomously) lead to major

24 Brodie, pp 110.
26 Te Karere Māori, 16/12/1862: 16.
27 For example, see McKenzie, p 15n.
28 See below.
"impacts" in terms of social and cognitive skills and Development'.

J. Goody, for example, attributes logical analytical and abstract reasoning to the acquisition of literacy. Similarly, Ong suggests that writing 'restructures thought', and while he concedes that the thought of members of oral cultures could be 'in some degree analytic', 'abstractly sequential, classificatory, explanatory examination of phenomena or of stated truths is impossible without reading and writing.'

According to Ong, orally based thought and language operates with a less elaborate grammar, is more prone to epithets and formulae; is 'redundant' and 'repetitive'; is conservative, and inhibited from 'intellectual experimentation'; is grounded in the present and immediate with knowledge placed in 'a context of struggle'. Where these oral components remain in a literate culture, they are deemed to be 'residual orality' or 'restricted literacy'.

A more contextual view of literacy

The ability of literacy per se to shape cognitive reasoning has been called into question. Street, for example, considers that 'the impact of the culture and of the politic-economic structures of those bringing it [literacy] is likely to be more significant than the impact of the technical skills associated with reading and writing.'

Even Luria and Vygotsky who worked in the 'backward and remote' regions of the Soviet Union, and whose findings generally place them within the 'autonomous' model of literacy were prepared to concede the effect of other factors, such as education and exposure to urban life.

Research of the Vai people of Liberia undertaken by Scribner and Cole during the 1970s into the relationship between literacy and formal education is perhaps the most pertinent to understanding the nature of nineteenth century Māori literacy. Among the Vai, there are literate and nonliterate people, but within the literate


31 Goody (1977), p 18, 37
32 Ong (1982), pp 7, 8.
33 Ong (1982), pp 36-49.
population there are also different kinds (and combinations) of literacy. English is used by some, mainly for governmental and educational purposes. There is an indigenous Vai script seen in letters (including commercial matters) and records, while Arabic is also used for writing, and for reading the Koran. English literacy is taught within schools whereas Vai literacy is learnt outside of institutions, mostly in short one-to-one lessons between adults with reading and writing skills being taught together. The research concluded that although literacy did have minor impacts on cognitive skills, the schooling environment was more important than the acquisition of literacy. At no particular task did they find all nonliterates performing at lower levels than all literates but that schooling fosters abilities in expository talk in contrived situations. They also concluded that knowledge of reading and writing did not have the same intellectual consequences as schooling, and, 'schooling goes considerably further in encompassing functional literacy-related skills embodied in our experimental tasks than script knowledge does in capturing school related tasks. Literacy, therefore, should not be seen as an autonomous agent of change. According to Street 'the underlying assumptions [of proponents of the 'autonomous' model] about the nature of literacy were often derived from the particular literacy practices of their own culture, and their own academic subculture within it, with its emphasis on "essay-text" uses of literacy and on "literary prose". Scollon and Scollon define this subculture as the 'Utilitarian discourse system', the dominant system of communication of the West, into which practitioners are inducted through 'socially approved and controlled institutions'. The superiority of this discourse system is perceived to be self-evident, while all other systems of communication are seen as confused and illogical.

Street, therefore, rejects the 'autonomous' model in favour of an 'ideological' model where literacy should be understood 'in terms of concrete social practices' and 'the ideologies in which different literacies are imbedded'. It follows, therefore, that where literacy was deliberately used as an agent of change, such as in the efforts to

---

38 Scribner & Cole, pp 244, 251.
'civilise' Māori in the nineteenth century, it could only really be effective in its aims when it was tied to institutions and practices of power. While schooling could be a major component of this, other influences include the church, government activity and commerce.

The acquisition of literacy by Māori.

As discussed previously, literacy before 1840 may have been less spectacular than missionaries claimed, but by the mid-century it was likely to have been relatively widespread. The initial teaching of reading and writing was undertaken by Pākehā missionaries in Northland, but literacy, like Christianity, was subsequently spread by Māori themselves. Many Māori learnt to read informally, taught by other Māori whose only qualification was their own literacy, using religious texts printed in Māori by the missionaries. At times Māori started their own informal schools, such as the ex-slave Ripahau at Ōtaki. A contemporary observed:

If one native in a tribe can read and write, he will not be long in teaching the others. The desire to learn this information engrosses their whole thoughts and they will continue for days with their slates in their hands...

The length of time it took Māori to learn to read to a functional level probably varied between individuals. McKenzie, using comparisons to the acquisition of literacy by English children in the nineteenth century, criticises contemporary claims that Māori could learn to read and write relatively rapidly. However, the orthography that Professor Lee of Cambridge had developed in 1820 (with the aid of the missionary Thomas Kendall, and the Ngā Puhi chiefs, Hongi and Waikato) made Māori easier to learn to read than English. Some contemporary commentators suggest that only a fortnight, or perhaps three months was sufficient for Māori to gain literacy in their own language. However, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, taught by the ex-slave Ripahau to read from the Gospel of St. Luke with his cousin Mātene Te Whiwhi, said

44 Purchas, p 73. According to Henry Williams Ripahau had taught many to read. See Purchas, p 77.
46 McKenzie, pp 16-17.
"[a]fter we had been there six months, we could read a little, very slowly." Early Māori literacy is perhaps better compared to Vai literacy. Lessons were informal, often one-to-one, with an orthography that was reasonably well suited to the language. In similar circumstances (although with a larger script to learn) Vai literacy is normally acquired within two or three months.

Missionary Education

The missionaries organised village schools, generally staffed with newly literate Māori, and, with the advent of kāwanatanga, were effectively given responsibility for the formal education of Māori. Grey’s 1847 Educational Ordinance provided the churches with some government funding, but this was to be spent solely on boarding schools. Moon has described this as ‘indicating governmental endorsement of the ideology and pedagogy of the religious schools.’ This may have been true at the time but it was also probably due to the missionaries already possessing the necessary educational structures and experience. The fact that this schooling was also partly funded by missionary societies was doubtless an added incentive in the government’s eyes. It is likely that there was also an unwillingness on the part of the government to commit themselves to a potentially expensive undertaking. Village schools were unfunded, and were not ‘generally established’ in any systematic way. The settler government continued this funding under the Native Schools Act 1858, until taking direct responsibility for Māori education with the passing of the Native Schools Act 1867.

From early on, the official education policy was ‘to assimilate [the Maoris’ habits and usages] as speedily as possible to those of the European population’. Boarding schools were deemed the best way of achieving this, by insulating Māori children away from what were perceived to be harmful and distracting ‘native’ practices. Grey’s 1847 Ordinance also required students to be taught English,
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48 Purchas, p 73.
50 Sorrenson (1992) p 144.
51 Moon, p 24.
52 AJHR, 1867, A3, p 1. Some of the boarding school pupils were, however, ‘sent out to such villages as the Missionary is unable to visit in person’, although it is unclear whether their main function was religious or educational. See AJHR 1859, E1, p 60.
54 Native Trust Ordinance 1844, quoted by Parr, p 215.
resulting in most schools following a bilingual approach to education.\textsuperscript{55} It is clear that education was considered to be an integral component of the ‘civilising mission’; the Church of England even describing its schools as ‘moral garrisons’, and the teachers as ‘moral policemen’.\textsuperscript{56}

In her thesis “Te Ihi, Te Mana, Te Wehi o te Ao Tuhi”, Kuni Jenkins looks at print literacy from 1814 to 1855. She concludes that ‘Māori emerged from their programmes of literacy able to ‘communicate’ in English and Māori but also as uncritical, mystified, passive readers with a non-empowered view of their changing world.’\textsuperscript{57} If we accept that these supposed development of the Māori mentalité derived from wider forces than literacy itself, in particular the schooling provided by missionaries, then her position suggests that this education was particularly efficacious in its assimilating role. The evidence, at least in this period, does not support this implication, and thus throws doubt on the mental subjugation that Māori supposedly suffered.

There is little evidence that the English language made serious inroads into Māori society, other than as words transliterated into the Māori language and the use of a ‘commercial pidgin English’. This commercial use of English is shown in the following account, where the writer disdainfully illustrates the fate of landless Māori – selling firewood.

\begin{quote}
Ka hua, ka tae ki tetahi whare, ka mea mai te pakeha, “Hau mate?” – “Tukapa”...
\end{quote}

Apart from a few successes, the acquisition of English by Māori before the Native Schools Act 1867 was judged by Pākehā contemporaries to be a failure.\textsuperscript{59} William Rolleston, for example, when inspecting probationary Māori teachers at St. Stephens School in 1866 found that ‘none is sufficiently acquainted with the English language to render them capable of teaching it.’\textsuperscript{60} Literacy for Māori of that time was literacy in the Māori language.

\textsuperscript{55} Parr, p 213-4; Simon (1998) p xv.
\textsuperscript{56} AJHR, 1856, A7, p 25.
\textsuperscript{57} Jenkins (1991), p 137.
\textsuperscript{58} Te Karere o Poneke, 5/11/1857:3.
\textsuperscript{59} See Parr, pp 217-219.
\textsuperscript{60} AJHR, 1867, A3, p 3.
Government funding was distributed unevenly to the mission boarding schools, with amounts ranging from six to forty pounds per student in 1858. Most mission schools suffered from a lack of funds, requiring them to give "industrial" training, which was often farm work. Simon attributes this policy to European racial and ideological assumptions that Māori were destined to become agricultural labourers. Given the rural basis of the New Zealand economy, and with still substantial areas of land in Māori hands, good agricultural knowledge could well have been empowering for Māori economically. However, farm work was not always seen as "educational" by the missionaries, but a necessity for survival. For example, the Tūranga Native School Report lamented that "it was necessary to resort to the self-supporting system", growing crops for food and sale. Parr is therefore probably correct in asserting that "[t]here was little the Maoris or the missionaries could do about this if the children were to be fed." Māori dislike of pupils being required to work for long hours to support the school was just one of the problems that the mission schools faced. There was also discontent over deficiencies in food, clothing, and accommodation; excessive discipline; poor teaching; requests for fees and the separation of children from their whānau, all of which helped to make schooling unpopular at various times.

Enthusiasm for the mission schools waxed and waned, sometimes due to changing Māori attitudes to missionary Christianity. In some areas, parents also withheld children from schools as anti-government sentiments grew. Some Māori established their own schools out of a 'desire for their own schools to be freed from European influence' which also undermined the rival mission schools in some areas. In addition, an agricultural boom of the mid-1850s caused some Māori to doubt the value of schooling to advance themselves, and also drew many young people back to their families' fields. School rolls could drop drastically: Hadfield's school in
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61 AJHR, 1860, E1, p 11.
62 Simon (1990), p 77.
63 Such thinking was prevalent among some prominent Māori even at the turn of the century. For example, Ngata and Kōhere of Te Kotahitanga o Te Aute, stressed the need for 'kura a-ringa' (manual schools) for Māori youth. See Te Pipiwharauroa, 12/1899:10; 2/1900:9; 3/1900:2; 4/1900:12.
64 AJHR, 1859, E1, p 7.
65 Parr, p 225.
67 Parr, p 229; Simon (1990), pp 82-83.
68 Parr, p 211-2
Otaki, for example, boasted 150 pupils in 1850, but by 1858 had practically none. However, even when education was popular, the numbers attending the boarding schools were a relatively small proportion of the Māori population, about 700-800, made up of children of both sexes, and sometimes large numbers of adults. Warfare between Māori and the Crown proved to be the deathblow to the mission schools and from 1860 rolls withered away almost completely.

It is not surprising then that Rolleston, who inspected the mission schools, considered that the government expenditure over the years could not 'be regarded as satisfactory'. His reports on schools in 1867 shows that the aims of the mission schools and the government, with the odd exception, were essentially dissimilar. He considered that the former had been more concerned with 'raising up teachers of religion', rather than teaching English and other useful subjects, as well as 'breaking through the communism of the Maori pa'. Neither did he think that the use of Native Teachers would bring about the desired changes, and he promoted village primary schools staffed with Pākehā teachers, a system that was applied after 1867.

In recent years, some academics have deemed the literacy that Māori obtained from the missionaries to be limited. Missionaries did not provide Māori with an 'emancipatory' literacy 'with which to challenge Māori incorporation into the hierarchical structures of Western society', or with a 'programme...on teaching or discussing capitalism and colonialism', as Jenkins (perhaps a little unrealistically) suggests they ought to have done. It did not allow Māori to 'unlock the literature and the technology of Europe, nor did it encourage the methods of abstraction, analysis, and comparison made available through a wide range of written materials.

Some academics have also suggested that mission education failed because 'the instruction was in Māori and confined to Christian tracts. These did little to equip the
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69 Parr, pp 224-5.
70 Parr, p 227.
71 Parr, pp 229-30.
73 AHR, 1867, A3, pp 1-3.
75 Jenkins (1991), pp 12, 13, 134.
Maori to combat the colonizing movement that was threatening to engulf them; they needed to learn English.\(^{77}\)

Such views tend to deny Maori the creativity and agency that is allowed to Pakeha. For example, nineteenth century Pakeha interested in Maori knowledge are considered to be gathering ‘information which could facilitate colonisation of the country’\(^{78}\) yet Maori are held to be unable to interpret the Pakeha knowledge that was available to them in order to confront or accommodate such colonisation. However, when early educators taught ancient European history, considered a suitably civilising subject for Maori to learn, Maori were able to apply that knowledge to their own situation. As Gorst noted, Waikato Maori resisted roads and bridges because ‘[h]aving heard how England was civilized by the Romans, they are resolved not to be civilized themselves in the same way.’\(^{79}\) Indeed, the *New Zealand Herald*, criticising the Aborigines’ Protection Society’s *Address* to Maori, considered that Maori had a ‘natural turn for word painting’ and would ‘search for a second meaning in every sentence’.\(^{80}\) Within the time parameters of this thesis, both the writings in the Kingitanga newspaper, *Te Hokioi*,\(^{81}\) and Reneata Kawepo’s censure of the government over Taranaki, point to Maori language literacy being used by Maori to powerfully articulate independent political viewpoints.\(^{82}\)

If we accept that literacy must be viewed in social and ideological contexts rather than as an autonomous agent, the general failure of mission education coupled with a relatively widespread literacy must suggest that for most Maori adults, the links between literacy and formal education, at least before 1867, were rather minimal. Take, for example, the pupils at the Tufanga mission school aspiring to be teachers in 1856-7. Most of these were adult married men who ‘with one exception...have had little or no education, and therefore, have had to be taught almost everything, except reading and writing, from the very beginning [my italics].’\(^{83}\) Reading and writing in Maori were skills that many Maori had gained outside of, or with minimal
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\(^{77}\) Sorrenson (1992), p 143-4. [citing Barrington & Beaglehole, p 28.]; Walker also states that Maori were thwarted by the use of the Maori language, which restricted instruction to religious texts. See Walker (1991), p 3-4.

\(^{78}\) Jenkins, pp 111-112.

\(^{79}\) Gorst (2001), p 15. Similar comments were made by Fenton, see *AJHR*, 1860, E1-C, p 17.

\(^{80}\) *New Zealand Herald*, 10/6/1865.

\(^{81}\) Literacy facilitated the emergence of Maori nationalist sentiments, as discussed in Chapter 8.

\(^{82}\) Challenges to Pakeha hegemony also abound in subsequent Maori-run newspapers, such as *Te Wananga* and *Te Paki o Matariki*. 
involvement in, educational institutions. However, even if reading and writing skills were more likely to be acquired in the social domain, rather than in educational institutions, they were still practised within particular social and political contexts.

**Biblical literacy and Imagery**

As Goody notes, ethical, ‘world’, converting religions are spread by alphabetical literacy. Initially, as the purveyors of both, missionaries were able to limit the reading material to Māori mainly to religious literature. The pursuit of literacy, bounded within religious discourse, is often suggested as one of the causes of Māori conversion. However, the relationship could also work the other way: full acceptance into the predominant Christian faith, Anglicanism, was not easy and ‘literacy allowed the Maoris to master the necessary biblical knowledge and terminology that the C.M.S. required for baptism.’

The newspapers were sometimes quite explicit in linking literacy with religion. For example, according to the Wesleyan paper, *Te Haeata*, God had taught Moses to write, therefore writing was a gift from God, and a companion to the Gospel. This concept was used in an argument that Māori should send their children to school and not impede the passage of mail, ‘lest we reject what God gives us.’ Sins were also written (presumably by God) upon a metaphorical page. The allegation that Ngāti Maniapoto denied the Wesleyans grazing rights over a disputed piece of land caused *Te Karere Maori* to state that ‘the [book]-page of the bad deeds of the Māori of Waipā is on the point of being filled. Should another page of their deeds be written or will they wish in future to deny wrongdoing and embrace goodness?’

The religious knowledge that Māori obtained from the printed *Kawenata*, *Rāwiri* and *Katikihama* (and from oral preaching) was a cultural lens through which to view the modern world. Māori creatively used the Biblical concepts and imagery
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83 AJHR, 1859, El, p 7.
86 *Te Haeata* 1/9/1860:4. ‘Kei whakaparahakotia ngā homaitanga a te Atua e tatou.’
87 *Te Karere Maori*, 20/4/1863:16. ‘Ko te wharangi pukapuka o nga hanga kino o nga Maori o Waipa, ka whao ka kapi. Me tuhihi ranei tetahi atu wharangi o a ratou mahi he tera ranei ratou e pai a muri ake nei, kia whakakore te he, kia whakau ki te tika.’ ‘The page of bad deeds against the Waipa natives is being rapidly filled up. Are the entries to be made on a new page against them, or will they in future prefer right to wrong [TKM].’
that they were exposed to, utilising them in their own texts, including political speech and writing, whether they were expressing pro- or anti-government viewpoints. Māori found they were able to understand the meaning of the Bible for themselves: Wiremu Tamihana cited Deuteronomy 17:15 to justify the establishment of the Kingitanga,\(^89\) and in 1862 the Te Pai Mārire religion emerged from Te Ua Haumene’s interpretations of the Old Testament.

Biblical knowledge was also the language that Māori and Pākehā could talk and understand together. For example, Gorst named his newspaper *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke i Rung a i te Tuanui* (a sparrow alone upon the rooftop) from Psalm 102 because Māori would know that this and because the following verse were an apt metaphor for his beleaguered position as the governor’s agent in the heart of the Kingitanga.\(^90\) When *Te Karere Māori* said, using the metaphor of writing in its discussion on the greatness of England and its laws, ‘the law [was] written in the hearts of the many’ Englishmen,\(^91\) Māori would doubtlessly also have been aware that God was said to have written his Law in the hearts of the House of Israel.\(^92\)

Similarly when Tawatawa of Ngā Puhi spoke publicly to Governor Grey at Kororareka in 1862, he evoked Matthew 7:17 with ‘a bad tree bears bad fruit, and a good tree bears good fruit: the fruit on my trees is all good’.\(^93\) All present would have been aware that he was associating himself with Grey’s plans for Māori rūnanga, and that the verse left unsaid, that ‘[e]very tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire’ could be applied to the Kingitanga, and other Māori unfriendly to the Crown. To a certain degree, the religious imagery of Biblical literacy was indigenised, becoming another weapon in the Māori verbal armoury.

\(^88\) The (New) Testaments, Prayer Books and Catechisms

\(^89\) Deut 17:15 ‘Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the LORD thy god shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.’

\(^90\) Psalm 102:7-8 ‘I watch, and as a sparrow on the house top. / Mine enemies reproach me all the day; and they that are mad against me are sworn against me.’

\(^91\) *Te Karere Māori*, 30/6/1856: 1. ‘...i tuhia putia ngā ture ki te ngakau o te tokomaha...’

\(^92\) Jeremiah 31:33; see also Psalm 40:8.

\(^93\) *Te Karere Māori*, 15/1/1862: 11. ‘...to te rakau kino he hua kino, ko to te rakau pai he hua pai: he pai anake nga hua o taku rakau.’
Maori Letter Writing

Maori, according to Lady Martin, a contemporary observer, 'enjoy writing letters heartily'. For McKenzie, it was the Maori's main use of literacy, because a letter 'allowed the person who wrote it to be in two places at once, his body in one, his thoughts in another', and was a form of communication that was later put to use for assembling tribes and planning war against the Crown. In 1845, Hone Heke sent a mere smeared with faeces to Kawiti, a symbolic request for his support in war. As noted in Chapter 1, Te Hapuku, in 1857, also requesting support, sent a letter to Wi Tako instead. Certainly, Maori wrote prolifically to each other, to Pakeha clergymen, and government officials, and to newspapers. Like many indigenous peoples, Maori were able to incorporate oral styles within their writing. This indigenisation of writing, coupled with critical awareness of political and social developments, allowed Maori to transcend the limited content of what they read.

Writing styles varied between individuals, with some letters displaying more 'oral' style than others. The degree of orality may well have conformed directly to the amount of European education that the writer had received. Take for example Pehimana Tamaiparea, the son of Aperahama Tamaiparea, chief of Waitotara. The nearest missionary, Rev R. Taylor, had a large catchment with many duties. Consequently he relied on native teachers who were considered indispensable, although 'their usefulness was strictly limited.' Tamaiparea's formal education was probably limited. The following are excerpts of a letter he sent to the Governor.

Go, my letter, to Governor Browne in Auckland. My friend, Greetings. My friend, this is what I am doing, pulling my tribe, Ngā Rauru, onto your institutions, that is, to the government, and the Queen's Law, my father and I [are involved in this].

I stood up to speak; Listen, my tribe, leave off, the methods for us are the Law of the Queen and the Law of God. The meeting agreed. Leave the fighting for other tribes to do, what use is that terrible thing to us?

---

95 McKenzie, p 19.
96 Ngā Tāngata Taumata Rau, Vol 1, p 34.
98 For a similar example of oral written style, see Hepata Turingenge's letter in Chapter 1.
100 Te Karere Maori, 16/8/1859:10. 'Haere, e taku reta, ki a Kawana Paraone, kei Akarana. E hoa, tena koe. E hoa, teni ano taku mahi, he kukume i toku iwi i a Ngāraurau ki runga ki to tikanga, ara, ki te Kawanatanga, ki te ture o te Kuini, maua ko taku papa, ko Aperahama Tamaiparea.'
The letter is farewelled, and Governor Browne is greeted and spoken to as if there in person. When writing of persuading his tribe, Tamaiparea uses the word *kukume* (to pull or drag) as if pulling a physical object, such as a canoe. He then assembles his tribe. When recounting the gist of the discussions, he shifts the scene from between past and present, between narration and dialogue. As in a performance, the ‘audience’ fills in the gaps. Despite the oral style of the letter, the substance is perfectly clear, with the verbal assents of the assembly establishing the tribe’s loyalty to the Crown.

The letter above can be compared with one written by Hēnare Taratoa. Taratoa had been educated for ten years in mission schools (where he also learnt milking cows, sewing and the cooking of Pākehā foods), and at St. Johns College in Auckland before becoming the teacher at Hadfield’s mission at Ōtaki. In the following letter, he explains that he has written to the Governor seeking clarification of the new settler political reforms.

My friends,

This is a letter from Mr. McLean, and a letter I wrote to the Governor [asking] him to discuss the methods by which a Māori person might enter into the Pākehā’s [political] institutions. I also asked him to explain [the nature of] the unity of the Pākehā and Māori people. But the main purpose of my enquiry was to ask about the seventh section of The Laws of New Zealand. But you can look at the meaning yourselves in this letter.

In conclusion.

Henare Wiremu Taratoa.

The style of Taratoa’s letter is much less personal than Tamaiparea’s: the audience may be ‘friends’, but they are definitely unknown readers, not intimate listeners. The letter does not revolve around speech, but alludes to texts written between the government officials and Taratoa, and a law book published by the government, and serialised by several newspapers.

---

Tu ana au ki te korero; Whakarongo maia, e te iwi, kaati ano he tikanga ma tatou ko te Ture o te Kuini, ko te Ture o te Atua. Whakaae ana te komiti. Waiho te whawhai ma ngā īwi ke atu, he āhā ma tatou tera mea kino?” The official translation kept much of the oral tone, but made some changes to made the text more literate in tone. ‘Go, my letter to Governor Browne in Auckland, friend, Salutation. Friend, I am engaged in trying to bring the my people, the Ngārawa [sic] into submission to the Government and Queen’s Laws. I and my father, Aperahama Tamaiparea, are doing what we can do to effect this...’; ‘I rose and spoke thus, hearken, O people, let us acknowledge only the Queen’s Law and the Laws of God. To this the meeting asserted let us leave quarrelling for other tribes, why should we have anything to do with that evil. [TKM]’

101 Te Karere o Poneke, 26/7/1858:3-4.
102 Te Karere o Poneke 8/11/1858: Suppl:1. ‘E hoa ma, He pukapuka tenei na Te Makarini, he rea hoki naku i tuhi atu ki a te Kawana, kia koreroa mai e ia he tikanga e uru a1i te tangata Maori ki o te Pakeha tikanga. He patai atu hoki naku kia whakamaratia mai e ia te whakakotahianga o te Pakeha, me te tangata maori. Otira, ko te tino take o taku patai, he ui atu naku, mo te 7 o nga upoko o nga Ture
Both writers are literate, in that they can read and write, but Taratoa’s letter is much more ‘literate’ in style. As Māori were exposed to more education through the second half of the nineteenth century, the nature of their writings in newspapers became less oral and conformed more closely to ‘essay-text’ style. Because a more prolonged educational encounter allowed Māori greater flexibility in writing styles, this ‘literate’ literacy indicates a conscious, even political and ideological, choice. This did not necessitate a submissive political stance.

In 1858, Taratoa, as the new teacher at Ōtaki and as a Māori from another region, wrote an account of his life and his philosophies for *Te Karere o Poneke*, perhaps to introduce himself to Wellington Māori. In it, he stated that Māori should internalise Pākehā *social* values and practices for material advancement.\(^{103}\) However, as his letter above shows, he was capable of subtly questioning the political authority of Pākehā to rule, which he continued to do.\(^{104}\) Taratoa later returned home, and in 1863 was killed fighting the Crown at Te Ranga.\(^{105}\) Not much is known about Pehimana Tamaiparea and his subsequent political affiliations.\(^{106}\) He and his father Aperahama later sold land to the Crown as a snub to the Kingitanga. Aperahama and his tribe, Ngā Rauru, joined the Pai Mārire cause in 1864, although Aperahama was eventually reconciled with the Crown.\(^{107}\) It is likely that political decisions of both Taratoa and Tamaiparea were made for various pragmatic or moral reasons, and the extent of educational conditioning probably played little part in them.

**Print as a ‘permanent’ text**

Print was a powerful force in Māori society. The early publications in Māori were almost exclusively religious and seen as embodying God’s truth. As befitted sources of divine knowledge, the words were bound and unchanging. For a short

---

\(^{103}\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 26/7/1858:3-4.

\(^{104}\) Much of the correspondence from Māori to the Native Department seems to be lost, or unrecoverable, but the correspondence records at National Archives show that a letter was received from Taratoa in 1859 requesting a copy of the New Zealand Constitution Act 1852. See listing for MA 1859/729.

\(^{105}\) *Ngā Tāngata Taumata Rau* 1769-1869, Vol 1, pp 160-161.

\(^{106}\) A Pehimana Hamarama, described variously as a chief, teacher and assessor, also of Waitotara also wrote to the newspaper. A Pehimana of Ngā Rauru also spoke at the Kohimarama Conference, but it is unclear which Pehimana this might have been. There is also a Pehimana Kaitana listed on the sale of land at Waitotara in *AJHR*, 1863, E15.
time, books gained a totemic power, capable of warding off evil. With the missionary texts forming the staple of Māori reading for many years, the association between print and truth would have been compelling. It is perhaps not surprising that most of the Māori language newspapers, including the government’s Te Karere Maori had a high religious content, thereby allowing the profane to bask a little in the glow of the sacred.

Printed texts thus had authority and permanence, and presented ideas as completed and finalised facts, in contrast to spoken words, which can be challenged and qualified. The permanence of printed and written texts may well have been unsettled for some Māori. Ngāti Pikiao and Ngāti Rangitihi, for example, had been at war with Tuhourangi over the ownership of the thermal attractions of Rotomahana which promised a lucrative tourist trade. In March, 1857, the enemies met at missionary sponsored peace talks at Te Wairoa.

At night, they held discussions together, and important thoughts were aired, so that the peace made would be certain. In the morning, when the document which would confirm the discussions was lying there, and [people] were writing in their names, Ngāti Pikiao departed, as if they were fleeing, and when it was completed they had come to Rotokakahi and were [still] running.109

Unfortunately, the newspaper account does not provide any explanation for their flight. Perhaps it may have been precipitated by the innovation of putting the agreements down in writing. Certainly literacy had an impact upon this Māori gathering, but it is unlikely that all the Ngāti Pikiao could not read or write. However, the decisions of the peace discussions were now bound within a text for all time, and the protagonists no longer could rely on the ambiguities of remembered speech. Perhaps Ngāti Pikiao were not prepared to commit themselves to that written text, or there may be another reason we will never know.

110 Te Karere Maori, 30/9/1857, pp 8-12, [Quote from page 9] ‘I te po ka runanga ratou tahi; katahi ano ka whakaputa i nga whakaaaro nunui, mo te houhanga kia pono. I te ata, ka takoto te pukapuka whakapumai i nga korero, me nga ingoa, e tuhituhi ana ano, ka mauku a Ngatipikiao me he ahua whati nei te rite, oti rawa ake kua puta i Rotokakahi e oma ana.’; ‘This was the first meeting that took place for the purpose of uniting parties. The second was Ngatipikiao’s, they were assembled at the Wairoa; these were also enemies of the Tuhourangi. ......At night, a consultation was held by both parties; important matters were discussed, and plans for securing the continuance of peace were arranged. In the morning a paper was produced which was to confirm what had been said, and to contain the names of those who had consented. While the paper was being written the Ngatipikiao all decamped, as though they had been running from an enemy, and by the time it was finished they had reached Rotokakahi, still running. [TKM]’
The very permanence of written texts was also portrayed in the newspapers as a blessing for Māori, in particular with regard to law. Written contracts were seen as a way of eliminating future arguments. Ngāti Whātua and Tapuika were commended for taking an argument over rights to kauri gum to court rather than resorting to arms, but were told the whole court process could have been avoided if they had drawn up a contract first.111 Business arguments were also common between Māori and Pākehā, and Te Karere Maori suggested that contracts should be drawn up and taken to the Native Department to be translated to avoid future argument.112

Politics was another arena in which literacy was to be practised. Pākehā attitudes to the place of literacy in public meetings is revealed by George Clarke, the Tumuaki (or Civil Commissioner) to Ngā Puhi, in his address to the first tribal rūnanga assembled under Grey’s ‘New Institutions’.

Some of thoughts [expressed] in your Maori councils are very good, but, those good thoughts get lost, because, people don’t work together.

Even when everyone can see a good idea and agrees to it, the consensus is lost, and the idea is not put into action because it hasn’t been discussed or written about widely.

So, all the activities of this runanga will be written down, and if the Governor and his Council agree, will be printed and be made permanent, to instruct people so all the people of this district will be able to comply with the Laws.113

Political agreements between Māori and Crown were often enshrined in written form. Government officials and some Wellington chiefs went to the Chatham Islands to persuade the Māori chiefs there to accept governmental control. They were reluctant, but finally agreed: ‘Finally their agreement was written down there – that made the act permanent.’114 Similarly, at Kohimarama, rather than allow the chiefs to reply verbally to the Governor’s address, McLean insisted that ‘each tribe in this Conference proceed to prepare a reply to the same, in writing, and unreservedly

---

111 Te Karere Maori, 31/10/1857:6.
112 Te Karere Maori, 30/9/1856:10-11.
113 Te Karere Maori 23/5/1862:2. "He nui ano te pai, o etahi o o koutou whakaaro, i roto i a koutou Runanga Maori; otira, ngaro noa aua whakaaro pai, i te mea hoki, kihai i whakakotahitia te mahinga.

Ahakoa ano hoki, whakaae katoa nga tangata i te kitenga o tetahi whakaaro pai, ngaro noa taua whakaaetanga, kihai i whakaritea, i te mea hoki kihai i korerotia nuiitia, i tuhituhia nuiitia.

Na, ko nga mahi o tenei Runanga, e tuhituhitia katoaitia, a ki te whakaaetia e te Kawara ratou ko tana Runanga, ka tiaa ki te perehi, kia whakapumautia, hei aki ma te tangata, kia ahei ai nga tangata katoa o tenei Takiwa te whakaratia i nga Ture."

114 Te Karere o Poneke, 30/8/1858: 2. "Tuhia rawatia ana i reira ta ratou whakaaetanga - ko te whakapumautanga tena o taua mahi." The officials were Stephen Carkeek of the Customs Department and Walter Buller, Interpreter (and soon after editor of Te Karere o Poneke). The chiefs were Honiana Te Puni-kokopu and Wi Tako Ngatata of Te Ati Awa.
express their feelings and opinions', no doubt aware the chiefs would be more circumspect if they had to commit their opinions to writing.

Māori sometimes declared their allegiance to the Crown by letter in order to portray their loyalty as enduring. For example, Ngāti Apa declared ‘this is a document to make permanent what people have said with regard to goodness [living peacefully], the law of God and the law of the Queen’. Similarly, when Tamihana Te Rauparaha was campaigning against the Kingitanga in the Wellington area, he advised several chiefs that they should write letters to the Governor to show their allegiance.

Māori were also prepared to take advantage of the permanence of the written word for their own purposes. As discussed in Chapter 1, the komiti nui of Te Hautōtara in the Wairarapa, deciding a land dispute, had wanted a written assent from the opposing parties, which was then printed, no doubt to stop further argument. Māori chiefs who had written to the Māori king in 1859 in order to join the Kingitanga, or to express sympathy with the cause, had their letters printed three years later in Te Hokioi. At Kohimarama, Tomika Te Mutu of Ngāiterangi complained that his lands had been ‘written down’ for the Māori King against his wishes.

Some individuals also saw official and legal documentation of land subdivision and “Crown Grants” [land titles] as a way of stopping quarrels and of developing their land. At Kohimarama, a number of chiefs complained that they were unable to get Crown Grants. Displaying his faith in literacy processes, Paora Tūhaere of Ngāti Whātua even suggested what he thought a suitable procedure: first the surveying of the land, then subdivision, followed by advertising the distribution in the newspaper, and finally the awarding of the grants. Tamihana Te Rauparaha, another chief

115 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860: 37. ‘...ma tena hapu ma tena hapu e ata tuhituhi marire i ona whakaaro ki te pukapuka, he i whakahoki i a te Kawana – he whakatika, hei whakaha ranei.’
116 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/9/1861:17 ‘He puka whakapumau tenei i nga korero a te hunga ki te pai, ki te ture o te Atua, me te ture o te Kuini’; ‘This paper is to make permanent the korero of those who agree to quietness, and those who acknowledge the laws of God, and the Queen. [TKM]’
118 Te Karere o Poneke, 30/8/1858:3.
119 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:4.
120 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:16.
121 Te Karere Maori, 31/1/1860:3-4; 3/8/1860 suppl:49; 15/1/1862:18.
122 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:22; 31/7/1860:61; 30/11/1860:44, 51.
123 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:58; 30/11/1860:24-25.
prominent at the conference, not only favoured the issuing of titles, but also inheritance through written wills.\textsuperscript{124}

Conclusion

The evidence suggests that Māori literacy in their own language, at least prior to the Native Schools Act 1867, was acquired, to a large degree, independently of educational institutions. If the ‘autonomous’ model of literacy is rejected for one which posits literacy within the social contexts in which it is practised, then Māori literacy was largely free from the sort of effects of schooling that ‘prevented them from arriving at a detached and critical appraisal of their real situation.’\textsuperscript{125} However, as Hēnare Taratoa’s story shows, an extensive missionary education did not necessarily mean a submissive mind.

Māori were able to use literacy for their own purposes, particularly in letter writing. However, while the effects of formal schooling may have been negligible, there were other social and political contexts in which literacy was practised that probably had more impact on Māori society. Māori language literacy was utilised by Pākehā missionaries and government officials for their own purposes, and imbued with their own ideologies. When dealing with Pākehā, Māori might have to interpret a variety of texts, including land sales agreements, work contracts, written wills and Crown Grants. In addition, missionaries, unofficial evangelists such as Buller and Davis, and the government, used printed texts, such as the newspaper, to convert Māori not only to the Christian faith, but also to Western notions of civilisation. However, literacy did not render Māori ‘as uncritical, mystified, passive readers’. The very permanence of paper-based texts gave Māori time for reflection, re-reading, discussion and re-interpretation.\textsuperscript{126} Māori were capable of, and showed enthusiasm for, interpreting what they read, incorporating literacy into indigenous discourse, and writing and printing their own independent and critical texts.

\textsuperscript{124} Te Karere o Poneke, 15/10/1857:3-4; Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 suppl:64; 1/9/1860:9.
\textsuperscript{125} Street, p 79. This quote refers to missionary education in Fiji.
\textsuperscript{126} Goody (1986), p 6.
Chapter 3: translation, language and 'amalgamation'

Introduction

When *Te Karere Maori* reviewed the government's Māori language Law book in 1858, it offered the following caution.

'Those of our Māori friends who undertake a careful perusal of its contents, with a view to obtaining a knowledge of the Laws of the Pakeha, must not be disheartened if they meet with much which they do not at first understand. It would not be possible to write a book on this subject in the Māori language, which should tell every thing about the Laws of the Pakeha and be perfectly intelligible to the Māori reader.'

Perhaps there will be some [of our] friends who will try to carefully read that book, to find out about the principles of the Laws of the Pākehā. Keep at it, and don't lose heart at a difficult section, or become fed up with reading on. [The meaning] might not be there, then [you] will see it. It's not possible to write a book setting out these concepts in the Māori language, that a Māori person could easily read and understand. There are many laws, many words that cannot be translated into Māori, there are no Māori words for those concepts.

Most of the newspaper content read by Māori in this period can rightly be considered as translation. Apart from published letters from Māori readers and the Kingitanga's *Te Hokioi*, most of the newspaper texts were written by Pākehā. *Te Karere Maori* was bilingual, as was some of Davis's *Ko Aotearoa*, and it is clear, from comparing any two texts, that nearly all Pākehā and Māori whose words appeared in these newspapers thought and wrote in their own languages first, which were subsequently translated into the other. It is very likely that the same first language thinking also occurred with the Māori language only newspapers. Given the prolix nature of the English prose used in the bilingual journals, and the frequent differences in meaning and tone, I doubt very much that accompanying English texts were to assist Māori to learn English. They were more likely provided for Pākehā.

---

1 *Te Karere Maori*, 16/8/1858: 1-2. 'Tena pea etahi o nga hoa e aro ki te ata korero marie i te pukapuka na, he mea nana kia kītea e ia nga tikanga o nga Ture Pakeha. Kia maia ra, kei he te manawa i te wahi pakeke, kei hoa ki te korero tonu; naua i ngaro, a-na, ka kītea. E kore e ahei te tuhitahi tetahi pukapuka korero i ara nga tikanga ki te reo Maori, kia takoto noa iho te korero e te tangata Maori, matau tonu ake. He tīni hoki nga Ture, he maha hoki nga kūpu e kore e taea te whakamaori, he kore kūpu maori hoki mo aua tikanga korero.'

2 Rogers claims that government 'translations fell out of favour in 1854'. See, Shef Rogers, 'Crusoe Among the Maori: Translation and Colonial Acculturation in Victorian New Zealand' in *Book History*, 1998, pp 182, 191. He is talking about the translations of books, primarily two works of fiction, Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Swift's *Pilgrim's Progress*. This is ignoring not just the publications on law, but also the content of the various Māori language newspapers.

3 For the purposes of this chapter, 'Māori language newspapers' will refer to those newspapers published by the government and Pākehā, rather than *Te Hokioi*.
who might read them, such as magistrates and missionaries, or possibly for the Colonial Office in England.\textsuperscript{4}

In the passage above, not only was the author discussing the travail of translation, but the translator (perhaps the same person) was giving some proof of it. Translation between Māori and English was not (and is not) an easy, seamless process. The English text is almost certainly what the author of the article originally wrote. The back-translation\textsuperscript{5} of the Māori text I have provided shows (despite its literal awkwardness) not only what Māori are more likely to have read and understood, but how the content of the source was changed in the transition. The Māori text addresses the reader more directly than the English version, and adds an explanation of why translation into Māori was difficult – because Māori lacked the necessary words.

But does translation revolve merely about finding the right words? As Sanford Budick wrote,

\begin{quote}
Translation necessarily marks the border crossing where, if anywhere, one culture passes over to the other, whether to inform it, to further its development, to capture or enslave it, or merely to open a space between the other and itself.\textsuperscript{6}
\end{quote}

If cultural assimilation can be likened to ‘enslavement’, then it is possible to say that the Pākehā writers and translators for the Māori newspapers undertook, to varying degrees, all of the roles Budick identifies. These individuals operated within a colonial society ordered according to a racially dichotomous ideology. While the actual newspaper messages are detailed in the following chapters, this chapter looks not just at translation theory and linguistic difference, but also at how certain words reflected the power and hierarchical relations in which colonial ideology was expounded.\textsuperscript{7} However, there are two sides to any border and Māori, as the “recipients” or “target audience” of this message were certainly not passive in their reading of the texts, and their engagement in the discourse, both as loyalists and Kingitanga supporters, will also be explored.

\textsuperscript{4} Walter Buller, as both secretary to the Kohimarama Conference and editor of Te Karere Māori, lamented that due to the size of the July 1860 issue of Te Karere Māori, and the demands of other government printing work, he was ‘sorry to find that it will not be out for the English Mail.’ McLean Papers, Folio 190 [Alexander Turnbull Library].

\textsuperscript{5} A “back-translation” is to retranslate a translation back into the original source language. This is normally done to determine whether the meaning of the text has changed.

Issues of Translation

Transparency

As discussed in Chapter 2, other than a minimal subset of terms required for trading with Pākehā, few Māori learnt English to a functional level in this period, although many English words were incorporated into Māori as loanwords. As the numbers of Pākehā immigrants increased, they tended to live in towns, or on farms within a white frontier, so felt little need to learn the Māori language. Geographical, cultural, as well as linguistic borders existed between most Māori and Pākehā, and meaningful communication between the races was mediated by a relatively small number of Pākehā, mainly missionaries and some government officials. Part of their role was to make Pākehā culture and institutions intelligible (and palatable) to Māori, and the Māori language newspapers were one space in which this process of cultural translation is evident.

The aim of most modern translation is ‘transparency’, that is to render a text fluently from one language to another, providing natural sounding language so that the reader is unaware of the intrinsic foreignness of the text. Maori language newspapers, to some extent followed this goal. Their mission of cultural translation involved changing the way Māori thought and acted, socially, politically and morally. They were aware that the more an audience identifies with a writer (or speaker), the more they will empathise with the message. For this reason, Pākehā writers sometimes included traditional oral techniques, including waiata and whakataukī, in order to connect with their Māori readership. For example, in recounting the ‘sins’ of Te Rangitāke and other Māori in Taranaki, the following whakataukī was employed:

7 A discussion on the terms mana and sovereignty can be found in Chapter 7.
9 Of course, there were some traders, early Pākehā settlers, and half-castes who were fluent in both languages.
You let your foot come towards me so that it may be said you favour me.

A warrior can expect an uncertain future, a cultivator will continue to hold onto [life].

*Whakatauki* are often used in Māori speech as received wisdom, as what is right, sensible and true. Therefore, it is not surprising that at times, writers and translators of the Māori language newspapers, knowledgeable in Māori idiom, employed them (as well as the biblical sayings that Māori had already embraced) for the same purpose.

However, a truly ‘transparent’ translation where the reader is unaware of the existence of any source text is more of a goal than a reality. Words and sayings of any complexity can seldom be translated into another language and still retain the multifarious layers of meanings of the original. For example, the first *whakatauki* cited above can also apply to doubts about the professions of a lover, a relationship which the author was probably not alluding to. Of course, readers can only understand texts written in languages they know. Most nineteenth century Māori readers of *Te Karere Maori* probably ignored the English language column, and their reading of the Māori text would have been influenced by an indigenous understanding of their own language. However, the presence of the foreign text, coupled with an unfamiliarity with some of the new concepts they encountered, would have lessened any ‘transparency’ the translators were hoping for.

Occasionally the gist of one text differed quite significantly from that of its translation. On one occasion the portrayal of legal matters to Māori in *Te Karere Maori* sparked ex-missionary William Colenso to fulminate at length on the issue in...
Parliament, that it was 'such a subject and such a translation as defied all attempts to understand or make any sense of it.' Māori readers would have been unaware of the subtle differences in manner and tone that sometimes existed between the parallel texts. One example will suffice: an account of an election of a council of Ngāti Mahanga and Ngāti Hourua at Whaingaroa under Grey's ‘New Institutions’ policy.

After considerable speechifying, and no debatable ground having been taken by any of the speakers—(the speeches of the Maori are happily short)—the elections took place with a gravity that would elicit a smile of Auckland citizens. There were a great many speeches by the people, and because there was no cause for intractable debate (fortunately the Māori speeches were short) the people were chosen for the rūnanga, in a calm manner, which would perhaps have been agreeable to the townsfolk of Auckland if they had seen it.

The English source is more condescending than the Māori back-translation. It uses the word “speechifying” which implies a tedium and repetition (despite the brevity of each speech) which conformed to a contemporary Pākehā view that Māori speeches were often redundant and unnecessary. However, the elections were conducted ‘with a gravity that would elicit a smile’ from Aucklanders. Pākehā expected Māori to take on European usages (see Chapter 6) yet often found such imitation, particularly when Māori were seen to be trying hard, as amusing or deficient. Yet in the Māori text, ‘gravity’ is translated as māhaki, which implies calmness and self-possession. The process might be āhuareka to the people of Auckland, which could be translated as ‘entertaining’, but also has the meanings of ‘pleasant’, ‘agreeable’ and ‘pleasing’. Given that Grey’s policy was designed to draw support away from the Kingitanga (see Chapter 8), Māori would have expected Aucklanders to be pleased that several Waikato hapū on their frontier had agreed to accept governmental jurisdiction. It is likely, therefore, that Māori would have read the version in their language without any inkling of the condescending tone of the source text. However, as will be seen below, the nature of the language used by these newspapers exposed to Māori their colonial relationship to Pākehā and the Crown.

Neither were Māori texts, when rendered into English, always particularly ‘transparent’. As the missionary, Octavius Hadfield noted, correspondence from Māori was often translated into poor English, perhaps to suggest Māori ‘were incapable of expressing their opinions in proper language, which is the reverse of the

---

18 NZPD, 1861-63, pp 518-522. Colenso was referring to Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/11/1861:2, but also discussed articles in Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862; 1/7/1862.
This may have been so, although the translators may also have been attempting to retain the Māori “voice” for subsequent readers. No doubt, most of the letters to which Hadfield referred had been written by Māori to the government, in particular the Native Department. Officials there would have had some knowledge of the Māori language, and translations which kept closely to the form and structure of the original Māori, might well have been more useful than ‘good’ English, where many of the subtleties might have been lost. Of course, most Māori, when reading the original letters reprinted in *Te Karere Maori*, would have been unaware of any lack of transparency in the English translation.

**Intentionality**

Languages, and the cultures they are spoken within inform each other. Not only do some languages make culturally based distinctions that are not found in others, but the changing nature of a language’s vocabulary also reflects the cultural developments and impositions upon its host culture. The arrival and settlement of Pākehā in New Zealand had a profound impact on Māori culture, especially upon their vocabulary, with terminology needed for new concepts, including religious, social, commercial and governmental. This was often done by borrowing and transliterating English words, particularly to accommodate the flood of new material possessions and technology. However, translators also employed onomasiological borrowing, that is, using a Māori term that roughly equated with a term in English. For example, early missionaries had co-opted certain significant Māori words relating to religious belief for the propagation of Christianity. *Atua*, a term used for a wide range of supernatural beings in pre-contact Māori society became *Te Atua*, or God, and *tapu*, which encompassed a wide range of spiritually (and culturally) based restrictions, was used to translate the biblical concept of ‘sacred’. Of course, all of the original *atua māori* and rules of *tapu* became dangerous superstitions to the missionaries as they sought to implant their own sets of meanings into these indigenous words.

---

19 *Te Karere Maori* 25/2/1862:6. ‘Nui atu te whai korero o te iwi, no ka kore noa te take e maro ai te korero—(marire ano kia poto ake nei te whai korero o te Māori)—ka whirihiria nga tangata mo te runanga, i runga i te mahi mahaki, hei ahuareka pea mei kitea e nga kai noho taone o Akarana.’
20 AJHR 1860: E4, p 6.
As European powers imposed themselves upon indigenous peoples around the world, they struggled to control the economic and political processes of their new possessions. To further these aims, they also sought to subdue the indigenous languages.²² Just as the early missionaries utilised indigenous Māori terminology to promote their message, the colonial institutions, in particular through the Māori language newspapers, also manipulated Māori words to suit their own needs. Pākehā had intruded upon Māori society, and Māori were expected to accommodate Pākehā desires, whether by converting to a new religion, giving up some of their land for Pākehā settlement, adopting European mores, or becoming loyal subjects of the Queen. However, Māori themselves were not passive towards colonisation. Indeed some Māori promoted the growth of Pākehā settlement, some an expansion of British law, some opposed both but still favoured material progress. These various positions were reflected in how Māori used the new vocabulary and its new sets of meanings.

When translation is imposed on (rather than requisitioned by) a target audience by an alien source culture, the source culture imperatives drive the process, with translators concerned with ensuring that the translated message reflects the intentions of the source.²³ This means a careful use of both the vocabulary of a language and the inherent distinctions found within it. Certainly this was true with the Māori language newspapers which existed self-consciously as propaganda devices. Notions of racial difference, for example, were quite explicit. However, the government translators were aware that certain statements could prove provocative and so occasionally mitigated the content.²⁴ As seen below, one technique was to use metaphor in presenting the new institutions and relationships that Māori encountered, rather than more explicit explanations.

²⁴ The softening, or omission, of harsh English passages, thus rendering a more moderate Māori text has not always been appreciated. Take for example, Sinclair (1961), p 41; Rogers, p 185. In the examples cited by these commentators the Māori texts are milder in tone than the English. In Sinclair’s example, small sections are quoted which remove the passage from its overall context.
Translation in mid nineteenth century New Zealand, as in other imperial possessions, was driven by the colonial imperatives.²⁵ Pākehā producing texts for the Māori language newspapers, whether translating texts or writing in Māori “from scratch”, had to convert cultural as well as semantic concepts from English into Māori whilst promoting the propaganda aims of the newspapers, that is, the furtherance of British colonisation. The gulf between the culture and vocabularies of Māori and the West meant that translators often created new words, or co-opted existing indigenous words whose meanings were then stretched, although sometimes the old nuances of these words were unavoidably retained. The translators attempted to make their work as transparent as possible to their Māori readers while also taking care that the intentions of the message were met, in order to ‘turn the alien theory into something that can be understood, transformed, and assimilated in the new place.'²⁶ As discussed below, translation, in particular of certain words, was a process that helped Pākehā authorities colonise the Māori language and its lexicon, in their attempts to colonise Māori themselves. Māori, in turn, utilised this language, sometimes in agreement with the colonising forces, sometimes against them.

**Dichotomy v Union**

*Amalgamation: he iwi kotahi*

The government race policy espoused to Māori was one of ‘amalgamation’, usually translated as ‘he iwi kotahi’ (one people). This policy, according to Alan Ward, was not inherently racist, but was based on the notion that Western culture and “civilisation” was transmissable and therefore available to Māori.²⁷ However, “amalgamation” did not mean the forming of one society comprising the best of the values and culture of two equal halves, but the assimilation of Māori into a European-

---


²⁷ Alan Ward, *A Show of Justice: Racial ‘Amalgamation’ in Nineteenth Century New Zealand,* 2nd Ed (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1995), pp viii. This government view was not shared by all settlers. For example, in 1851 William Fox stated that Māori still ‘retain all the principal, and many of the most disagreeable features of savage character’ and, should the colonists leave, he could ‘see nothing in their present civilization which would be likely to prevent a lapse of the natives into absolute barbarism almost the next day.’ While Fox was prepared to concede that Māori were capable of civilisation, he thought it unlikely given their impending extinction. See Fox (1971), pp 61-69.
style society. Māori were expected to “catch up” to Pākehā in order to fit into the new society. That “native” races could “improve” was a tenet of colonial thought at least up until the 1860s. The pressures were sufficiently hegemonic that the policy was eventually successful in certain aspects: most Māori now live in nuclear families, speak English as their first language, and compete in the job market as individuals, although Māori identity has not been subsumed into a generic New Zealand one. This transformation was the result of educational and economic changes, particularly in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and through the twentieth century. However, for much of the nineteenth century, assimilatory policies were only marginally successful: the embrace, or rejection, of these policy by Māori was generally on their own terms.

Many Māori did strive to better themselves materially. Some Māori even saw benefits in accepting aspects of state authority, although often conditionally. However, the government’s failure to universally win the hearts and minds of Māori was a major cause of the wars of the 1860s. As this English text from Te Karere Maori shows, “amalgamation” did suggest that Māori could climb the racial ladder and mix with Pākehā.

If you exert yourselves, the Natives will rank more with the European, and the European associate more with the Maori. [my italics.] When the Maori acts like the Pakeha, many Pakeha will enter in amongst the Maori, and the Maori will enter in amongst the Pakeha.

However, despite the supposed accessibility of civilisation for Māori, and therefore equality of the races, the colonial discourse was predicated on the ideas of racial difference and hierarchy. With European colonisation of countries inhabited by non-European races, notions of race and the grouping of peoples on account of their appearance had developed, perhaps due to the desire of Europeans to understand and classify the diversity of humanity. In some languages, the colours black and white were (and sometimes still are) used as metaphors for various human characteristics. In English, sin, evil, and ugliness were associated with black: chastity, virginity, beauty and peace with white. Of course, these concepts predated modern times and were not exclusive to Europeans. Indeed, in Māori the word mā can mean both “white” and “clean”. However, the enslavement of Africans in the Americas led to

---

30 Head (2001a) pp 112-113.
these metaphors being applied to racial groups: the blacker a race, the more loathsome and offensive, and thus the lower its position, or rank, in the family of human kind. In addition, many Western intellectuals also saw civilisation in terms of progressive attainment of certain cultural attributes, such as cultivation and a structured polity.\textsuperscript{32} This, 'the extent of conformity to the dictates of utility in the organisation of [Western] society'\textsuperscript{33} allowed human groups to be classified on the scale of human social development.\textsuperscript{34} Naturally, the Europeans who conceived this system saw themselves as the superior race in terms of physiognomy, religion, customs, language and utility.\textsuperscript{35}

Skin pigmentation is a physical attribute over which its possessor has no control. Colonial theorists considered individuals and races could raise their civilisation ranking essentially through cultural improvement, yet blackness and lack of civilisation appeared to go hand in hand.\textsuperscript{36} In New Zealand, the policy of 'he iwi kotahi' was designed, among other things, to raise Māori in terms of civilisation. These new ideas needed to be communicated to Māori. It is the key words of that discourse and the nature of their translation, in particular through the Māori language newspapers, which I will now discuss, with regard both to the binary racial distinctions inherent in colonialism, and the supposed potentiality of achieving a state of civilisation equal to that of Pākehā.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1857:10. 'Ka rite te Maori ki te Pakeha; ka tino uru te tini o te Pakeha ki roto ki te Maori, me te Maori ka uru ki roto ki te Pakeha.'
\item \textsuperscript{32} While much of the important theoretical work by archaeologists and anthropologists on the stages of social development did not occur until after 1860, the concept of cultural advancement had been circulating since the previous century. See Peter J. Bowler, \textit{The Invention of Progress: The Victorians and the Past} (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989) pp 21-22, 30-39.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Hyam, p 39.
\item \textsuperscript{34} These ideas preceded formal colonisation. Take for example, John Nicholas who accompanied Marsden on his 1814 journey, who wished 'for the moment to arrive when civilization and well-regulated industry would take the place of barbarism'. When reckoning the ship's company he divided those present between 'savages' and 'civilised people'. See J.L. Nicholas, \textit{Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand} (London: James Black and Son, 1817; facsimile, Auckland: Wilson & Horton, n.d.), Vol 1, pp 226, 371.
\item \textsuperscript{35} See Paul Spoonley, \textit{Racism and Ethnicity}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Edition. (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1993) pp 1-2; Christine Bolt, \textit{Victorian Attitudes to Race.} (London: Routledge, 1971) pp 2, 9, 11, 17, 28, 111, 131-2, 154, 168, 178, 185-201, 208-9. These attitudes were pervasive, as well as transportable. See, for example, the racist tone and 'nigger' language of 'A Scene at a Slave Sale in Savannah' in Auckland's \textit{Southern Cross}, 2/9/1859: 4.
\item \textsuperscript{36} The lighter coloured Māori and Polynesians, for example, possessed chiefly hierarchies and agricultural economies and were deemed to be more 'civilisable' than the blacker hunter-gatherer Aboriginals of Australia.
\end{itemize}
The Terminology

Māori and Pākehā – Native and European.

Frantz Fanon states, ‘[t]he colonial world is a Manichaean world’ that is, a world of dichotomy. This dichotomous nature of colonialism is such that both the coloniser and the colonised will seek to define themselves and the ‘other’. In the English language, it was often through the terms ‘native’ and ‘European’ that this relationship was defined. In Māori, these were translated as Māori and Pākehā, terms originating from early contacts between Europeans and the indigenous people of New Zealand.

The nature of these contacts was unequal, in that Europeans generally possessed a superior technology. Europeans, unlike Māori, also already possessed a shared cultural identity as opposed to non-Europeans, as well as national identities. They were also familiar with “discovering” new lands and encountering “natives”.

Although Māori were divided politically and genealogically, their world was more closed, their cultures less heterogeneous than European experience. The arrival of Europeans who confronted their accepted notions of normality were sufficiently strange to be considered Pākehā, a term most likely deriving from pakepakehā, a form of supernatural being. Despite their existing internal differences, Māori were now aware of themselves as a distinct group within a wider humanity and termed themselves tāngata māori (normal people). Not surprisingly, the supernaturality of Europeans was soon lost, although the terms were not.

38 For example, in 1817, Nicholas’s list of Māori words and phrases has ‘white man’ as ‘Packahā’ or ‘Pakkahah’ and ‘black man’ as ‘tangiata maoude’. See Nicholas, pp 338, 344.
40 Walker (1990), 94, Barlow (1998), 70, 86-87. Other derivations for the term ‘Pākehā’ have also been proposed. Mohi Turei, for example, suggested that it derived from words chanted by Captain Cook’s sailors. See Kaa & Kaa, (1996) p 106. The Dictionary of the Maori Language [Williams] suggests that the use of ‘Māori’ to mean ‘native of New Zealand’ began about 1850. However, the word used as an adjective (‘Tangata Maori’ and ‘Rangatira Maori’) is found in the Māori version of the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840. The word ‘Pakeha’ occurs in the 1835 Declaration of Independence, as well as the Treaty of Waitangi.
41 This probably happened very quickly. While the strangeness of Europeans was apparent, so was their human-like appearance. For example, see the following comment on Captain Cook’s visit by Te Horeta Te Taniwha. ‘Kotahi te tino tangata o taua kaipuke. I mōhiotia ko ia te ariki nō te mea, he tangata rangatira, he pai nō taua tū, ā, he hāngū, ārā, kōrero nui ai ētahi o aua tupua, ko taua tangata kihai i maha ana kupu’ (My translation and italics: That ship had one supreme man. We knew he was the arītō [paramount chief] because he was a rangatira [noble, chiefly] man and his bearing was good, and he was silent. That is, while some of the tupua [goblins] spoke a lot, this man had few words). Salmond, Amé, Two Worlds, First Meetings Between Māori and Europeans 1642-1772. (London: Viking, 1991) pp 87-89; Te Horeta Te Taniwha, ‘Te Taenga Mai o Kāpene Kuki mā ki
Whereas the "native" in a colonial setting was considered an inferior being to the European, in Māori, the terms Māori and Pākehā do not necessarily possess these connotations. The Māori language newspapers, however, did try to extend the existing set of meanings for the word māori, by imposing new meanings based on European conceptions of the "native". The term, māori was used not just for the New Zealand 'native' but for any indigenous race in the world. Māori, in the Māori language, does mean 'normal', as in 'not unusual' or 'not unnatural', but this was extended to translate the idea of 'natural', as in a part of nature, for example, the word "coal" being called one of 'nga hua maori o te whenua' (the natural fruit of the land).

Many Pākehā of the nineteenth century saw New Zealand's natural environment as dark, rampant, oppressive and dangerous; in Nicholas's words 'savage wilds'. This was an entity to be tamed and exploited, or destroyed, in order for cultivation and civilisation to reign. By extension, the word māori was also applied to the violent side of human nature. The term, as an adverb, is listed in the Dictionary of the Maori Language to mean 'without restraint' and 'without object'. The latter meaning was ignored, but the former was extended in the Māori language newspapers to other grammatical categories, widening the nuances. It was often appended to the word ngākau. This word means "heart" but can be metaphorically extended to "mind", "inclination" and "conscience". The word was often further extended to include the "nature" of animals and people. For example, horses acted in a certain way because of a "ngakau hoiho" (horsey nature). In the newspapers, the all too common possession of a "ngakau Maori" meant, for Māori, slipping back to evil ways: apostasy from Christian practice indicated a 'maoritanga o te ngakau' (willfullness of the heart).


42 This perhaps explains why the term 'native' has lost favour for defining people in a post-colonial environment, whereas Māori and Pākehā are still used not only in Māori, but also commonly in New Zealand English.

43 Nicholas, p 204.


45 For example, see Te Karere Maori, 31/1/1859:1.

46 Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:32; 1/9/1855:13, Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:2; Te Karere o Poneke, 22/2/1858: 3.
The lack of restraint inherent in the word *māori* was further extended to specifically include violence, reflecting Western concepts of the violence and unpredictability of nature. ‘Force’, unsanctioned by Western notions of justice and propriety, became ‘kaha maori’, ‘murder’ was translated as ‘kohuru Maori’, ‘conquest’ as ‘tango maori’. Similarly, feuding over land was seen as the return of ‘ritenga maori, ritenga kino’ (bad, native practices), deemed not even to be ‘ritenga tangata’ (human practice) but the work of the devil. Similarly, *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* labelled the murder of settlers during the first Taranaki War, which some Māori had called ‘uru maranga’ (a justifiable act of war) as ‘uru Maori’, ‘an up-Maoriing, a going back to their savage Maoriism’.

Because passionate, unrestrained violence was antithetical to notions of civilisation, and because modern civilisation was linked to Christian belief, the term *māori* was further developed to indicate uncivilised and pagan. According to *Te Haeata* in 1860, the Holy Spirit descended on black Jamaicans who gave up their ‘mahi maori’ (un-Christian ways).

Before Christianity, Romans had indulged in ‘ritenga maori’ (pagan practices). In *Te Karere Maori*, Māori learnt that ancient Britons, with their ‘tohunga’ (native priests) had lived like Māori, until conquered by the more civilised Romans. Romans and Phœnicians, although pagans, were, when in their civilising role, deemed to be ‘manuhiri Pakeha’ (civilised visitors), who encouraged the Britons to change their customs, including the wearing of ‘kakahu pakeha’ (civilised clothing).

Thus, the word *māori* became synonymous with negative human qualities and activities. Māori readers of *Te Karere o Poneke* even read in 1858 that with their dirty bodies, clothes and houses, they still retained their ‘ahua maori’ (native

---


49 *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 15/8/1861:16. ‘E kiana, he *uru maranga!* Huatua he *uru* Maori. He hokinga whakamuri ki tona nanakiatanga maoritanga.’ ‘It is called a [simple] ambush! [But] call it a Māori act, a backward return to Māori treachery.[LP]’ According to the Dictionary of the Maori Language, “*urumaranga*” is an ambush. *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* prints it as two words and, with an emphasis on maranga (to arise) translates it as ‘uprousing’. However, the inference from Māori who used it was that it was a justifiable act of war, similar to ‘*he maroro kokoti ihu waka*’, an unlucky victim who crosses the path of a war party. See *Te Karere Maori* 3/8/1860 Apiti:26.

50 *Te Haeata*, 2/12/1861:2


Māori were called ‘Maori’, that is, defined as a ‘native’ race. However, they also possessed a culture, which could be shed, defined as ‘maori’ onto which an extended set of negative meanings had been attached. The message was clear that Māori were inextricably ‘Maori’ as a people, yet needed to reject their unrestrained, uncivilised, natural, māori ways in order to progress in the modern world.

Vertical Familial Relationships

In nineteenth century Western notions of sovereignty, the sovereign ruled over his/her subjects. The relationship and responsibilities between the two were both distant and formal. This sort of connection was foreign to the thinking of Māori, where political relationships were generally based on personally known individuals, often related through whakapapa. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Māori understanding was utilised in representing the new relationship between Crown and Māori. As Claudia Orange notes, the idea of a personal relationship between the Crown and Māori was initially fostered by Samuel Marsden, who planted the first Christian mission in New Zealand. Queen Victoria, and by proxy the governor and government, were defined as matua (parent) to her Māori tamariki (children). Another missionary, Henry Williams, also encouraged Māori to sign the Treaty of Waitangi with assurances that it was proof of the Queen’s love for them, and of her desire for a close relationship with Māori. Although the Treaty conformed to nineteenth century statecraft, its very wording reinforced the Māori understanding that the Queen personally was making the agreement with them. At this time, Māori relationships were personal rather than institutional, so it is unlikely they would have interpreted their relationship with the Crown in any other way. As Archdeacon George Kissling stated in 1858:

The Queen is regarded by them in the relation of mother, and the Governor as Her Representative and their friend. No special respect is paid by them to a changeable ministry elected by the European population.

---

55 For example, *Te Karere Maori*, 31/8/1858:6, 30/9/1857:1, 31/8/1859:1,2.
57 *AJHR* 1860 E1, p 3. See also Swainson’s comments, AJHR 1860 E1, p 29.
Therefore, the paternal relationship expressed in the Māori language newspapers was consciously maintaining an existing belief held by many Māori. For example, Te Karere Maori stated:

It was by the word of Māori themselves that the Government came to this land, and came as a fence [protection] for them. Should we point out its many acts so you might see the truth of its friendship at all times? Its policy has been parental care alone, from the beginning to this [day], so that good might increase for the Māori.  

Given the looseness of governmental influence over Māori, this personal relationship allowed Governors to use moral suasion on Māori chiefs which might have been less effective had the understanding of Māori about their relationship been closer to that of Pākehā. This influence was also strengthened by the notion that ‘God has given the Governors to be kind and to protect the people’. Fanon suggests that:

colonialism...did not seek to be considered by the native as a gentle loving mother who protects her child from a hostile environment, but rather as a mother who unceasingly restrains her fundamentally perverse offspring from managing to commit suicide and giving free rein to its evil instincts.

However, we see that the Crown presented itself as a loving parent, partly because ‘love’ was cheaper than coercion. When the Crown considered that circumstances demanded more active intervention, it was capable of accepting that role.

Māori were British ‘subjects’, but the full implications of this term were not adequately defined when translated. It was not that Māori society, with hierarchies descending from tapu chief to noa slaves, did not possess words to indicate the notion of ‘control’ implicit in the word ‘subject’. The Bible too contained examples of subjection to the power of both God and temporal rulers. This was often translated as ngohengohe whose set of meanings include the notions of ‘obedience’, ‘softness’ and ‘pliability’. However, this concept does not appear to have been used in the political discourse of the time. The verb rongo was sometimes used, which can mean to ‘obey’, but also merely to ‘listen’, ‘hear’ or ‘sense’ in some way. Sometimes,

58 Te Karere Maori, 31/8/1859:2-3. ‘Na nga Maori ano te kupu i haere mai ai te Kawanatanga ki tenei whernua, i haere pai mai ano hoki hei taea pa mona, a me tohutohu koia e matou ana tini maihi e kitea ai e koutou te pono o tana whakahoatanga i nga wa katoa? He atawhai whakamataua anake tona tikanga, i te timatanga, a teaa noaia tenei, he mea kia tupa ai te pai ki nga Maori; ‘The Government came hither at the solicitation, and as the friend, of the Maori people, and we need but refer the latter to all its acts to demonstrate how true and steadfast a friend it has been. A parental care for their well-being has been manifested from first to last. [TKM]'  
59 Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1857:5. ‘Na te Atua i homai nga Kawana hei atawhai hei tiaki i te iwi’ ‘God has given rulers to love and protect the people [TKM]’.  
60 Fanon, pp 169-170.  
61 For example, ‘hauraro’.
however, no attempt was made to translate the word ‘subject’ meaningfully.\textsuperscript{62} If the subject/ruler dichotomy was to be generalised, or if some distance was required from the Queen and her subjects, subjects were often referred to as \textit{tāngata} (people) of the Queen. For example:

They should also bear in mind that, as the Queen’s subjects, they can have no enemies but those who are also the enemies of the Queen, as she protects with her soldiers all those who are owned by her as subjects.\textsuperscript{[77]}\textsuperscript{[70]}

Another thing for them to think on, if they are \textit{tāngata} of the Queen, an enemy will not be able to rise up to fight them – but [if] they have an enemy, that becomes an enemy of hers, because she will protect with her soldiers all \textit{tāngata} who are said to be \textit{tāngata} of hers.\textsuperscript{[LP]}

More commonly, however, the term \textit{tamariki} (children) was used to translate when defining Māori subjects, particularly when trying to encourage loyalty by gentle exhortation, or by threats.\textsuperscript{64} This may have appealed more than \textit{tangata}, which also has the connotation of ‘slave’.\textsuperscript{65} The use of a vertical familial structure allowed the hierarchical nature of the relationship to remain. This drew the sovereign and subject together into a close and personal connection, so that Māori might believe that the Queen really loved them, despite living in London and reigning over a vast empire. The distinction between subject and child was eliminated.

This love and concern, from the Queen and her governors, was made explicit to Māori. As Governor Browne told Māori at Kaiapoi, ‘Our great chief the Queen, the chief of many peoples, loves you, and still thinks of you.\textsuperscript{[LP]}\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} even attributed to the Queen herself the law banning alcohol sales to Māori, and presented it as a sign of her love.\textsuperscript{67} The governors also felt parental love and concern for their Māori children. Māori were told, when the Governor was establishing

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{62} For example, see \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/6/1857:4.
  \item \textsuperscript{63} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31.3.1857:5. ‘Tetahi atu hoki hei maharatanga ma ratou, me he mea he tangata ratou no te Kuini, e kore a he ai te whakatika noa tetahi hoa riri ki te whawhai ki a ratou – engari he hoa riri no ratou, he hoa riri tena nona, ta te mea, mana e tiaki ki ana hoia ngā tangata katoa e kia ana he tangata nona.’
  \item \textsuperscript{64} For example, see \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/8/1859: 6.
  \item \textsuperscript{65} See \textit{Dictionary of the Maori Language}; Angela Ballara, \textit{Iwi: The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from c. 1769 to c. 1945} (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1998) p 162.
  \item \textsuperscript{66} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/12/1860:8. ‘Ko to tatou tino rangatira ko te Kuini, ko te rangatira o ngā iwi tini, e aroha ana ki a koutou, e whakaaro tonu ana ki a koutou.’; ‘Our Great Sovereign [sic] the Queen who reigns over the people of many nations loves you and cares for you. [TKM]’
  \item \textsuperscript{67} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} 15/2/1858:3. ‘Te aroha tenel o te matua ki tana tamaiti, ekore nga kino e homai ki a ia. He penei hoki ta te Kuini tikanga ki ona tamariki o te motu nei o Niu Tīrene. Kua kita e te tukunga iho o tenel kai i roto i te iwi pakeha — he kino anake: nokonei hoki ia i whakarite ture ai, kia kaua ehi tamariki ona e uru mai ki tenel mahi wairangi.’ ‘This is the love of the parent for her child, that bad things may not be given to him. The Queen’s plan for her children in New Zealand is like this. [The result of] the availability of this food [drink] amongst Pākehā has been recognised – [it is] only bad: therefore she has organised [a] law so that these children of hers do not indulge in this stupefying activity.’ \textsuperscript{[LP]}
\end{itemize}
schools that, ‘[t]he parent thinks of things from which benefits will accrue for his children. The Governor’s plan for the Māori people is just like this too.’\textsuperscript{68} When Grey arbitrated a dispute between two groups in Kaipara, it was reported that all were happy with ‘his paternal solicitude’.\textsuperscript{69} Similarly, when tensions were rising again in Taranaki, \textit{Te Karere Maori} suggested to Māori that ‘we should hearken to the kind voice of our father Governor Grey’.\textsuperscript{70}

It was the paternal love of the Governor protecting his children that justified the laws that discriminated against Māori. As Māori were told, ‘[c]hildren cannot have what belongs to persons of mature age; and a child does not grow to be a man in a day.’\textsuperscript{71} It was the responsibility of parents also, not just to love and protect their children but to punish their children so that they learn to \textit{rongo}. Māori parents themselves were given instructions on how this should be carried out with their own children.

\ldots let your grasp be firm, be faithful, hold the child, drag [him] to obedience and life…
\ldots you should whip, and whip until [he feels] pain, and whip until [he] obeys \textit{rongo} again.\textsuperscript{72}

Using this metaphor, Browne justified his actions in Taranaki against Te Rangitāke.

The parent punishes his child so that he will obey \textit{rongo} him, and turn reasonably to his parent: then the punishment stops, and the kindness and love of the parent are again available to his child.\textsuperscript{73}

Such actions, claimed Browne, were regrettable, and he hoped that ‘soon the children would stop their quarrelsomeness towards their father, and see the ignorance of their deeds.’\textsuperscript{74}

Thus, the relationship of Māori to the imperial authority was expressed principally through the metaphor of parent and child, an association reflected in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{68} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 22/2/1858:2, ‘Ka whakaaro te matua i nga mea e tupu ai te pai mo ana tamariki. Ka pera ano hoki ta te Kawana ritenga ki nga tangata maori.’
  \item \textsuperscript{69} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 12/2/1863:2, ‘tona whakamatuatanga’
  \item \textsuperscript{70} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 20/4/1863:15, ‘…me whakarongo tatou ki te reo atawhai o to tatou matua o Kawana Kerei…’
  \item \textsuperscript{71} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 14/7/1860: 38, ‘E kore hoki nga tamariki e tango i nga mea o te kaumatua; a e kore hoki te tama iti e tupu kia kaumatua i te ra kotahi.’
  \item \textsuperscript{72} \textit{Te Manuhiri Tuarangi}, 2/9/1861:6. ‘…kia u tonu tou pupuri, kia pono, mau ano te tamaiti[,] e to mai ki runga i te rongo, ki te ora… …me whiu, me whiu kia mamae, me whiu kia rongo ra ano.’; ‘But hold tight your grasp, be faithful and you will drag your child into obedience and life… …then you must chastise, you must whip to produce pain, and cause trembling to produce obedience.’
  \item \textsuperscript{73} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 28/2/1861:9. ‘E whiu ana te matua i tana tamaiti kia rongo mai ai ki a ia, na, kia ngawari te tamaiti, kia tahuhi pai mai ki tona matua, ka mutu i konei te whiu, ka puta ano te atawhai me te aroha a te matua ki tona tamaiti.’; ‘A parent chastises his child to bring him to reason, and when he is reclaimed and brought to reason, then the object of the punishment is obtained, and the parent extends to him his friendship and love. \textit{[TKM]’}
  \item \textsuperscript{74} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 28/2/1861:9.
\end{itemize}
Victorian racial beliefs, and originally fostered by missionaries before the Treaty of Waitangi. In New Zealand, successive governors found it convenient to allow the more detached European understandings of power to be hidden in more close and personalised terms, familiar to Māori. This required the Governor not only to love and protect his children, but also to chastise them when appropriate.

*Horizontal Familial Relationships*

The policy of “he iwi kotahi” implied that Pākehā and Māori were a combined people under one authority, despite Māori and Pākehā living mostly apart, and most Māori paying only lip service to Crown authority. As Browne informed the people of Rangiaohia in 1857,

> The Queen has no policy of favouring people, and doesn’t look at her children as one race or another, but [they] all appear as one, and her love for the pale skinned and the dark skinned is the same.\(^{75}\)

However, the relationship between Māori and Pākehā was not always close. By the late 1850s, many settlers believed that Māori were selfishly impeding Pākehā settlement on the land, were excessively greedy in their dealings with Pākehā, were unduly favoured by the government, and that Māori attitudes had worsened over time.\(^{76}\) The attitudes of many settlers meant many chiefs did not like going into Pākehā towns lest their dignity be compromised by racist insults.\(^{77}\)

The Māori language newspapers, *Te Karere Maori* in particular, sought to minimise Māori concerns with the terminology they used to define the relationship of Māori to the Crown, as well as between Māori and Pākehā settlers. Although Māori and Pākehā were often defined as *hoa* (friends), horizontal familial terms were more often used to link the two races together: Māori and Pākehā became ‘brothers’. In Māori, there is no single word to express the concept, it must be translated as *tuakana* (older sibling) or *teina* (younger sibling).\(^{78}\) Māori society was heavily hierarchical,

\(^{75}\) *Te Kareere Maori*, 30/4/1857:4. ‘Kahore o te Kuini tikanga kowhiti tangata; kahore ana titiro ki ona tamariki, he iwi ke he iwi ke, engari, he ahua kotahi ki a ia, me tona aroha hoki rite tahi ki te kiri parauri.’; ‘Her Majesty knows no distinction of race or color among her subjects, and loves the dark and pale face equally. [TKMJ]

\(^{76}\) Southern Cross, 5/7/1859 Suppl., p 1; 10/1/1860:2; 17/1/1860:3; 21/2/1860 Suppl., 1. The anti-Māori sentiments in the settler press were sufficiently bad for C.O.B. Davis to advise Māori to ignore them. See *Ko Aoteaoro*, 1/1/1861:9-11. Davis’s opinions were also echoed in a Memorandum by the Bishop of New Zealand to the Governor. *AJHR* 1860 E1, p 24.

\(^{77}\) For example, see *Te Kareere Maori*, 30/4/1857:3.

\(^{78}\) These pair of words are used within sexes, rather than between sexes, i.e. a *tuakana* can be the older sister of a woman or the older brother of a man.
based on genealogical standings. Not only did the tuakana / teina dichotomy rank individuals within a family, but also superior and inferior branches from a common ancestor in whakapapa.\footnote{95}

Although ‘brother’ is a gendered term in English, it lacks the status differential of its Māori equivalents. Consequently it could not be translated in Māori without inserting cultural notions of rank, and those writing (or translating) for the newspapers would have been well aware of the distinction. If we consider Te Paipera Tapu (Maori Bible) we find that the word teina appears twice as often as tuakana,\footnote{80} thus indicating that its translators perhaps considered that teina was the term less likely to distort or conflate the meaning. However, the primary society depicted in the Bible was culturally homogenous (Jewish) and exclusive: such brothers were individual Jewish brothers. In contrast, the Māori language newspapers used the tuakana / teina metaphor extensively when discussing the cross-cultural Māori-Pākehā relationship: Māori as a group became brothers to all Pākehā. On one occasion, in Te Pīhoihoi Mokemoke, Māori were accorded the higher status,\footnote{81} but given the editor’s precarious position, this may have been politic.\footnote{82} This allocation of rank was rare: as a rule Pākehā were accorded the tuakana status.\footnote{83} Pākehā wanted to ‘whakateina’ (make younger brothers of) their Māori neighbours.\footnote{84} As Te Karere Maori advised its Māori readers:

The Pākehā wishes to make the Māori his younger brother; Likewise you should think of him as your older brother. Let your thoughts be like this “The knowledge of my older brother, the Pākehā, about all the things I need, is greater [than mine], and so I will follow his practices.”\footnote{85}[	ext{LP}]

\footnote{81}Te Pīhoihoi Mokemoke, 9/3/1863:13.
\footnote{82}See ‘The Newspaper War’ in Chapter 8.
\footnote{83}For example, Te Karere Maori, 31/3/1856:7; 27/11/1856:7; 15/3/1858:7; 31/3/1858:2.
\footnote{84}Te Whetu o te Tau, 1/9/1858:1; Te Karere Maori, 27/11/1856:7.
\footnote{85}Te Karere Maori, 27/11/1856:7. ‘E hiahia te Pakeha ki te whakateina i te tangata Maori; waihoki ra me whakaaro koutou ki a ia he tuakana no koutou. Kia penei o koutou whakaaro, “E nui ake te mohio o taku tuakana i ngā mea katoa e matea ana e ahau, waihoki ka aru ahau i tona tikanga.” ‘The European wishes the Maori to be his brother, then think of him as such, say to yourselves the European knows more than we do about those things which have become necessary to us, he is our elder brother and we will learn from him. [TKM]'
The newspapers presented familial relationships which reflected a Māori understanding of the world based on whakapapa. However, unlike the mātua / tamariki division which sought to minimise the distance between the Crown and Māori, the tuakana / teina dichotomy inserted difference between Māori and Pākehā. The former pairing was concerned with a vertical political relationship. Māori were sensitive to issues of mana and did not want to assume a politically subservient role. The government was unable to impose its will by force over Māori at this time. Naturally, it was in the government’s interest to create an image of parental love which would assuage Māori fears. To Māori, their perceived relationship with the Crown minimised the political importance of settler institutions: the Pākehā were just another set of tamariki beneath the Queen’s authority.

The Māori relationship to Pākehā was therefore politically horizontal: their differences were essentially cultural. The writers of the Māori language newspapers felt comfortable describing Pākehā as tuakana because this reflected their belief in the primacy of Western civilisation. As discussed in Chapter 5, many Māori also accepted this portrayal of the superiority of Pākehā cultural and material achievements. Therefore value judgements and ranking of the races could be made, which inferred a Māori cultural inferiority, without causing concern over possible political subservience.

The metaphor of chiefliness

The cultural superiority that the Māori language newspapers assumed was based on the notions of improvement and civilisation. Europeans were naturally at the leading edge of civilisation, but Māori were considered to be capable of improving themselves under the tutelage of their Pākehā tuakana despite their current ‘semi-civilized’, and recent ‘savage’ state.86 “Civilisation” as a concept did not exist in the pre-contact Māori world view. Civilisation, by implication, requires a ‘un-civilised’ state with which to compare: Europeans considered they had encountered this outside of their own continent. Pre-contact Māori society had internal structural divisions, such as classes and tribes, but was not sufficiently diverse to allow this type of cultural value judgement to be made. Neither was the idea of ‘improvement’ a feature

86 Te Karere Māori, 1/2/1855:20; 1/9/1855:13. ‘Savagery’ was translated as mohoaotanga, literally ‘wildness’. ‘Semi-civilised’ was translated as marama iti (little understanding). See note below.
of pre-contact Māori society. Scientific knowledge, such as Tāne’s gaining of the three baskets of knowledge or Māui’s acquisition of fire, derived from supernatural and divine sources, rather than from a gradual, purely human process. “Civilisation” was new to Māori.

Translators sometimes used approximate synonyms for the notion of ‘civilisation’, such as mārama (clear), mātauranga (knowledge) or the verbs kake (to ascend) or tupu (to grow). However, the concept was most commonly associated with the qualities of the rangatira (chief). The rangatira class was a large grouping within Māori society, although there could be great distinctions between individuals who might call themselves rangatira. However, the behaviour of rangatira was expected to conform to higher standards than that of the tūtū (common or slave classes). Indeed, lowborn Māori were also known as ware or kūware (or kūare), words which also possess the meaning ‘ignorant’. In New Zealand, the colonial ideology usurped the term rangatira with its idea of high standards of behaviour, separated it from the traditional notions of intrinsic tapu and mana, and applied it to the Western civilisation that Māori were yet to attain. Individual Māori might still be rangatira in a political sense as leaders of tribal groups, but Māori, as a race, had far to go in becoming truly rangatira (civilised).

Thus Davis’s Te Waka o te Iwi called on Māori to

be strong, be brave, be bold, exert yourselves in seeking all the practices by which you will become civilised [rangatira], great, influential [mana], proper, so that you will be cherished by all knowledgeable people, so that you will also be cherished by our Father in heaven.

88 This is not to suggest that Māori did not learn from practical experience. For example, the first Polynesian migrants to New Zealand needed to adapt to the new climate and environment. (See Davidson, pp 3, 10.) However, Māori saw their knowledge as being tapu, and deriving from divine sources.
91 Rangatira possessed both mana (authority and power), and was tapu (spiritually set apart). These qualities derived from the gods.
92 Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:1. ‘...ki kia kaha, kia toa, kia maia, kia uaa ki te rapu i ngā tikanga katoa e rangatira ai koutou, e nui ai, e mana ai, e tika ai, kia paingia ai koutou e nga tangata whakaaaro katoa, kia paingia ai hoki e to matou Matua i te rangi.’ This sentence is significant in that mana relates to mere influence rather than political power and while rangatira can be translated as ‘chiefly’, the context here implies ‘civilised’.
Some editors deemed that Māori were unlikely to achieve *rangatiratanga* (civilisation) by themselves, and saw their own newspapers as agents in the transformation. For example, Buller of *Te Karere o Poneke* asked his readers (through the metaphor of the newspaper as a canoe) whether Māori would support his efforts or ‘turn the prow of our canoe away, and return home to live in darkness and ignorance [*kuaretanga*].’ 93 Davis, exhorting Māori to help him establish a Māori press, said ‘Now, I am telling you to be eager about this civilising [*whakarangatira*] way for yourselves’. 94 These Pākehā considered it their role to uplift the Māori. Just as Pākehā had civilised other lands, they too would ‘*whakarangatira*’ (civilise, ennoble, improve) Māori by living among them as settlers and offering an example to follow. This extended from mundane civilising utensils such as knives and forks, to the ‘*tino rangatiratanga*’, or apogee of civilisation, fluency in English. 95

The ideas of civilisation promoted to Māori were inseparable from the notion of improvement, not just morally but also materially. Thus, Māori were instructed to ‘*whakarangatira*’ their own settlements by creating better fences, fields and houses. 96 Improving attitudes to work would result in Māori acquiring greater wealth, thus Māori were encouraged to participate in the market economy to help New Zealand ‘*rangatira haere*’ (become rich). However, in traditional Māori society, the *rangatira* status of individual Māori was based on *whakapapa*. That status could be lost through capture and enslavement, but was a relatively rigid impediment to upward social mobility. Status could be improved through marriage, but it was the resulting children who generally reaped any benefit. *Rangatira* were seen as possessing desirable personal qualities due to their rank in comparison with the common *tūtū* or *ware* class. The Māori language newspapers used this hierarchical dichotomy to distinguish between the desirable civilisation of the West and the undesirable ignorance of Māori. While Māori could improve, they were, by inference, collectively relegated to the ranks of the common people.

93 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 31/12/1857:2. ‘...me takuri ke ranei te ihu o to tatou waka, me hoki atu ki te kainga noho ai i roto i te pouritanga, i te kuaretanga.’
94 *Te Waka o te Iwi*, 1/10/1857:1. ‘Na ka mea atu ahau ki a koutou kia maia ki tenei tikanga *whakarangatira* mo koutou...’ ‘Whaka-* is commonly used as a causative prefix in Māori, so that ‘*whakarangatira*’ translates as “to make rangatira”.
96 *Te Waka o te Iwi*, 1/10/1857:1.
Notions of Race and Colour

The hapū was the effective socio-political unit in Māori society, although Māori also identified with a wider descent group known as iwi. The word iwi refers to groups of people, and its use was extended beyond tribal groupings by Māori, as well as the Māori language newspapers, to indicate larger groups, such as nationalities and races. The newspapers promoted Māori and Pākehā as being he iwi kotahi (one people), but they were also te iwi Māori and te iwi Pākehā. The latter could be further divided into entities such as te iwi Wiwi (the French people) and te iwi Pāniora (the Spanish people). Because of this wide use of the term, iwi did not generally possess negative connotations in the press despite negative attitudes towards Māori tribalism.

While the word iwi was used to classify various groups of people, skin colour terms were employed to specifically describe physical racial difference. In some cases in Māori society, skin colour could have associations with beauty and ugliness as seen in the following whakatauki:

Kātahi ka auraki mai te whānau a te man gumangumangikikinī, i te aitangi a Punga i a favoured dark one, a descendant of Punga such as I. au et.

Beauty was also associated with fairness. However, proverbs which equated darkness with ugliness were rare, and negative connotations were also sometimes attached to paler skins, such as the association with the dangerous supernatural beings, the tūrehu. Thus, pre-contact Māori did not consider skin colour to be relevant to particular human traits or status within society. Denoting skin pigmentation was essentially a descriptive process, using words such as tea (pale),

---

97 Ballara, pp 19, 42.
98 One exception was the description of barbaric Russian tactics in Crimea as 'he tikanga iwi' (tribal practices). Te Karere Māori, 1/6/1855:1.
99 H. Moko Mead and Neil Grove, Vol 3, No.258. Punga was said to be the progenitor of lizards, a creature considered repellent and dangerous by Māori. There is also the account of people laughing at Whakatāu's black appearance after he had smeared himself with soot. See Sir George Grey, Nga Mahi a nga Tupuna (London, 1854; reprint, Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed Ltd, 1971), p 35.
100 For example, see Makereti, p 97n.
101 The comprehensive, Nga Pepeha a nga Tupuna, for example, has few examples.
waitutu (dark/red), parauri (dark/blue black), and mangu (black). Colour was used metaphorically in Māori society to denote rank, as illustrated in the proverb:

Mā pango, mā whero, ka oti te mahi. By black and by red the work is done.

This proverb links the common and slave classes with the rangatira class, the former associated with the colour black, and the latter with the colour red. However, actual skin colour had no bearing in this linking of colour to rank.

Like culture and language, the distinction of skin pigmentation between Māori and Pākehā was tangible and obvious. The binary nature of this colonial relationship tended to foster complementary opposites, and that of racial difference was generally expressed in terms of kiri mā (white skin) and kiri mangu (black skin). However, when actually comparing non-white races, the Māori language newspapers used words which were essentially descriptive, as seen in this account of various Asian races.

The people of India are black. But they are not like the peoples of Africa [who have] bent down noses. But they are like Pākehā. The head is [of] pendent [hair], not curly. ... The people [of Persia] are good looking [with] a reddish-brown skin. ... That [Chinese race] is not black. [The skin] is not reddish-brown like that of the Māori here. But the skin type is yellow-brownish.

---

103 See, for example, use by Tuta Tamati ‘A Reply to “What is a Tangata Maori”’ in JPS, Vol 2, No. 2, (1893) 60-63. Williams 1992:477, Henry M. Stowell (Hare Hongi), Maori-English Tutor and Vade Mecum (Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs Limited, 1911) p 107. The word mangu may also have been used purely to denote colour. For example, Nicholas has ‘A man of colour’ as ‘Mangho tangata’.

104 Brougham & Reed, p 16. Māori chiefs did daub their faces with red ochre, and red is considered a chiefly colour in other Polynesian societies. Consider also King Pōtatau’s maxim ‘Kotahi te kōhao o te ngira, e kuhuna ai te miro mā, te miro pango, te miro whero. I muri, kia mau kite aroha, kite ture, ki te whakapono’ (There is but one eye of the needle through which the white, black and red threads must pass. After I am gone, hold fast to love, to the law, and to the religion of Christ); text and translation from Brougham & Reed, p 56. His trinity of ideals (love, law, faith) are linked with a trinity of colours which can also represent the idealised unity and equality of Pakeha, chiefs and commoners.

105 In the post-contact period, the Māori who invaded the Chatham Islands in 1835 also named their new slaves, the Moriori – a fellow Polynesian people, paraíwhara (blackfellow). Michael King, Moriori: A People Rediscovered. (Auckland: Viking, 1989) pp 16, 67, 68, 73, 90, 92, 130. This loanword King describes as the ‘borrowed currency of racism’. Te Karere o Poneke, in welcoming readers from the Chatham Islands, also used the term, although not in an obviously disparaging manner. It is likely that its editor, Walter Buller, learnt the term when assisting the Collector of Customs on the Chathams in 1856. See Te Karere o Poneke, 9/8/1858: 2; 30/8/1858:2-3, Galbreath 1989:31.

106 There is one occurrence of the more descriptive ‘kiritea’ (pale skin) and ‘kiri parauri’ (dark skin) in Te Karere Maori, but the Māori language newspapers seldom used these words. Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1857:4.

107 Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1855:8-9. ‘Ko nga tangata o Inia he mangu. Otiia kahore i rite ki nga iwi o Africa; te whati o nga ihu. Erangi i rite ki te rite te pakeha te tika. Ko te mahunga he mahora tonu, ehara i te kotetetete. ... Ko te ahun o ngā tangata e pai ana, he kiri whero. ... Ehara tera i te mangumangu. Ehara i te whero me to te Maori nei. Erangi he whero kowhai nei te tu o te kiri.’; ‘The people of India are very dark, nearly Black, but they do not have the flat noses or curly hair of the African Negro. ... The people are light colored and good looking... the Chinese are not black or even so brown as the
Similarly in the Americas, Columbus met people who were not black but ‘fine looking’, and the Indians of the Great Plains were not black, but looked like Māori.\textsuperscript{108} That Māori were not “black” like Africans, but were black in relation to the white of Pākehā shows that the terminology was not descriptive in nature but ideological, that is, it reflected the ideas underpinning the colonial relationship.

Ironically, it was in the pursuit of unity that the terms \textit{kiri mā} and \textit{kiri mangu} were often brought together. For example, with war raging in Taranaki, the Wesleyan \textit{Te Haeata} sought a scripturally based unity of races, telling Māori ‘...whether white or black skinned, [we] are all relatives, in one relationship’.\textsuperscript{109} The government’s \textit{Te Karere Maori} used similar language when seeking unity under the Queen and her laws.

They [the chiefs] should not consider that a tribe becomes \textit{tūtū} when they honour the just laws that protect all men, whether big or small, white skinned or black. No!\textsuperscript{110} However, in the very appeals for unity, the stark reality of ethnic difference and colonial polarities was exposed.

\textbf{Māori participation in the discourse of ‘civilisation’}

Māori were the “target audience” of the Māori language newspapers’ message of civilisation, and through the expression of that message were exposed to the new vocabulary of racial difference. Of course for Māori, the discourse was less a matter of language translation, because it was conducted in their language, than a translation of ideas. As discussed in Chapter 6, most Māori wanted to better themselves materially, and were therefore willing to adopt sufficient Pākehā practices in order to do so. Some Māori were prepared to pursue the total package of Western ‘civilisation’, including the acceptance of British law and sovereignty.\textsuperscript{111} Their
participation in this colonial discourse is evident in Māori speeches and letters in the Pākehā-run newspapers, as well as in the Kingitanga’s own newspaper, *Te Hokioi*.

Some Māori were willing to accord the status of “parent” to the Queen, the Governor, and sometimes Pākehā in general, especially when accepting or affirming British sovereignty, both in letters and in reported public speeches, such as at Kohimarama. Tamihana Te Rauparaha of Ōtaki was a political loyalist, as well as an advocate of progress and materialism. Writing to Davis, editor of *Te Waka o te Īwi*, he stated ‘You, the Pākehā, are tuākana, and we, the Māori people, are tēina to you.’ The innovative chiefs of Rangiaohia who saw their land individualisation scheme as a model for ‘other tribes who are living in ignorance’, also used the terminology of ‘civilisation’.

We were seeking some Pākehā practices, that is, some ways by which people become rangatira, advance, and acquire possessions, in accord with Pākehā methods. The racial and cultural differences between the races were as obvious to Māori as to Pākehā, and the words, Pākehā and Māori were used unselfconsciously by Māori in labelling the two races. Occasionally Māori cast negative aspersions on their own customs. For example, in the letter to *Te Karere Maori* Pehimana of Waitōtara wrote ‘I am satisfied that the Maori customs are bad, and therefore oppose them; not one of them is good.’ There were also occasional references by Māori to the ‘ngakau maori’ which was limiting their ability to progress, but they saw this as a lingering problem, rather than an inherent characteristic.

Māori also described the racial difference in terms of the *kiri ma / kiri mangu* dichotomy. For example, Paeturi of Tihorewaru, in Waikato, wrote in a letter of

---

Crown was often conditional. (The word *kiipapa* means ‘neutral’ or ‘passive’, but tended to be used to describe those individuals and tribes which allied themselves to, or collaborated with the Crown. This has sometimes been used as a disparaging term in recent years. For example, Doug Graham defines the term as ‘traitor’. See Douglas Graham, *Trick or Treaty?* (Wellington, N.Z.: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University, 1997) p 103.)


*Te Waka o te Īwi*, 1/11/1857:3. ‘Hei tuakana koutou nga Pakeha, hei teina matou nga tangata Maori ki a koutou.’

*Te Karere Maori*, 15/9/1857:2-3. ‘E rapu ana matou i etahi tikanga Pakeha, ara, i etahi ritenga e rangatira ai te tangata, e kake haere ai, e whai taonga ai, ki runga i nga tikanga Pakeha...’; ‘...we are endeavouring to find out some European method, or method, by which we shall advance in civilisation, and acquire wealth by following the European customs.’

*Te Karere Maori*, 16/8/1858:10. ‘...he mohio noku ki ngā tikanga Maori, e he ana. Ko au ia e kino ana ki nga tikanga Maori, kaore hoki he tikanga Maori i tika.’

*Te Karere o Poneke*, 25/1/1858:3; 19/7/1858:3. The first reference was concerned with the knowledge of money and credit, the second with the willingness to accept the Queen’s law.
thanks to Davis, stating ‘and now the black [mangu] knows the white skin [kiri ma] loves us’. Davis, on a journey through the Kingitanga area in 1858 was greeted similarly by Mare, a chief at Kihikihi. Māori were well aware of the connotations of the label ‘black’, and while accepting the notion of ‘blackness’ for their skin, were not prepared to accept that this made them inferior either in the eyes of God or the law. For example, Kāniwhaniwha told McLean at Whāingaroa.

So, Mr. McLean, you are white skinned, I am black skinned, but do not think because I am black that my heart is black. No, rather my heart is greenstone.118

Similar sentiments were expressed by Nerehana Te Whare of Manawatu in a letter to Te Karere o Poneke.

[Whether you are Pākehā or we are Māori – you are white and we are black – [but] we are all white firstly from the law of religion, and secondly from the law of the Queen.119

To these Māori, their ‘blackness’ did not imply any inequality.

Some Māori, like the Pākehā writers, also asserted unity through the dichotomies of race. For example, the people of Waiapu, lamenting Satan’s work in Taranaki, considered Christ to be the shepherd of all people, ‘whether Pakeha or Maori, black skin or red skin’.120 However, sometimes the terms were used much more creatively and inclusively in order to limit differences between the two races. For example, Paora Tūhaere, of Ngāti Whātau, in an appeal to the Kingitanga to return to governmental favour, said ‘turn to me, the man who taught you. Be kind to me; to the black skin, to the white skin’. This, according to the Southern Cross, was ‘an appeal to the meeting on behalf of the white men, who have advanced the natives in civilization.’121 Divisive issues such as the Kingitanga and war sometimes induced Māori to make these identifications. Hēneri Te Puni, for example, rejected involvement in Taranaki, stating ‘We are all Pākehā’.122 Similarly, Morena, an

117 Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:2, Te Whetu o te Tau, 1/9/1858:3.
118 Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1860:15. ‘Na, ko koe e te Makarini he kiri ma, ko au he kiri mangu, otira, kei mea koe he mangu au me tolu ngakau he mangu; kaore, otira ko taku ngakau he kahurangi...’; ‘Mr. McLean, you have a white skin and I have a dark one; but do not suppose that because my skin is dark my heart is dark also. No: my heart is as clear as a kahurangi (a semi-translucent jade).’
119 Te Karere o Poneke, 10/12/1857:3-4. ‘...aha koa pakeha koutou aha koa maori matou-e ma ana koutou, e pango ana matou–kua ma katoa tatou i te ture o te Whakapono katahi, i te ture o te Kuini ka rua.’
120 Te Karere Maori, 15/12/1860:12. ‘ahakoa Pakeha, Maori ranei, kirimangu, kiriwhero ranei’
121 Southern Cross, 5/6/1860:3 [English translation]; 8/6/1860: Supplement. [Māori original]…tahuri mai ki au, ki te tangata nana koe i whakaako, me atawhai ki au, ki te kiri mangu, ki te kiri ma.’
122 Te Haeata, 1/5/1860:2.
Ahuriri chief, asserting loyalty to the government as more general war was erupting in 1863, said 'in my opinion, we, the people of this island, are all Māori'.

However Māori also applied the new terminology to critique the colonial discourse, and the place of Māori in the emerging New Zealand state. The government preached the message of *he iwi kotahi*, but politically, Māori and Pākehā for the most part lived in separate societies, and certain laws discriminated against Māori, for example on access to alcohol, and to guns and powder. When Te Ahitara Tangatangata of Moutoa criticised restrictions on his ability to buy rum, he used the familial metaphors to make his point.

> [T]he *mana* of the Queen is [now] on the Māori—[we] are now related, younger and older brother, parent and child. Well, on account of this I say my piece, [that is] don’t deny the person who spends his money on rum. But, if a Māori is drunk, treat him the same as a Pākehā—so that our [treatment under the] law of the power of the Queen is the same.

However, it was the Kingitanga that, through its newspaper *Te Hokioi*, offered an alternative political ideology to the government’s policy of *he iwi kotahi*. The colonial discourse had provided the Kingitanga with new terminology for expressing their ideas but the Kingitanga applied it quite differently. The terms Māori and Pākehā were used widely, but without any connotations of ‘civilisation’. There is one occurrence of a ‘*ngakau maori*’, describing the people who suggested that the Kingitanga was wanting to fight the Crown militarily, but expressions where the word *māori* is used disparagingly are rare. Neither were the terms *tuakana* and *teina* used to describe the relationship of Māori and Pākehā. It is not surprising that a movement that was pushing an independent political agenda did not embrace terminology that denigrated a Māori identity or promoted European ideas of racial hierarchy.

*Te Hokioi* directly critiqued the policy of *he iwi kotahi* and its discriminatory laws.

In the time before [the establishment of] the Kingitanga, the Governors said the Māori and the Pākehā would be as one people, or that’s what they shouted out. [But] when the Māori went to buy guns and powder, they could not get them, [and] when Māori sold the

---

123 Te Waka Māori o Ahuriri, 8/8/1863:2.

124 Te Karere o Poneke, 15/2/1858:3. ‘...ko te mana o te Kuini kei runga i te Maori–kua whanaunga, kua teina, kua tuakana, kua matua, kua tamaiti. Ha, no reira hoki au i ki atu ai i taku kupu, kaua e whakakore te tangata e kai ana i ana moni ki te rama; engari, ka haurangi te tangata maori, me pena me te pakeha–kia rite ai to tatou ture o te mana o te Kuini.’

125 This is discussed more in Chapters 3 and 6.

126 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:2.
land to the Governor, the price was low. Where is the proof of the words that say we are one people, and there is one law.\textsuperscript{127}

*Te Hokioi* did occasionally describe Queen Victoria as ‘whaea’ (mother) and the Governor as ‘matua’, but these uses were heavily ironic. For example, it suggested to its readers that the governor’s espoused love for ‘his Māori children’ was to buy their land, and leave them like a gull whose sandbank is covered by the tide.\textsuperscript{128}

However, the Kingitanga quite happily adopted the binary dichotomy of colour, or *kiri mā* and *kiri mangu*. Most districts where the Kingitanga enjoyed the greatest support had few Pākehā settlers. Governmental authority, such as embodied by Pākehā magistrates and Māori assessors, was sparse and weak. These conditions were not unique to the Kingitanga heartland of Waikato and Ngāti Maniapoto, but the Kingitanga did seek to maintain Māori exclusivity, both by stopping further land sales and by asserting their own political power. The adoption of ‘blackness’ for Māori differentiated them from the ‘white’ Pākehā, and thus became a source of pride and identity.

These sentiments were expressed by Hōrī Ngātai-rākaunui when, in a letter to his people, he stated,

> [J]ust [we] should join together as Māori, without any Pākehā, leave the Pākehā to themselves, and the Māori to themselves... I am Māori, not a Pākehā, my skin is black skin, my canoe is a Māori canoe... \textsuperscript{[LP]}\textsuperscript{129}

These sentiments no doubt increased as tensions rose between the government and Kingitanga. The *Southern Cross* noted that ‘the distinction so frequently made in speeches, as “kiri mangu” (black skin) and “kiri ma” (white skin)’ by Kingitanga orators indicated that the attitudes of the movement towards Pākehā had changed for the worst.\textsuperscript{130} At a meeting at Parewanui, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, on a tour of his district attempting to quell enthusiasm for the Kingitanga, said to Ngāti Apa,

> I came to hear the evil words of these tribes about my Pākehā relatives, that the black skin be separated from the white skin. Whose are these evil words?\textsuperscript{[LP]}\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{127} *Te Hokioi*, 15/2/1863:2. ‘I te takiwa i mua atu o te Kingitanga, ka mea ngā Kawana hei iwi kotahi te maori, te pakeha, e ai ki te hamumu a o ratou waha haere atu ana ngā Maori, ki te hoko pu; paura, kaore e ma kere mai, hokona atu e ngā Maori; te whenua ki a Kawana, he i ti te utu, — kei whaea te tīkanga o ngā kupu i kia nei he iwi kotahi, he ture kotahi?’

\textsuperscript{128} *Te Hokioi*, 15/2/1863:1.

\textsuperscript{129} Ngatai Rakaunui of Taranaki, 1860, MS-Papers-3134, ATL. ‘...me uhono anake hei maori, kaua he Pakeha, me waiho atu ngā Pakeha ki a ratou ano, ko ngā Maori ki ngā Maori ano...he maori au he hara i te Pakeha he kiri pango toku kiri, he waka maori toku waka...’

\textsuperscript{130} *Southern Cross*, 5/6/1860:3.

\textsuperscript{131} *Te Karere Maori*, 15/12/1860:8. ‘I haere mai au ki te whararongorongo i nga kupu kino a enei iwi mo aku whanaunga Pakeha, kia wehea te kiri pango i te kiri ma. Na wai enei kupu kino?’; ‘I have
King Tāwhiao himself utilised the metaphor of blackness in order to draw Māori together as a distinct race. In a New Year greeting in *Te Hokioi*, he addressed ‘all black-skinned people, whether on the Queen’s or King’s side’. It is clear that he saw Māori, despite their tribal divisions, sharing a common identity. Welcoming people at a meeting at Peria, he stated.

Welcome the peoples of the east, north, west and south, welcome to Waikato. We were a *rangatira* people in the past, and now, although the skin is black, let the work of those who direct matters be clear [marama], and cleave to the law, love and religion.

Tāwhiao was using the term *rangatira* in its traditional sense, of nobility and leadership. Despite the ‘black’ skin, Māori were still capable of being leaders, and directing their own future. Their actions could be *mārama*, that is, both clear and, in the discourse of the day, ‘civilised’.

However, *Te Hokioi* was prepared to extend the *kiri mā / kiri mangu* dichotomy beyond the essentially British and Māori identification onto a wider global context of race conflict. In several issues, *Te Hokioi* recounted the revolution by black slaves in Haiti against their French overlords. This account, and the countering history printed in the government’s *Te Karere Maori*, are discussed in detail in the following chapter. However, it is worth noting here that *Te Hokioi* presented the Haitian conflict in binary racial terms. The Spanish who first invaded, then the French who followed, were ‘Pakeha’ and ‘kiri ma’. The original inhabitants, who were wiped out by the Spanish, were both ‘Māori’ and ‘kiri mangu’. However, the ‘mangumangu o Awherika’ (the blacks of Africa), imported as slaves, were also shown as both ‘maori’ and ‘kiri mangu’. Thus, *Te Hokioi* demolished the semantic distinctions between ‘native’ and ‘black’: all non-whites (by implication Māori also) were *kiri mangu* in an ethno-political sense in contrast to all *kiri ma*.

The newspaper also diminished the historical significance of the ‘Hawhekaihe’ (half-castes, mulattoes) of Haiti. The mixing of race can threaten or confuse the binary nature of colonial society, but by implying a solidarity between Haitian
mulattoes and blacks, *Te Hokioi* was able to retain the dichotomy of black and white. However, the mixed ancestry of Haitian *hawhekaibe* also allowed for an actual, rather than metaphorical, familial relationship, as ‘tamariki’ of their French fathers. Receiving a civilising education in Europe enabled them to see ‘the evil [deeds] of their Pākehā fathers’.¹³⁶ *Te Hokioi* utilised Haiti as a model because the revolt had been successful: Haiti ‘has established its Rangatiratanga’. While this term is clearly being used to equate with the *rangatiratanga* (independence) declared by Māori themselves in 1835, it also brought the prosperity and benefits of civilisation to which Māori still aspired.

Let the councils work peacefully, wait and perhaps the Rangatiratanga of this island will be like Haiti’s, possessing wealth, power, law, because we are striving for a just cause, and perhaps God will protect his black-skinned children living in Aotearoa.¹³⁷

**Conclusion**

The Pākehā communicating to Māori through the Māori language newspapers attempted to assimilate Māori into Pākehā models of society, both in day to day life and in their relationship to governmental power. This message was intentional – they wanted Māori to change – and firmly embedded within the contexts of Pākehā colonialism. Because the Western world-view was so different to that of Māori, the translation of the message was not easy. Terminology was needed in order to translate the message, which was principally achieved through adding new meanings onto existing Māori words.

The Pākehā newspaper writers sought, at times, to make their translations ‘transparent’, to give the foreign ideas a Māori patina in order for their message to be more readily consumed by Māori, their target audience. Because Māori relationships tended to be on a personal level, their relations with both the Crown and with the Pākehā were personalised through the use of the metaphor of the family. The Queen and her governor were presented as ‘parents’ to their Māori ‘children’. This was a vertical hierarchical relationship, but the metaphor of parental love, even when chastisement was necessary, mitigated the more distant ruler / subject dichotomy of Western political thought and sought to assuage Māori fears of political domination.

¹³⁶ *Te Hokioi*, 24/3/1863:2. ‘...nga kino a o ratou matua Pakeha...’
¹³⁷ *Te Hokioi*, 26/4/1863:2. ‘Waiho marire ki a mahi nga runanga, taihoa pea ka rite te Rangatiratanga o te motu nei ki to Haiti, whai taonga, whai mana, whai ture, ta te mea e tohe ana matou ki te taha tika, tera pea te Atua e tiaki i ona tamariki kiri mangu, e noho ana ki Aotearoa.’
Pākehā settlers were also the Queen’s children, and therefore ‘brothers’ to the Māori. The colonial discourse was predicated on the notion that Māori had not yet reached the level of ‘civilisation’ that Pākehā had attained but were capable of realising that goal. Thus, Pākehā were tuakana to the Māori teina within a metaphorical family structure. Pākehā ranked more highly than Māori in terms of civilisation but were not to be seen as a threat to Māori in terms of political domination.

Politically, the civilised ‘native’ could aspire to enjoy the benefits of a common citizenship, of belonging to he iwi kotahi. However, this unity was espoused in a colonial context in which Māori and Pākehā were set as binary opposites. Not only were Māori separated from Pākehā in terms of their ranking in civilisation, but in terms of race, as kiri mā and kiri mangu, and as māori (native) and pākehā (European). Race was an identity characteristic which Māori could not easily eschew even if they had wished to, yet the terminology employed by the Māori language newspapers linked their Māori-ness with human aspects antithetical to the Pākehā civilisation. This was accentuated by associating the nobler aspects of Māori society, rangatiratanga, with Western civilisation, leaving the ignoble aspects to Māori themselves.

In the newspapers, Māori responded to this translation in various ways. Some were prepared to reproduce the message because they saw “civilisation” as the means to material prosperity while others used the terminology to critique the colonial relationship. In particular, the Kingitanga, through its newspaper Te Hokioi, sought to provide an alternative vision to the policy of he iwi kotahi promoted by the government. They did not portray Māori as teina to the Pākehā tuakana lest an acceptance of cultural inferiority also implied political subjection. Rather, Māori were a rangatira people who could forge their own destiny in the modern world. Using the kiri mangu metaphor, they reinterpreted the language of the colonial discourse in an attempt to create a distinctive and independent Māori identity.
Chapter 4: propaganda

Introduction

All people agree this thing, the newspaper, possesses great mana—great mana for good or evil. At all times, the newspapers should operate according to proper tikanga, and if the errors and fickle thoughts of the masses arise, then the newspaper should put its energies into pointing out the evil, and also be zealous in raising up the good.[LP]

The New Modern Oxford Dictionary of English describes “propaganda” as ‘information, especially of a biased or misleading nature, used to promote or publicise a particular political cause or point of view’ or as the Institute for Propaganda Analysis defines the term, propaganda seeks to influence people ‘with reference to predetermined ends.’ By these definitions, all the Māori language newspapers within the timeframe of this research can be characterised as propaganda organs.4 These newspapers were not interested in just providing a neutral portrayal of facts. Rather they were engaged, as in Harold Lasswell’s definition of propaganda, in transmitting ‘value dispositions’, or what the editor above termed ‘advocating sound principles’ as the newspapers saw them.

Lasswell also defines propaganda as ‘the technique of influencing human activity through representations.’ These “representations” can be transmitted through direct verbal communication, printed matter, or contemporarily, by radio, television or other electronic means. For Jeremy Hawthorn, the propaganda process involves four factors: the persuader, the persuasive text or discourse, those being persuaded (generally groups or nations), and the historical setting in which the propaganda occurred.

---

1 Te Karere Māori, 1/2/1855:1. ‘E whakaae ana nga tangata katoa, he mana nui to tenei mea, to te nupepa; he mana nui mo te kino, mo te pai. I roto i nga tahiwa katoa, me whakau nga nupepa ki runga ki nga tikanga tika; a, ki te mea, ka ara whakarunga nga he o te mano, me ana whakaaro kawe ke, me whakawhingoi te nupepa ki te wh[ā]kaatu i te kino, me kakama hoki ki te whakairi i te pai.’ ‘All are willing to admit that a newspaper is a powerful thing for either good or evil; and to seek the mere applause of the superficial readers of the day, therefore, is beneath the dignity of any man to whom the deeply responsible work of editorship is entrusted. The press, should at all times advocate sound principles, and when brought into contact with the prejudices, or perverted judgement of the multitude, it should unflinchingly point out the evil, and as unhesitatingly uphold the good.’


3 Institute of Propaganda Analysis, p 222.

4 Arguably all the Māori language newspapers that comprise Nupepa 1842-1933, a microfiche collection produced by the Alexander Turnbull Library, could be considered to be propaganda organs.


6 Lasswell, p 13.
process occurred. In this thesis, the persuaders are the Government, interested Pākehā and Māori, and the Kingitanga itself; the texts are material from Māori language newspapers, including reported accounts of public meetings. Those being persuaded were the Māori people, and the historical setting incorporates my research period, the eight years leading up to the invasion of the Waikato in 1863.

The first part of this chapter discusses how the newspapers perceived and defined their own roles. It then describes the characteristics of propaganda defined by a number of twentieth century theorists, providing examples from various Māori language newspapers which conform to these characteristics. The chapter then investigates a specific propaganda theme that surfaced in 1863 concerning the realisation of independence in Haiti by black slaves against white colonial rulers. This event, although occurring more than 60 years earlier, was used by the Kingitanga’s Te Hokioi to advance the concept of Māori independence in New Zealand. In response, Te Karere Maori published its own counter-propaganda to Te Hokioi’s interpretation of Haitian history. An overview of that period of Haitian history shows that both sides were prepared to distort the “truth” for their own propaganda aims.

The roles the newspapers saw for themselves

The newspapers did not want their messages to appear misleading, but none pretended to be representing any other political position than their own. As Day explains, impartiality was not expected of early settler newspapers in English. The modern technology that allowed newspapers to be cheaper, larger and more frequent was not introduced to settler newspaper production until the 1860s. A profitable enterprise rather than a means of advocacy then became the prime goal of newspaper controllers. The expense of the new technology demanded larger circulations, so editors moderated overtly political stances which might alienate their customers. The

---


8 Much of the data below comes from Te Karere Maori: it was the most important newspaper as a vehicle for propaganda because of its longevity and size (accounting for almost 80% of all pages printed during this research period), but also because it represented the viewpoint of government to Māori. However, the smaller papers also indulged in their own propaganda.

9 Day observes, ‘Until the 1860s financial profit was seldom possible for [settler] newspapers and they were oriented principally in terms of the political ambitions of their controllers’ functioning ‘not as observers on matters political but a part of the political system and advocates for political positions
Māori newspapers had small circulations and were produced with hand-driven technology. Like the early settler newspapers, profitability was generally not a factor in their production, with institutions such as the government, Wesleyan Church, or the Kingitanga supporting most of the output. The exceptions were Te Karere o Poneke, which struggled on subscription fees whilst also pleading to the government for financial backing, and the three short-lived newspapers of C.O.B Davis which sought financial backing from Māori tribes.10

The Māori language newspapers were also quite open about their roles. Te Hokioi, for example, stated that “the value of this press is in carrying our opinions [ā tātou whakaaro] to the peoples of this world”.11 The grammar is revealing. The possessive pronoun, ā tātou, included both writer and reader, implying that the opinions were shared. It also indicated that these ideas had been externalised into the public arena and were not mere internalised thoughts. Quite clearly, unlike the Pākehā-run papers which wrote of themselves as mātou12 and addressed Māori as “our Māori friends” or “you”, Te Hokioi was promoting itself as an authentic Māori voice.13

As discussed in Chapter 6, much of the propaganda that the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers supplied to Māori was designed to gain Māori acceptance of the myriad customs that Pākehā practised, and rejection of Māori tikanga that was considered obnoxious. As seen above, the Pākehā-run newspapers, therefore, quite deliberately portrayed themselves as the bringers of knowledge and civilisation to Māori. The Wesleyan Te Haeata stated that its role was to instruct and “make public what good things people are doing”14 and Davis saw Te Waka o te Iwi as “a treasure to


10 For a discussion on these newspapers, see Chapter 1. Despite a total of nine publications, the exceptions contributed less than 12% of the number of pages printed during this period.

11 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:1. ‘...ko te pai o tenei perehi: hei kawe i a tatou whakaro, ki nga iwi o te Ao...’

12 Unlike English, first person plural pronouns differentiate between including or excluding the person[s] being addressed. Thus tātou means “we” including the listener, while mātou means “we” excluding the listener. If the whakaaro had merely been thoughts belonging just to the writer and his friends, he would have used the pronoun ō mātou.

13 This identification of the newspaper as spokesperson for the readership has parallels with the early settler press. For example see, See New Zealand Gazette, 18/4/1840:2; New Zealand Colonist & Port Nicholson Advertiser 2/8/1842:2; Nelson Examiner, 12/3/1842:2; Taranaki Herald, 4/8/1852:2.

14 Te Haeata, 1/4/1859:1. ‘...hei whakapuki i ngā mahi pai a ngā iwi...’
inform those who are ignorant". In introducing *Ko Aotearoa* Davis compared it to the material goods that Māori had already attained, describing it as a 'treasure for the mind ... to teach and inform the Māori tribes of New Zealand'.

Similarly, Buller described *Te Karere o Poneke* as 'the pathway of knowledge', and 'the purpose of the newspaper is to be a door by which man may enter that pathway'. Buller was more revealing in a letter to McLean, saying that his paper would ‘encourage a taste for literature, create and foster a desire to acquire knowledge ... My leading article will take up some subject of interest, and by practical remarks will aim at imparting information and instruction thereon’. *Te Karere Maori* said that ‘teaching the Māori race, alone, is what is sought’. Describing the efforts of *Te Karere Maori*, its successor, *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* stated,

> It has steadily watched over the interests of the Maori, and has ever endeavoured by timely and plain spoken advice to turn his feet into the right direction, and so promote his moral wellbeing as well as his social advancement and considered that it had been ‘sent forth to instruct and enlighten you in all matters affecting your welfare’.

These newspapers assumed the role of teacher, self-consciously conferring the benefits of civilisation upon Māori. Indeed, their work occasionally complemented formal schooling. For example, *Te Haeata* supplied some basic arithmetic information, having been asked by "Believer", 'to show kindness to the people living in Ignorance, living in wild places, with no school teacher in their villages'.

All the newspapers exposed Māori to propaganda on political issues: such as the dispute over the Waitara, the Kingitanga, the Kohimarama Conference and Grey’s *Tikanga Hou*. However, *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* was the only newspaper that

---

15 *Te Waka o te Iwi*, 10/1857:1. ‘...he taonga whakamohio tenei i te hunga e kuare ana...’

16 *Ko Aotearoa*, 1/1861, pp 3, 6. ‘...te taonga mo te hinengaro ... hei whakaako, hei whakamarama mo nga iwi Maori o Niu Tireni;’ ‘...for the benefit of the mind ... which will be a medium of communicating instruction, and will tend to enlighten the Native people of New Zealand. [K.A]’

17 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 31/12/1857:2; 31/5/1858:2. ‘...te huarahi o te mohiotanga...” “Te ritenga hoki o te nupepa, he kuwaha hei tapokoranga ma te tangata ki taua huarahi.’


19 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/5/1855:15. ‘Ko te ako i nga iwi Maori, anake, tana i whai ai.’

20 *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 1/3/1861:2, 3-4. ‘He tiaki tonu tana i pai mo te taha Maori: te hapa ianei te korero, ia wahi ia wahi, hei tohutouho marire, hei arataki i te waewae o te Maori ki te huarahi tika, kia tupu ngatahi ai ko te pai mo te tinana ko te pai mo te wairua;’ ‘...he iutopea ako, whakamarama hoki i a koutou ki ngā mea katoa e tupu ati te oranga...’.

21 *Te Haeata*, 2/11/1860:4. Nā ‘Hoa Whakapono”. ‘...kia atawhai koe ki nga tangata e noho kuware ana, e noho ana i nga wahi mohoho, kahore he kai-whakaako kura i o ratou kainga...’

22 Political issues are discussed further in Chapters 7 and 8.
admitted that its role was essentially political. That the government established this paper specifically to attack *Te Hōkioi*, the Kingitanga paper, was obvious to all concerned, so its editor had nothing to lose in asserting that ‘if the cry of the Hōkioi is wrong, that small thing, the Pihoihoi will be able to subdue it because its [own] chirping is true’. 23

The style of the various Pākehā-run papers differed. The missionaries, such as Thomas Buddle of *Te Haeata*, were primarily interested in religious matters, in strengthening Protestant beliefs among Māori, and eliminating social practices that they deemed incompatible with civilization. Davis, editor of *Te Waka o te Iwi, Te Whetu o te Tau* and *Ko Aotearoa*, preached the same values, yet was more sympathetic to Māori aspirations for autonomy. Government sponsored papers, like *Te Karere Maori*, were concerned with religious and social matters, but, as political tensions increased, concentrated more on the issues of sovereignty and law and order. Each newspaper had its own agenda in persuading Māori to think a certain way. However, all the Pākehā-run papers promoted Victorian ideas of progress and civilisation and despite the divergent motives driving the publication of these papers, the differences, as will be seen in later chapters, complemented rather than contested with each other.

**Propaganda and the Māori language newspapers.**

**Language and Propaganda**

It is difficult to ascertain the coverage that the newspapers’ propaganda attained, as it is unclear how many copies of each newspaper were distributed, how many people read each copy, whether the information was accepted, or how it might have been passed on to other people. 24 As discussed in Chapter 2, scholars debate the level of Māori literacy. 25 However, even a low literacy rate did not necessarily diminish the impact of newspaper information upon Māori audiences. It is likely that copies of

---

23 *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke*, 2/2/1863:2. ‘Ki te he te tangi o te Hokioi, e taea ano te patu e tēra mea iti e te Pihoihoi ina pono tona korihitanga.’ The “newspaper war” conducted by *Te Hokioi* and *Te Pihoihoi* is discussed in Chapter 8.

24 This is discussed further in Chapters 1 and 2.

newspapers were shared, a practice that still exists today, and those who were literate may well have read the contents to others, transforming the printed document into an oral one. Bartlett asserts that in partially-literate societies, printed matter can take on “institutional authority”, and this, perhaps, would have been more pronounced with the Māori language newspapers as most were run by, or aligned to, institutions such as the government or churches. The newspapers also promoted the acts of writing and printing in terms of their power to render the content permanent and to spread knowledge. Although many Māori could not read English, C.O.B. Davis of Ko Aotearoa considered it necessary to tell Māori not to give credence to the more outrageous statements being printed in the English language press. This indicates that Māori were aware of English language material and it is not unreasonable to assume that non-literate Māori were similarly aware of printed Māori language material.

Ultimately, the success of propaganda can be judged on how well and how long its audience accepts it. For propaganda to be effective, ideas need to be communicated successfully and accepted by the target audience. A competent knowledge of the language, including aspects such as humour and idiom, and of the culture of the target audience is a distinct advantage. In a Māori context, this included the use of metaphorical language that would make sense to Māori readers, whether it derived from traditional or biblical sources, or the use of verbal techniques (such as whaikōrero and waiata) in the printed medium. While Māori naturally wrote in this manner, the editors of Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers also employed this kind of language. Of the various titles selected for newspapers in this period, most employ notions or words readily applicable to Māori life: karere

---

26 Mana, No 2, Apr/May 1993, p 1. The editor bemoans the fact that Māori share their copies of this magazine rather than buy their own.
27 For an example of a written document, the Treaty of Waitangi, being ‘received as an oral statement’ by Māori, see McKenzie, pp 35-40.
28 F.C. Bartlett, Political Propaganda, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940, p 54. McKenzie asserts that printed material had a ‘totemic power of warding off...evil spirits’ in pre-Treaty days. However, I am not suggesting that by the 1850s newspapers of that era retained any such powers. See McKenzie, p 30.
29 For example, see Ko Aotearoa, 1861:6; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/4/1861:3;15/7/1861:7; 1/8/1861:1; 15/11/1861:8-9; Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1859:1-5; 23/5/62:2
30 Ko Aotearoa, 1/1/1861:10-12.
32 Bartlett, p 87, 118, 126.
33 See Chapter 3 for discussion on the language used in newspapers.
34 See Kāretu, pp 1-10.
Feuding inhibited agricultural endeavours, so the article employed another proverb when discussing the fight between Te Hāpuku and Te Moananui of Ahuriri. It suggested that ‘[t]his then may be considered as a fight of “Rauru who acts like one man.” It is one that will soon cease if left to the people themselves.’ However, such is the esoteric nature of some Māori expressions that they needed explaining, even to Māori. As discussed in Chapter 2, it is clear that the Pākehā editors knew that they needed to reach Māori on their own intellectual and emotional terms, and thus employed language techniques which would facilitate this.

The characteristics of propaganda: did the newspapers conform?

Propagandists also attempt to define the nature of their relationship with the audience. One technique is to claim a commonality with those being addressed, that they all share similar experiences and ideas. For example, Māori obituaries, including those by Māori, often stressed the deceased’s loyalty to church or state. The propagandist may also utilise the evidence of others who are members of the target group. For example, after Pākehā settlers had been murdered in Taranaki at the advent of renewed hostilities, *Te Karere Māori* published 17 letters from Māori condemning the malefactors.

---

41 Te Hāpuku of Ngāti Kahungunu was involved in selling large tracts of land in Wairarapa and Hawkes Bay, often with the connivance of government purchasing agents but against the wishes of his fellow tribespeople. Matters came to a head in 1857-58 when Te Moananui and other Ngāti Kahungunu clashed with Te Hāpuku and his followers. See *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* 1769-1869, pp 444-5.

42 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/10/1857:3. ‘I naianei he whawhai tenei na “Rauru tangata tahi.” Ara, ki te mea ka waio ma raua ano ta raua nei whawhai, ekore e roa ka mutu.’

43 For example, the expression “he kiri kei waho, he puku kei roto” (The outside is skin, but the inside is secret) contains a pun, as puku means stomach, as well as secret, but was explained as ‘while persons may resemble each other in countenance, their thoughts may be widely different.’ *Te Karere Maori*, 30/11/1860:7.


46 Institute of Propaganda Analysis, p 220.

Before the 1860s, the dream portrayed by the government newspapers was one of inter-racial harmony. As the governor told Ngā Puhi:

One thing I want is for there to be a town for Māori and Pākehā together, in which they live together; so that the whole world can see the Pākehā’s house with the Māori’s, the Pākehā’s farm with the Māori’s. It is true what is said, the Māori and Pākehā living in New Zealand are one people; there is one authority, the Queen’s, and one law. 48

Certainly the newspapers promoted “good news” in which Māori and Pākehā were seen to be mixing and getting on. 49 One example was the annual Auckland regatta, 50 and Māori were also encouraged to participate in agricultural shows. 51 A number of the newspapers made much of the flagpoles being erected by the Māori of Te Tai Tokerau in 1857 and 1858 to symbolise their loyalty to the Queen, and their goodwill to Pākehā, including an acknowledgement from the Queen’s Secretary of State. 52

Both religious and government newspapers directed at Māori at that time also printed letters from Māori, or reproduced parts of whaikōrero from hui, which showed Māori perspectives that were sympathetic to the newspaper’s opinion. 53

Times of turmoil are often connected with the use of propaganda. 54 While Māori society retained some pre-contact structures, it was in a state of transition in the mid-nineteenth century. Conversion to Christianity, and concepts of Western “civilisation”, had destroyed, undermined, or altered many traditional belief patterns and customs. Māori were also drawn into commercial activity which altered the economic structure of many tribes. 55 In addition, the political division of power had not been fully determined, with the Crown attempting to gain the sovereignty it had reserved to itself through the Treaty of Waitangi, while most Māori tribes still

48 Te Karere o Poneke, 17/5/1858:3. ‘Tetahi hoki e pai ai ahau kia meinga ano hei taone mo te Māori ngatahi ano ko te Pakeha, kia nohoia e raua tahi; ko te whare a te Pakeha, ko te whare a te Māori; ko te paamu o te Pakeha, ko te paamu o te Māori, kia kītea ai e te ao katoa. He pono te kupu e kiia nei; he iwi kotahi te tangata Māori te Pakeha e noho nei ki Niu Tirenī; kotahi te mana ko to te Kuini, kotahi ano hoki Ture.’

49 For example, see Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:3; Te Karere Maori, 31/12/1858:1-3; 16/5/1859:5; Te Haewata 1/4/1860:2; Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri, 13/6/1863:1.

50 Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:12-13; 31/1/1858:1-3; 15/2/1859:1-2.

51 Te Karere Maori, 15/12/1857:1-2; 15/1/1858:5; 28/2/1859:5-6.

52 Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/11/1857:3; Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1858:2-3; 15/2/1858:5; 27/2/1858:1-3; 15/5/1858:3; 31/8/1858:5-6; 31/12/1858:2; Te Karere o Poneke, 31/5/1858:4; 12/7/1858:2; 22/11/1858:3; Te Whetu o te Tau, 1/7/1858:1.

53 For example, see Māori letters in Te Karere Maori, 1/1/1855:13; 1/7/1855:7; 1/9/1855:5-6; 1/12/1855:16; 31/1/1860:10-11; 15/4/1860:1-3; 30/8/1863:6-7; Te Karere o Poneke, 29/10/57:3; 26/11/1857:3; 25/1/1858:3; 7/6/1858:3; Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:3, 1/11/1857:2.


55 This is discussed further in Chapter 6.
exercised their \textit{tino rangatiratanga}. Land represented political and economic power, as well as spiritual connectedness, for Māori, yet much had been sold, and the government continued to press for more. The mid-nineteenth century then, was certainly a period of turmoil. The newspapers were thus a leading weapon in the continuing struggle to assimilate Māori, and to facilitate Pākehā control of the country.\footnote{See Chapter 4.}

Whether relating to ideological or economic concerns, or even to actual war, propaganda is a weapon in the struggle to gain or wield power and thereby denies that power to other groups.\footnote{Lambert, \textit{Propaganda}, p 18; Lasswell, p 15; Robins et al, p 2.} Its value lies in being ‘cheaper than violence, bribery or other possible control methods’.\footnote{Lasswell, quoted by Robins et al, p 9.} Newspaper propaganda was but one of the Crown’s weapons. Successive governors practised open bribery, in the form of pensions or goods to chiefs. For example, to the accusation made by the Kingitanga leader, Wiremu Tamihana, that the governor was dispensing money ‘to ally the people of the country to yourself’, Governor Grey replied,

\begin{quote}
whose were the mills, the horses, the ploughs, the carts, the schools at Rangiaohia? I tell you – they were mine. Hori Te Waru, Taati, and all the chiefs who saw money and goods were mine, and you said that people were favourable to me because of money. Well then, why have those men who have consumed my money turned away [from me]?\footnote{Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, 10/2/1863:8. ‘...hei ami atu i ngā tangata o te motu ki a koe...’; ‘...na wai nga mira, nga hoihot, nga parau, nga kata, nga kura i Rangiaohia? e mea ana ahatu – naku. Naku a Hori Te Waru, me Taati, me nga rangatira katoa i kite ai i te moni, i te taonga, a i mea mai na koe na te moni ka pai mai ai te tangata ki a au, tena, he aha i tahuri ke ai ena tangata kua ka nai i aku moni?’}
\end{quote}

Even propaganda and bribery combined was only partially successful. While some \textit{iwi} remained loyal or neutral, the government still resorted to war and law courts in order to gain its aims, that is, the political control of Māori in order to free up land for Pākehā settlement. Yet even war was only partially successful as the Kingitanga did not effectively come under the sway of the government for at least another twenty years.\footnote{Sorrenson, p 165.}

People in modern societies are often more isolated, and thus more vulnerable to external propaganda, than groups retaining their traditional community bonds.\footnote{Robins et al, p 2.} Nineteenth century Māori society still retained much of its pre-contact tribal structure, despite the social changes deriving from introduced commercialism, education and
religion. Individuals still owed their primary loyalty to hapu and iwi. Māori were therefore less vulnerable to government propaganda than modern urbanised societies. Because of this, the government resorted to war and legal mechanisms to achieve its aims.

Bartlett suggests that propagandists attempt to gain the ‘intense sectional enthusiasm and emotion’ of influential groupings. Bartlett. P 106. Rangatira, in particular, were courted by government. The Kohimarama Conference was an attempt at gaining a unanimity among the assembled chiefs. However, while Māori society allowed a large degree of autonomy to individual rangatira, the over-riding loyalty to tribal unity meant that hapu and iwi in accord with chiefly opinion would accept, or reject, propaganda arguments rather than rangatira as a class across the whole Māori people. Propaganda effectiveness was also hampered by the inability of Pākehā to control all means of thought dispersal. While Pākehā dominated the newspaper output, they were unable to control all the various meetings that Māori held to discuss current political affairs, and therefore were not able to secure the hearts and minds of many leading members of the Māori community.

Lambert claims, in his analysis of ideological propaganda, that it reflects a conflict between differing schools of thought. On the one hand, there is the “established” side whose position rests on authority and tradition, strengthened by “intellectual inertia” where people are expected to act and think as they always have. He argues that, on the other hand, revolutionary or innovative schools of thought appear which desire changes and rely on reason or emotion to gain ground. Lambert, p 19. In the New Zealand situation, both Māori chiefs and the government could claim to be the “established” authority. The government attempted to grasp the position of legitimised power through Article One of the Treaty of Waitangi, and through asserting its authority when it could. It also bolstered its position by presenting itself as the embodiment, and bringer, of a superior cultural order. As Te Manuhiri Tuarangi stated,

So, we said before, when that governor who is now dead [Hobson] arrived, that you should agree to the government of the Pākehā. We should like that then: because your

62 Bartlett. P 106.
63 Lambert, p 19. These schools of thought have parallels with Gramsci’s “traditional” and “organic” intellectuals, although his dichotomy relates more to classes within a culture rather than separate ethnicities. See Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1972) pp 5-7.
tikanga with regard to the spirit and God were wrong, your acts were wrong in regard to that other world; because your tikanga concerning this world were also wrong, your rangatiratanga was nothing in this world. And so, you agreed to our religious tikanga, as rangatiratanga for you in the other world, so you should agree to the tikanga of the governor, as rangatiratanga for you in this world.

By the time that Pōtatau was crowned as Māori King in 1858, New Zealand had been a British colony for a mere 18 years, and the Crown had been largely unable to impose its will upon Māori. The mana of Māori chiefs derived from many generations of ancestors. Indeed, Pōtatau could trace his whakapapa back to the captains of many of the original colonising Polynesian canoes: his personal mana was much more 'traditional' in Māori terms than that of the various governors. However, the kingship was a novelty in Māori society so the Kingitanga attempted to define itself through chiefly backing and identification with sacred tribal mountains, that is, to traditional Māori mana. Thus the structures of established authority that either side was attempting to build could be viewed by the other as innovative and revolutionary.

When competing sides attempt to take the role of the established authority, they would be likely to indulge in counter-propaganda, pointing out the inconsistencies of innovative propaganda or contrary thought. This often took place at Māori hui where government agents and missionaries were present to deliver their viewpoint, and curb any divergent Māori opinions. As newspaper technology was principally in the hands of Pakehā, argument which may well have been expressed verbally by Māori, could be expressed, either directly or paraphrased, and then countered in print. For example, Te Haeata stated,

64 Te Mamihiri Tuarangi, 1/7/1861:10. 'Koia matou ka mea ai, i mua, i te taenga mai o tera Kawana kua mate, me whakaae koutou ki te Kawanatanga o te Pakeha. I penei hoki o matou whakaaro i reira, Na te he o o koutou tikanga mo te wairua, mo te Atua, i he ai a koutou mahi mo tera ao; na te he hoki o o koutou tikanga ki tenei ao, i he ai ta koutou mahi ki tenei ao, i kore ai ta koutou rangatiratanga ki tenei ao, Wāhokī, kua whakaae koutou ki o matou tikanga karakia, hei Rangatiratanga mo koutou ki tere ao; me whakaae hoki koutou ki nga tikanga o te Kawana, hei Rangatiratanga mo koutou ki tenei ao.'; 'And hence we advised you, formerly, on the arrival of that Governor who is dead (Hobson) that you should consent to the government of the Pakeha. At that time our thoughts ran thus:-because of the erroneousness of your system about worship, the soul and God, so your work was wrong with regard to futurity; and because of the errors of your system about worldly affairs, so your worldly actions were wrong and degrading. Even so, therefore, as you had accepted our system of religion as the means of ennobling you in another world, so you should receive the administration of the Governor as the means of your obtaining real chieftainship in this world.'

65 Te Hurinui, pp 20-21.

66 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:2-3, 8/12/1862:2; Te Hurinui, p 224.

67 Lambert, p 82.

68 Lambert, pp 86, 122.
Māori have two wrong ideas. The first wrong idea is this: [they] say that the Queen and the Pākehā of overseas want to take all the land of the Māori. The second wrong idea is this: [they] say that the Governor and the Pākehā of this place want to destroy all the Māori.

No! No! These two ideas are just wrong. Queen Victoria and the nobles of England will never be like that. What they want is for the Māori to develop, be noble [rangatira] and to increase.  

The government newspapers also attempted to quash recurrent rumours that Pākehā wanted to exterminate Māori or, particularly once the government had seized Waitara, that they wanted to take all Māori land, and suppress chiefly mana. Māori did contest some Pākehā arguments through letters to the editor. For example, Ahitara Tangatangata of Moutoa was happy to argue with both Buller and his missionary father on the issue of drinking rum. However, Te Hokioi was the only newspaper which provided an alternative Māori editorial line, and pointed out inconsistencies in the government's treatment of Māori, and the 'covenant of the blind', the Treaty of Waitangi. Such was its success that the government felt compelled to set up *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* under John Gorst at Te Awamutu as 'a protagonist to the Maori weekly [sic].' According to Grey, 'Sir John Gorst's satire was so keen that they [Waikato Māori] could not, themselves, help laughing over the fun which “The Lonely Sparrow on the House Top” made of “the Giant Eagle Flying Aloft.”'

All the newspapers were attempting, not merely to provide information, but to encourage Māori to believe what was printed. The “representation” of truth was thus a vital component of the propaganda process. For example, in their effort to induce Māori to accept British law, the government consistently maintained that Māori and

---

69 See for example, Bishop Selwyn's comments at the Kingitanga meeting at Peria on the 21st October, 1862. *Te Hokioi*, 10/11/1862:1; *AJHR* 1863, E12:15.
70 Te Haeta, 1/5/1860:2. 'E rua nga whakaaro he a te Maori. Ko te tuatahi o nga whakaaro he koia tenei: E ki ana kei te hiahia mai a te Kuini me nga Pakeha o Tawahi kia tangohia katoatia nga whenua o te Maori. Ko te tuara o nga whakaaro he koia tenei: E ki ana kei te hiahia nei a te Kawana me nga Pakeha o konei kia whakangaromia katoatia nga Maori. Kahore! Kahore! Kei te he anake enei whakaaro e rua. Ekore rawa a Kuini Wikitoria me nga rangatira o Ingarangi e pena. Tena ke te ratou hiahia; kia tupu, kia rangatira, kia nui haere te Maori.'
71 For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 31/5/1859:1-2; 29/2/1860:1-3; 28/2/1861:9-18; *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 1/3/1861:4-6; 15/3/1861:1-2.
72 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 15/2/1858:3; 31/5/1858:3; 14/6/1858:2; 30/8/1858 Suppl:1. See Chapter 3.
73 *Te Hokioi*, 8/12/1862:3. ‘...te kawenata o te matapop...’ See Chapter 7 for more discussion on the Treaty of Waitangi.
74 Milne, p 176.
75 Milne, p 177.
Pākehā were equal before the law. When Charles Marsden, a poor mad Catholic woodcutter, was tried for the murder of Kerara Rangiawhpirae, a woman of Ngāti Whakaue, most of the February issue of *Te Karere Maori* was given over to the case, giving full details of the procedures, including Marsden’s execution. The paper then printed the governor’s letter to Ngāti Whakaue.

When I spoke to the Māori chiefs on my initial arrival here, I told them that what the Queen wanted was that the *tikanga* for her children should not be divided in two, but [they] should be one people to her, that the law should also be as one, and should be administered properly for all her children, whether Māori or Pākehā. Now, you did not believe this word of mine, and you were mistaken in this, because you did not know that the Queen’s representative would never speak falsely.

And now, your own eyes have seen, so, in future you will believe what I say.76

In presenting information as truth, the propagandist should be careful that the material seems consistent and probable, and to give the appearance of impartiality and disinterestedness if possible.77 If lies and deceit can be disguised, they may be employed, as might the careful selection of truthful statements.78 As seen below, this was certainly true of the propaganda about Haiti. Rumours may be fabricated and spread, particularly in an effort to divide enemies.79 The actions of enemies may be exaggerated, particularly their atrocities in wartime, in order to vilify them.80

Certainly, as the account of the murder of settlers by Ngāti Ruanui and Taranaki in 1860 shows, *Te Karere Maori* was prepared to use emotive language to denounce the attackers.

And what was the sin of the Pākehā to those tribes? Nothing, and we will repeat it, the Pākehā had no sin whatsoever. There was no cause whatsoever for those *tūtūi* tribes to rise up without authority. However, they did so, and came upon the Pākehā’s land, they burnt down the Pākehā’s houses, and seized the cattle, laid their farms bare. This was not all, three Pākehā were murdered violently, and they murdered cruelly two Pākehā children. There was no weapon in the hands of this group. Those children were cruelly chopped into pieces with a tomahawk. And who was it that chopped up these children

76 *Te Karere Maori*, 29/2/1856:16. ‘I taku koverotanga ki nga Rangatira Maori i taku taenga mataatii mai ki konei, i korero atu ano shau ki a ratou, ko ta te Kuini i pai ai, kaua e weheweheka kia rua nga tikanga ki ana tamariki, engari, hei iwi kotahi ki a ia, me te Ture ano hoki kia kotahi ano, me whakahaire tika ki ana tamariki katoa, ahakoa Maori, Pakeha ranei. Na, ki hai koutou i whakapono ki tenei kupu aku, na, ko ta koutou wahi pohehe tenei, te mohio hoki koutou, e kore rawarawa te Te Kuini Ahua e korero teka.

Ko tenei, kua kito pu o koutou kanohi, na, ka whakapono koutou ki muri nei ki taku korero.’; ‘When I spoke to the Chiefs on my first arrival, I told them the Queen made no distinctions between her subjects, but directed that all should have equal justice. You did not believe me, which was not wise; for you should know that the Queens representative would scorn to tell a lie. You have now seen with your eyes, and will believe in future what I say.’

77 Bartlett, pp 118, 121.

78 Hawthorn, pp vii; Institute of Propaganda Analysis, p 221; Bartlett, pp 95, 97.

79 Bartlett, pp 90-91

80 Lambert, p 24.
with a tomahawk? By men? Yes, by men, indeed by some men who met to pray on all
the Sundays preceding.  

On some occasions, ideas may be implied or hinted at, or certain facts portrayed
with suggestions made to their meaning, and at other times, statements may be
presented without any suggestion that a contrary view might be held. For example,
not all Māori considered that the Treaty of Waitangi legitimised Crown control over
all New Zealand. However, when McLean translated a vice-regal speech at
Kohimarama, he left little room for any alternative interpretations on the division of
power, essentially enunciating the English reading of the Treaty which was translated
reasonably faithfully into Māori. 

In an effort to get certain ideas accepted, repetition may be used, perhaps with
variations in minor detail in order to keep the message fresh. The recipients may be
appealed to as rational human beings, for whom the selected information is self
evident, or the information portrayed in such general terms that disagreement would
seem inappropriate. For example, when fighting was about to break out in Taranaki
in 1860, Te Karere Maori sought to distance Māori from Te Rangitāke, saying

Our thoughts suggest that few people will ally with him because his war is wrong. All
people, that is, the people who understand the substance of the debate, can really see the
wrongdoing of Wiremu Kingi. For example, when fighting was about to break out in Taranaki
in 1860, Te Karere Maori sought to distance Māori from Te Rangitāke, saying

Certainly the government and its newspapers could be somewhat disingenuous
in their representations to Māori, as seen in their portrayal of the Kohimarama

---

81 Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1860:1-2. ‘He aha koia te hara o te Pakeha ki era iwi? Kahore kau, a ka
tuarutia ano e matou tenei kupu, kahore kau ra he hara o te Pakeha. Kahore he take kahore he aha, i
whakatikia pokanoa ai era iwi tutua. Heoi, whakatikia noa ake, haere mai aki ki to te Pakeha
whenua, ko nga whare o nga Pakeha tahuana ana e ratou ki te ahi, ko nga kau, riore atu te tango,
whakamarakeraketia ana nga paamu. Te kaati hoki i e nei, na, tokitoru nga Pakeha Maori kohurutia iho,
tokoru hoki nga tamariki Pakeha, i kohurutia kinotia e ratou; kahore kau he patu i te ringa o e nei
hunga, ko aua tamariki ra, he mea tapahi kino ki te patiti a ngakongako noa. Na wai koia e nei tamariki i
tapatapahi ki te patiti? Na te tangata ranei? Ae ra, na te tangata, na eta hi tangata ano e huuhui ana ki te
karakia i nga Ratupe katoa ka pahemo nei!’; ‘What harm had the pakehas done to those tribes? The
answer is, not any. We repeat it—not any, and challenge contradiction. Without the slightest provocation
those mean people invaded the pakeha territory, plundered and burnt their houses, stole their cattle,
devastated their farms, and cruelly murdered three unarmed settlers and two little boys! The latter were
literally hacked to pieces. By whom were the little boys hacked to pieces? By men? Yes, by men,
nearly all of whom have hitherto regularly assembled for Christian worship on the Sabbath day.’

82 Hawthorn, pp viii, ix; Bartlett, p 70.
83 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:6. This is quoted substantially in Chapter 7.
84 Bartlett, pp 67, 69.
85 Institute of Propaganda Analysis, p 219; Lambert, p 12; Bartlett, p 117.
86 Te Karere Maori, 15/3/1860:3. ‘Kei te mea to matou whakaaro, e kore pea e tokomaha nga tangata
hei whakauru ia ia, i te he o tona pakanga. E kitea nutia ana e nga tangata katoa te he o Wiremu
Kingi, ara, e te hunga e mohio ana ki te tikanga o tua koro.’; ‘We do not think, however, that he will
find many ready to join him. It must be so evident to all who know anything about the question that he
is wholly in the wrong.’
Conference. Governor Browne had invited chiefs not openly hostile to the Crown to come to give their opinions. In particular, Browne wanted these chiefs to show their loyalty to the Crown, especially with support for its actions in Taranaki, and antipathy towards the Kingitanga. In essence, Kohimarama was a propaganda event, and for five months, Te Karere Maori was given over to printing accounts of its many speeches. The newspaper was at pains to imply that ‘the principal sub-divisions of the Maori race are, on the whole, well represented in this Conference’ suggesting that the non-appearance of the powerful Waikato tribes was due purely to the recent death of King Pōtatau. In reality, few attended from Taranaki or from tribes loyal to the Kingitanga. The Kingitanga and the Waitara dispute were the two major political issues of the time, and indeed were heavily debated at Kohimarama. However, the paper suggested that the primary reasons for the meeting were far more benign, ‘of discussing (with him [the Governor]) various matters connected with the welfare and advancement of the two races dwelling in New Zealand.’

Propagandists often appeal to emotion because it has the power to move the recipients to act in irrational ways. They may utilize positive emotions, such as love and pride for one’s people or land to draw a group together, and direct hate and anger at outsiders of the group. Propagandists may induce fear amongst their own potential supporters, so long as there is a realistic hope of resisting the threat, in order to gain conformity of ideas and actions, whereas it may be used to dishearten the enemy. For example, the religious press tried to induce a fear of not going to heaven. In encouraging Taranaki to desist in fighting over the Waitara, Te Haeata suggested, ‘People, deliberate over peace in the world so we live well in this world, and go directly to the other world to live forever.’ It later stated, ‘What use is
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87 The Kohimarama Conference is discussed in depth in Chapter 6.
88 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:1. ‘Ma konei ka kitea ai kua uru nui nga tino hapu o Niu Tirani ki tenei runanga.’
89 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:2. ‘...ka korerotia e tatou etahi tikanga e tupu pai ai e kake ai nga iwi erua e noho nei ki tenei whenua ki Nui Tirani.’
90 Hawthorn, p ix; Bartlett, pp 74.
91 Bartlett, p 74.
92 Bartlett, pp 77, 107, 113, 114.
93 Te Haeata, 1/7/1859:3. ‘E te iwi, wauhia te rongo ki te ao kia noho pai tatou i tenei ao, kia haere tika ai ki tera ao ora tonu atu ai.’
having one’s big name extolled (for fighting) when the body is rotting in the graveyard, and the soul is lamenting in hell. 94

Propaganda can be both an instrument of power and weapon of war, used differently depending on whether it is being directed towards one’s own camp to unify the supporters, or that of the enemy to discourage, demoralise and divide the opposition. 95 Māori attitudes towards the government were diverse, from firm loyalists who were extremely antagonistic towards the King Movement, to those who would have liked to have driven all Pākehā from New Zealand. The Kingitanga and the Government engaged each other in war officially in mid-1863, but this was preceded by growing mistrust and a cold war mentality. The antipathy had been exacerbated by some Kingitanga followers who disobeyed their King to join in the Taranaki conflict, and when the Taranaki leader, Wiremu Kingi Rangi Te Rangitāke, attempted to put himself under the mana of the King’s flag. 96

After the Taranaki War had erupted in 1860, the Pākehā newspapers were keen to make clear that Māori were dealing with the nineteenth century world’s superpower. For example, Grey stated that Te Pihoihoi was established not just to battle with Te Hokioi, but ‘to show how absurd it was for any section of the Maoris to think they could beat the English.’ 97 Pākehā were just too numerous, ‘the country whence he comes is a never failing fountain—his people are “like the sands of the sea shore for multitude and numerous as the stars of heaven.”’—Not so with the Maori. 98 This quotation shows that Pākehā enjoyed the blessing God gave to Abraham, and many Māori would also have been aware of what was unstated, that ‘thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies’. 99 Similarly, “Tohunga” of Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, explaining that British soldiers had not come to take Māori land but ‘intended to repress the evil’, compared their multitudes to an unstoppable spring.

But as for the Maori, if any of them be killed, say four or six, where is there another island whence he can derive allies to handle the guns of those who lie dead, and to

94 Te Haeta, 1/8/1961:4. ‘Hei aha te huhuatanga o te ingoa nui, i te mea e pirau ana te tinana i te urupa, e tangi ana hoki te wairua i te reinga.’
95 Lambert, p 21.
97 Milne, p 177.
98 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:1. ‘Ko te whenua i tupu ma i te Pakeha, e rite ana ki te puna wai e pupu ake ana, e kore rawa e mimiti—e rite ana tona iwi ki nga onepu i te taha moana, me nga whetu o te rangi tona tini.’
avenge their death? There is none, and so they would simply consume away, and be exterminated. 100

He concluded that Māori should instead ‘cede to him [the Pākehā] the tikanga for all things[LP]’ in order to maintain their physical salvation. 101 Much of the same article was used by “Rongomau” in Te Haeata. However, his conclusion asked that if neither French under Bonaparte, nor the Indian Rebellion, could defeat the Pākehā, how could Māori achieve it. 102

Another important propaganda technique is to associate a higher authority with the ideas being portrayed, thereby enabling a transfer of that power onto the ideas being expressed. 103 In the Māori newspapers, the authority of a particularly important chief or even the Māori King, Pōtatau, could be invoked. 104 The positions of Governor, and that of the Government, of course, carried their own authority, but these could be enhanced with references to Queen Victoria, or to the Treaty of Waitangi when appropriate. The highest authority, however, was God, who, not surprisingly, was invoked most often by the religious press. For example, in an article in Ko Aotearoa denigrating the concept of war, the phrase “E ki ana te Atua...” (God says...) was used eight times to make God’s opinions perfectly clear. 105 God was omnipresent and it seemed that He sometimes even read the newspaper, Te Haeata, to find out what was being said.

The report sent in by the writer, Kipa Ngamoke, was printed on the press for all the people of the world to look at, and for God also to look at. 106

Māori were not passive recipients of Pākehā thought shaping. Not only did the Kingitanga newspaper, Te Hokioi, provide the movement with its own printed expression, but Māori letter writers also used the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers as a forum for their own ideas. However, Māori found public meetings the most valuable forum for sharing and airing ideas, opinions and information. The Māori language newspapers are a valuable source of information regarding these

100 ‘Tena ko te tangata Māori, ka mate etahi o ratou, tokorua pu ranei, tokotoru pu ranei, kei hea he motu ke hei tikingi tangata mona, hei hapai i nga pu o era kua mate, hei takitaki i o ratou mate. Kahore ra hoki, ka memeha noa iho, ka ngaro noa iho.’
101 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/7/1861:8-10. ‘...tukua ki a ia te tikanga mo nga mea katoa...’; ‘[s]urrender to him [the Pakeha] the regulating of all things [TMT]’
102 Te Haeata, 1/11/1861:1-2.
103 Institute of Propaganda Analysis, p 219; Lambert, p 19; Bartlett, p 55
104 For example, see Ko Aotearoa, 1/1861:7-9.
105 Ko Aotearoa, 1/1862:29.
106 Te Haeata, 1/7/1859:3. ‘Ka taia nei ki te perehi nga korero i tukua mai e Kipa Ngamoke te kai tuhituihi, ma nga tangata katoa o te ao e titiro, ma te Atua hoki e titiro.’
meetings, although it is likely that a great many were not reported. Māori met together to discuss land issues,107 or for religious purposes.108 However, most of the meetings reported related more to political issues concerning the relationship between Māori and the Crown. These included the establishment of the Kingitanga; how Māori might run their own affairs, the acceptance of law and government authority, and Maori expressions of loyalty to the Queen.109

The Governor or other officials sometimes called meetings, or undertook tours, to communicate directly with Māori, and these were often well recorded by *Te Karere Maori*.110 But they found meetings initiated by Māori much more difficult to control. Pākehā often attended these meetings, either as official or unofficial government agents.111 For example, at a Kingitanga hui held at Ngāruawahia in April 1860, Governor Brown had not only official agents present, but also requested that the Bishop of New Zealand attend, because ‘he will be likely to have more influence and obtain correct information than any directly accredited agent’.112 He later sought information from Rev. Thomas Buddie, Wesleyan missionary and editor of *Te Haeata*, on the meeting.113 But these meetings were run according to Māori protocols for Māori purposes, and the Governor was sometimes directly supplied with information from Māori themselves, as when Heta Tarawhiti advised of the Māori King’s pacific intentions.

Father, I wish that you should hear the words of Potatau and some of the other chiefs of Waikato, after the agents of the government went away.114
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107 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/2/1855:6; 30/9/1857:8-12; 31/1/1858:3-5; 30/4/1858:1-3; *Te Karere o Poneke*, 19/4/1858:3; 12/7/1858:3-4; 15/11/1858:3; *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 15/10/1861:7-11.
109 The reporting of meetings varied, from short letters to extensive accounts of speeches over a number of pages. Often a number of issues were discussed at meetings, and it is possible that political issues were discussed, even when the report implied that the meeting concerned only land issues or religious practice. For example, when Waikato Maori met to raise money for the Ngāruawahia church at Christmas, 1862, it is likely that some may have discussed political issues, even if at an informal level. *Te Hokioi*, 15/1/1863.
110 For example see *Te Karere Maori*, 1/3/1855:2-10; 30/4/1857:1-7; 30/6/1860:12-15; 15/1/1862:1-3, 7-9; See also “Governor’s Address to Natives”, *British Parliamentary Papers: Correspondence and Papers relating to the Māori Uprisings in New Zealand 1861*, [Colonies, New Zealand, Vol 12], (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1969) p 1.
111 For example, missionaries were present at Māori called meetings discussed in *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 1/5/1861:7-8; 15/8/1861:22-25; *Te Hokioi*, 1/11/1862:1. Missionaries also accompanied officials to meetings. For example, *Te Haeata*, 1/7/1860:1; *Te Hokioi*, 15/6/1862:2-3.
Māori often sent in their own reports of these meetings to newspapers, or to officials who forwarded them on to be printed, especially when these reports implied that the meetings favoured the government.\footnote{For example, \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 12/11/1857:2-4; 13/9/1858:4; \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 15/8/1859:5-6; 15/4/1860:3-4; 1/5/1862:13-15; \textit{Te Mamihiri Tuaraangi}, 15/8/1861:22-25.} Although various Pākehā attended meetings called to established the Kingitanga and later to conduct its business, with one exception\footnote{See \textit{Te Hēkioi}, 15/6/1862:2-3, 4; 10/11/1862:1; 15/2/1863:2; 24/3/1863:2.} the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers did not report specific Kingitanga meetings, preferring more generalised comments on the movement. For example, \textit{Te Karere Māori}, employing a Māori proverb which compared sapwood to the heart of the tree, merely alluded to ‘recent gatherings at Taupō, Waikato, and other places’.\footnote{\textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/6/1857:1-3 ‘...nga hui ki Taupo, ki Waikato, ki hea...’} The paper discussed the gist of their \textit{kaupapa}, but not specific meetings. A desire for law was considered to be heart wood but,

\begin{quote}
the part which is said to be sapwood, and will not last, are the irrational statements which say that he [the Māori] will make a system [tikanga] which will end those evils which are causing distress, that is, one which will not support the government and the administrators whom the Queen has placed in this country. This irrationality considers that the Māori should separate from the Pākehā, with separate laws and leaders, and then they will achieve what they are seeking.\footnote{\textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/6/1857:2. ‘Ko te wahl e kiia nei, he taitea, ekore e mau, koia tenei ko nga kupu horihori e penei ana, mana e hanga noa ake tetahi tikanga e mutu ai aua kino e pouritia nei, ara, kaua e whakawhirinaki mai ki te Kawanatanga, ki nga kaiwhakahaire tikanga kua oti te whakarite e te Kuini ki tenei whenua. Ko te kupu horihori e meatia nei me wehewehe te tangata Māori te Pakeha--me ture ano me ture ano--me tumuaki ano me tumuaki ano, katahi ka oti te wahi e whaia nei.’; ‘[t]he part we say is unsound is the foolish talk of some, who would persuade the Māori people that they are able of themselves to frame and carry out a system independently of the Government and the authorities constituted by the Queen in this country which shall remedy the evils they complain of: who say, that, in order to do this, the Maories should separate from the Europeans, have separate laws and separate rulers. [TKM]’} \footnote{In particular, see the presentation of the discussions of Governor Grey and Waikato chiefs at Taupari, \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 16/12/1861. 5/2/1862:8-20. See also Governor Browne’s visit to Waikato, \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 30/4/1857:1-7.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Te Karere Maori} was happy to publicise meetings between governors and Kingitanga representatives because it could present the discussions in a way that made the Kingitanga appear intransigent.\footnote{\textit{Te Hēkioi}, 1/7/1860:2. This article reports on a Kingitanga meeting at Ngāruawāhia, 24th May, 1860. In 1860, \textit{Te Hēkioi}’s editor wrote \textit{The Maori King Movement in New Zealand, with a Full Report of the Native Meetings held at Waikato, April and May, 1860} for a Pākehā audience, so he may not have written extensively on specific Kingitanga meetings for his Māori readers, as with the other Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers, lest it be thought he was giving the Kingitanga more standing than it deserved.} It was also prepared to attack the Kingitanga and the principles on which it was established, but would not risk any endorsement of the movement by reporting on its meetings.
Haitian independence as a propaganda issue.

*Te Hokioi* engaged the government on various issues relating directly to Māori, such as land and mana. With a creative display of propaganda, it drew the example of Haiti into its arguments. Haiti is a small country on the western half of the Caribbean island of Hispaniola, first colonised by the Spanish, then the French who called it Saint-Dominique. Between 1790 and 1804, the country was convulsed in war until the black slaves managed to overthrow their French masters and form their own independent state. As discussed in Chapter 3, the racial dichotomisation inherent in colonialism led Māori to identify as *kiri mangu* (black skin) in contrast to the Pākehā *kiri mā* (white skin). An independent state run by *kiri mangu* was thus an attractive example for the Kingitanga who were attempting to establish their own Māori state. Thus, in 1863 *Te Hokioi* provided a history of Haiti through which it could show Māori that their aspirations were indeed possible. With the suppression of *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* by Ngāti Maniapoto, the task of countering this argument fell upon the principal government newspaper, *Te Karere Maori*, which supplied its own version of Haitian history.

An overview of the Haitian Revolution

Before discussing these rival histories, I will provide a version based upon modern scholarship, and removed from the propaganda aims of promoting or denigrating the Kingitanga. In 1790, Haiti’s population comprised three main groups: whites, totalling some 40,000; mulattoes or people of mixed race, totalling some 35,000, and perhaps half a million black slaves.\(^1\) Despite the legal requirements of slave owners under France’s *Code Noir*, the conditions of slavery on the large plantations were very brutal.\(^2\) Mulattoes were free, and while not possessing political rights, were sometimes very rich, owning their own plantations and slaves.\(^3\)

The fourteen years of unrest in Haiti roughly coincided with the French Revolution, the Directorate, and the rise of Napoleon to the position of Emperor of the

---

3. Ros, pp 22, 25. For example, 10% of mulattoes owned more slaves than the average white planter.
French. The French Revolution produced a political vacuum in which interest groups in Haiti competed for power. A class struggle initially ensued between the republican poor whites and the rich planters who supported the monarchy. Blacks sought freedom while the mulattoes fought for the retention of slavery, full political rights, and if possible, political ascendency for themselves. The British invaded, afraid emancipatory ideas might spill over into their own slave islands, and because of war with the French Republic. The Spanish who controlled the eastern half of the island attempted to regain their former colony, while the actions of the French government vacillated depending on the circumstances.

The principal black leader to emerge was Toussaint Louverture. He initially fought for the Spanish king, but when the French republicans promised freedom for blacks, he turned to their side and defeated the Spanish. He ejected the British, and outmanoeuvred the mulattoes and the French. Although Haiti was still nominally a French possession, Toussaint became its effective ruler, making secret treaties with the British and the USA. When Napoleon sought to reintroduce slavery in 1802, French forces reinvaded Haiti. Toussaint Louverture was recaptured due to French treachery, and deported to France where he died. Once it was clear that the French wished to exterminate all mulattoes and blacks and restock the island with fresh slaves, the blacks and mulattoes combined to defeat them. An independent republic was declared, and all the French remaining in Haiti were massacred.

The subsequent history of Haiti was one of poverty and unstable government under various rulers. In 1825, France coerced Haiti into promising to pay 150 million francs in return for recognising their independence, although only a portion was paid. France also reconsidered another invasion of Haiti in 1840, but turned its attentions to North Africa instead.
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Te Hokioi's history of the Haitian Revolution

It appears unusual that a Māori king, whose authority derived from his exulted whakapapa, would be associated with a slave rebellion. Haiti was not the only state ruled by non-whites in the 1860s: indigenous states existed in Africa, Asia and the Pacific. There was also Liberia, founded in West Africa by former black slaves from America. Haiti's attraction derived from actually contesting with, and winning power from a major white colonial power. The first possible reference to Haiti was in the 15th February, 1863 issue of Te Hokioi in an article entitled “This is a word to Pākehā friends” that argued against lands sales which were causing disruption to Māori society. It concluded with the words, 'look at an island overseas which sought a method for itself of emerging into the world.' The following issue contained “Te Korero o Haiti”. According to this account, Haiti emerged into history on being sighted by Koromu (Columbus). The Spanish who landed were covetous of gold and decided to murder all the indigenous people. In the text, these local people are referred to as both 'taua iwi Māori' (that native race) and 'tau[a] iwi kiri mangu' (that black skinned race) while the Spanish were 'te iwi kiri ma' (the white skinned race). God was unhappy with what the Spanish had done, so sent the French to fight them. The French seized the island, then imported 'nga mangumangu o Awherika' (the blacks of Africa) to work their coffee and sugar cane plantations. ‘So, that people, the French, slept with their slave women, and half-castes came forth.’ Some half-caste children were sent by their fathers to be educated in Europe. On their return, they agitated for the end of slavery. Such was the anger of the French fathers, that some of the children were crucified, others thrown into the sea, yet others torn apart by horses. God saw and heard the sufferings of these people, and 'sent their half-caste children and the Māori to fight the French.' Not only were the blacks identified as “Māori” but they built a pā upon a hill, with their flag flying above it. The French were roused
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133 For example, Tonga, Siam, Japan and Madagascar.
134 Te Hokioi, 24/2/1863:2. ‘He kupu tenei ki nga hoa Pakeha’; ‘...titiro hoki atu iana tetehi motu o tawahi i rapu nei i tetehi ritenga moona kia puta ia ki te ao ka huri.’
135 Te Hokioi, 24/3/1863:1-2. This could be translated as “The story [or history] of Haiti”. When Te Karere Maori rebutted the article it was translated as “Talk about Hayti”.
136 Te Hokioi, 24/3/1863:1. ‘Na, ko taua iwi ko te wiwi ka moe ki o ratou wahine taurekareka, puta ana he Hawhekaihie[.]’
137 Te Hokioi, 24/3/1863:1. ‘...tukua e te Atua ko a ratou takatiki [tamariki] hawhe kaihe me nga maori hei whawhai ki te wiwi.’
to anger, and attacked. The attack was repulsed, but the people were now roused to kill, slaughtering 70,000 French, then proclaiming independence.

In the year 1804, that people announced their idea to the whole world, of their separation from French mana, and their [intention to] stop the practice of land sales, to establish their own policemen, with their statements saying, “Seal off Haiti, lest it fall to that other side. By the lack of blood in our veins [alone] will it be lost.”

Stung by anti-Kingitanga remarks made by its rival, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, the April issue of Te Hokioi again used the Haitian example, this time in its countering argument.

Now that island has law, and its rangatiratanga is secure. Its flags have flown, and the runanga of that place work for the good of their country. The rangatira of Haiti have unified their word; the law is empowered; their many harbours are rich.

In response to Te Pihoihoi’s doubt over whether Tāwhiao could rule successfully as a king, and bring law and order to Māori districts, Te Hokioi replied,

Let the runanga work quietly; wait a little and perhaps the Rangatiratanga of that island will be like that of Haiti: possessing property, authority [mana], law, because we aspire to right side. Perhaps God will protect his black skinned children who are living in Aotearoa.

The most important omission from Te Hokioi’s account of Haitian independence was the political context. France was unstable, due to revolution and foreign wars, and Toussaint Louverture was able to play off at different times the Spanish, the French, the British and the mulattoes. Yellow fever and Haiti’s tropical climate also helped defeat white armies. None of these options were available to Māori. Also omitted was the fact that one third of the population died in the conflict. Neither did independence bring prosperity because the USA, France and Britain, fearing their own slave revolts, restricted trade with, and the political recognition of, Haiti. The large rich plantations were also destroyed, and agriculture went into further decline when the blacks opted for subsistence farming.

138 Te Hokioi, 26/4/1863:2. ‘No te tau 1804, ka panuitia e tau iwi ta ratou whakaaro ki te ae katoa no to ratou wehenga, i te mana wiwi, me ta ratou puru i te tikanga hoko whenua, me te whakatū i a ratou pirihia mana, me ta ratou kupunui, e ki ana: purutia mai ko Haiti: kei makere atu ki te rataha: ma te kore toto o roto o to matou uaua ka riro aii!’

139 Te Hokioi, 26/4/1863:2. ‘Iaianei kua whai ture taua motu kua pumau tona Rangatiratanga, kua tare ona Kara, tenei ano e mahi ana nga runanga o reira mo te pai o to ratou whenua. Ko nga rangatira o Haiti kua whakakotahiia ta ratou kupu; ko te ture kua mana; ko ta ratou wa-apu maha noa iho kua whai moni.’

140 Te Hokioi, 26/4/1863:2. ‘Waiho marire ki a maahi nga runanga, taioha pea ka rite te Rangatiratanga o te motu nei ki to Haiti, whai taonga, whai mana, whai ture, tatemia e tohe ana matou ki te taha tīka, tera pea te Atua e tiakī i ona tamariki kiri mangu, e noho ana ki Aotearoa.’
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Māori political concerns were included in this portrayal of Haitian history as Te Hokioi tried to clearly associate the Haitian situation with that of Māori. There was little distinction between the original indigenous people and the black slaves. Both were described as *kiri mangu* and *māori*. Māori also became God's black skinned children, just like the Haitians. In *Te Hokioi*’s account, no antipathy exists between half-castes and black slaves, although the two groups often fought during the unrest, and suspicion and hatred continued after independence.¹⁴⁵ Unlike Haiti, New Zealand half-castes tended to be incorporated into Māori society and did not form a separate ethnicity.¹⁴⁶

Stopping land sales in order to retain what remained of Māori land, and to prevent the arguments and feuds that land sales produced, was the major issue that held the Kingitanga together. It is not surprising, therefore, that *Te Hokioi* projected this concern into its Haitian history. Although foreigners were denied ownership of land in Haiti, this rule was often ignored or rescinded.¹⁴⁷ The account also claims prosperity and stability for the independent Haiti. However, the *rangatira* and *rūnanga* of Haiti were seldom united. From 1804 to the appearance of *Te Hokioi*’s articles, there had been eleven rulers, all generals. Some were styled as kings or emperors, some were assassinated.¹⁴⁸

Identification was also reinforced by the use of cultural symbols readily known to Māori. The Haitians built a *pā* to entice the French into battle, similar in principle to the modern fighting *pā* developed by Māori to fight the Pākehā.¹⁴⁹ Flags, although not indigenous motifs, were symbols that possessed great significance in New Zealand history, both to Māori and Pākehā.¹⁵⁰ As with the Haitians, the Kingitanga

¹⁴⁵ Ros, pp 106, 109-110; Langley, p 133; Logan, pp 95-96. A bitter “War of Knives” had occurred between mulatto and blacks before 1801, and the two groups did not unite until 1803. As late as 1859, a general order to massacre mulattoes was issued by a black ruler.
¹⁴⁶ “Half-castes” were counted in some New Zealand censuses of the nineteenth century in various ways. For example see D. Ian Poole, *The Māori Population of New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1977) p 237.
¹⁵⁰ For example, Hone Heke provoked the British into war by felling a number of times the flagstaff at Kororāreka which bore the Union Jack. Flags were also significant for both pro and anti-government Māori groups in the nineteenth century.
used flags to rally its adherents, and as symbols of nationhood. Key words used in the accounts, such as rangatira (chief), rangatiratanga (independence), and rūnanga (council), although applicable to non-Māori situations, were all clearly identifiable with Māori society at that time.

In terms of a propaganda exercise, Te Hokioi’s version of Haitian history answered all the worries that Māori readers might possess concerning the very existence of the Kīngitanga. Black slaves had managed to defeat a European power and form their own state. Through unity, they retained their lands, introduced law and order, and acquired wealth and prosperity. God had overseen the whole historical process, first punishing the Spanish, then the French. Just as he had acted for the blacks of Haiti, he would perhaps do the same for the kiri mangu of New Zealand.151

Te Karere Māori’s response

Māori knowledge of events beyond New Zealand’s shores was often filtered through Pākehā sources.152 It is likely that a French priest, Joseph Garavel, provided the information about Haiti to Pātara Te Tuhi, the editor of Te Hokioi,153 and that Pātara’s knowledge was limited to what Garavel was prepared to divulge.154 We
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151 The concept of divine intervention was also transmitted by the Pākehā-run papers, including the government’s Te Karere Māori, which promoted the notion that the end of the world was near, and asserted that all biblical history was factually correct, and that earthquakes were warnings from God. For example, see Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:31-32; 1/3/1855:23-24, 33-36, 45-46; 1/9/1855:13-14; 1/12/1855:3-5.

152 For example, Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikāheke lived in Auckland and was a loyal supporter of the government. He had also been a cultural informant to Grey. Yet, he was unaware of the new friendship between Britain and France until he read it in a Māori language newspaper. See Te Karere Maori, 1/3/1855:18.

153 Garavel was the resident priest at Rangiaohia from 1850, then “vicar forane” (rural dean) of Catholic Māori missions, based around the Waikato area until early 1863. King Tāwhiao respected Garavel, who, according to Simmonds, was considered one of the best Catholic missionaries in New Zealand. Until Bishop Pompallier sent his nephew to Rangiaohia in 1862, the only other Catholic missionary in the Waikato was Michael O’Hara, an Irishman. See E.R. Simmons, Pompallier: Prince of Bishops (Auckland: CPC Publishing, 1984), pp 127, 139, 156, 170-171; Dictionary of New Zealand Biography 1769-1869, pp 143, 350. According to F.J. Moore, Gorst’s brother-in-law, who was living at Te Awamutu until ejected by Ngāti Maniapoto in 1863, Pātara’s articles ‘were inspired by a French priest, who had a long reign of authority in the Waikato district.’ See “The Lonely Sparrow” in Dominion Journal 4/8/1908 (contained in F&J 10, p 121 and F&J 11, p 34, Hocken Library, Dunedin). Garavel’s involvement is also indicated by Te Hokioi’s referencing its principal article about Haiti with the words ‘so says the History of the French about their loss in Haiti’. [‘... e kiana te Hitoria o te wiwi mo to ratou matenga ki Haiti...’] Te Hokioi, 24/3/1863:2.

154 Garavel did act in a partisan manner once war began, first compromising his neutral position by accusing the Anglican priest, Rev. Carl Volkner of being a spy. Garavel also carried a letter from Wiremu Tamihana Tarapipipi to Ōpōtiki calling on the Whakatōhea tribe to rise against the British, although he later denied knowing the letter’s contents. However, Simmons considers that it was unlikely that he did not have some idea of Tamihana’s intentions. Garavel lost favour with Pompallier
cannot be sure whether it was Pātara or Garavel who tailored the material that appeared in *Te Hokioi*’s truncated and distorted version to fit the Kingitanga’s propaganda aims.\(^{155}\) Certainly Māori would not have been particularly knowledgeable on the subject. The Government initially ignored the issue until the 18\(^{th}\) July issue of *Te Karere Maori*, almost four months after the appearance of the main *Te Hokioi* article.\(^ {156}\) Certainly the article was readily available, a translation even being printed in a settler newspaper soon after the article appeared in *Te Hokioi*.\(^ {157}\)

The rejoinder to the initial article was unprecedented, as directly countering Kingitanga rhetoric had been left to the short-lived *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke*. *Te Karere Maori* did not normally respond to the Kingitanga paper, and it failed to mention the Kingitanga paper by name in this extended reply. By the time *Te Karere Maori*’s response appeared, the Government had already sent troops into the Waikato and was now at war with the Kingitanga. As a result, the Government would have known that its counter-propaganda would have virtually no impact in the Waikato. However, by discrediting the original propaganda, it may have been attempting to prevent any potential support developing for the Kingitanga. Perhaps some Māori *kūpapa* may have also questioned the content of *Te Hokioi*’s articles, as *Te Karere Maori* stated that it had given its reply ‘with the wishes of our friends.’\(^ {158}\)

*Te Karere Maori* printed two articles in the issue relating to Haiti, one a brief history of two and a half pages, followed by a much longer article in which the original *Te Hokioi* article is critiqued by “A Voice from Afar”.\(^ {159}\) The initial article is closer to modern accounts of Haitian history detailing the Spanish, then the French occupation of Haiti which followed. It then discussed the years of unrest, stressing the savage nature of the warfare, for example, detailing events in the first year.

‘...soon after, however, war broke out in all its | It was not long, when the dust was raised and war

---

\(^{155}\) Other than the references to Haiti in *Te Hokioi* and *Te Karere Maori*, it does not appear to be mentioned in any other Māori language newspaper. Nor did it not feature significantly in the settler press. Where it did, the black rule of Haiti tended to be disparaged. For example, see *Southern Cross*, 21/6/1859:3.

\(^{156}\) *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* would probably have been a far better vehicle to counter this propaganda, but Ngāti Maniapoto had captured the press, and expelled the editor just before *Te Hokioi*’s main Haiti article.


\(^{158}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 18/7/1863:6. ‘...na nga hoa te hiahia kia taia.’

\(^{159}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 18/7/1863:6-14. “Te Reo o Tawhiti”.
horrors, and no fewer than 10,000 negroes and Mulattos, it is estimated, perished by the sword and famine, in the space of two months, and 2,000 whites were massacred[790].

Again came about. Fearful consequences appeared. More than 10,000 blacks and half-castes died from the sword or hunger in two months, and 2,000 Pākehā died.

While portraying the horrors of war, the article does not dwell on the racial hatred of the killings. There had been a number of murders of Pākehā settlers in the Taranaki area and the newspaper perhaps did not want to encourage the practice. As can be seen in the quotation above, the 2,000 whites were ‘massacred’ in the English text, but merely ‘died’ in the Māori version. The extermination of all the whites on the island in 1804 is not mentioned at all, whereas the article makes clear that many blacks and mulattoes died. The article concluded with the ongoing political instability once black rule was established, and that Haiti was forced to pay an indemnity to France to guarantee its freedom. This first article contains more information than provided by Te Hokioi, and delivered it in a calm and authoritative fashion. Certainly it would have planted doubt in the minds of any Māori who had heard of Te Hokioi’s account of Haiti.

The second article followed on directly after the first. Only once did it address the Kingitanga directly, and did so in the opening paragraph.

Māori people, the King people of New Zealand, with a glad heart do you employ this thing, the parable.

This article was both more figurative and emotive than the first. Using his own metaphors, the writer compares ‘our words’ to ‘clear and bright white glass...which by its purity reveals all that is within it’ to ‘your words’ which is the green glass of bottles which ‘reveals but indistinctly their contents’, or even the calabash which hides all within it. It then stated that some of the Kingitanga’s parables were indeed designed to deceive, ‘like the weights and measures of dishonest traders.’ It warned Māori to be careful about what they read, citing Luke 11.34 for good

---

160 Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:6. ‘Kihai wheau, ka tutu te heihei, ka ara ano te pakanga. Puta ana nga hua whakamataku. Haere ake nga mangumangu, me nga ahikaehe i mate i te hoari i te hemo kai, 10,000, tekaun mano, i nga marama e rua; ko te Pakeha i mate 2,000.’

161 Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:8. ‘E nga tangata Maori, nga tangata Kingi o Nui Tireni,—e hapai ana koutou i runga i te ngakau hari, tenei mea te kupu whakarite.’; ‘O Maoris! kingites of New Zealand, you delight in the use of parables, and love to argue by the aid of fancy and similitudes. [TKM]’

162 Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:8. ‘...a matou nei kupu...te karahi ma kānapanapa...na te marama kehoketo, na te tino piata, i kitea katoaia ai a roto, a waho.’ ‘a koutou korero...te ata kitea te kai o roto.’

163 Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:9. ‘...e penei ana ki nga weeti, me nga mehua o te tihanga e hanga ana hei whakawai, hei whakaware i te kaihoko.’
measure. The opening paragraphs, therefore, before discussing what actually appeared in *Te Hokioi*, had set a scenario where *Te Hokioi* was cast as a deceiver.

The writer then sought to destroy the credibility of the “Talk of Hayti” which was described as “a cunning mixture of the truth with falsehood.”

The writers of that story knew your affection for this type of speech, the parable, and he laid his trap to catch you. And so, he went about searching, his searching went far away to overseas. A person perhaps found that story and gave it to him, and he wove his tale about an island discovered by the Pākehā with Māori upon it, saying the Pākehā killed those Māori, and afterwards took that island.

Despite knowing the truth of that story to be different, the writer gladly made it up. It was not lost to him that the weka answers the voice imitating its own call, likewise that ignorant and thoughtless Māori would say, “That island is the same as New Zealand, the Māori of that place the same as us, and the Pākehā of Spain and France are like the English Pākehā here.”

Having done that, [he] begins to explore the oppression of those Spanish and French upon the people of that island and the rising up of the people of that island from the bad treatment they received, and their emergence.

Not only was *Te Hokioi*’s writer exposed as a liar, but there was also a less than subtle suggestion that a Pākehā must have supplied him with the information.

The *Te Karere Maori* article then turns to the conclusion of *Te Hokioi*’s argument, which details Haiti’s independence, where land sales are forbidden, and police established. Here, *Te Karere Maori* completely rewrites the conclusion, and presents it as a quotation. *Te Hokioi* had written ‘*me ta ratou puru i te tikanga hoko*”

164 Luke 11:34, ‘The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness.’

165 *Te Karere Maori*, 18/7/1863:9. ‘he mea hanga *terra korero*, kotahi wahi pono kotahi wahi teka’.

166 *Te Karere Maori*, 18/7/1863:9-10. ‘Mohiotia ana e nga kniuhuhitu o taua korero ta koutou manaaki ki tenei tu korero, ki te kupu whakarite; a, whakatakotoria ana e ia tona mahanga kia mau ai koutou. No konei, kimikimi haere ana ia; a auatu ki tawhiti te kimihanga. Na te tangata pea te kitinga o taua korero, me te hoatutanga ki a ia, a nana i raranga tana korero, mo tetahi motu i kitea ai e e te pakeha, me nga Maori i tunga, e meatia ana, na te Pakeha i patu aua Maori, muri iho, ka tangohia taua moutere. Ahakoa, i mohiotia e reke ke ana te pono o taua korero whangai marie taua tangata tuituiti, kihai i ngaro i a ia, ko te weka e whakao mai ana ki te reo ina whakaritea ki tona tangi; waihoki, tera i kiia ake e nga Maori kiuere katoa, whakaaro kore hoki.- “E rite ana tena motu ki Nui Tiren, ko nga Maori o ia wahi e rite ana ki a tatou; a, ko nga Pakeha o Paniora o Parani e penei ana me nga Pakeha Ingarihi o konei.”

Ka mutu tera, na, ka timata te rapu mo te mahi pepehi o nga Paniora o nga Parani i nga tangata o taua motu, i te hanga kino kia ratou, me te ohanga o nga tangata o taua motu, me te ratou putanga; ‘The crafty writer knew full well your aptitude and fondness for similitudes, and set his trap accordingly, to catch you by that foolish weakness. He has therefore searched around about, and far, and someone no doubt has found it for him, and he has produced for you a tale, about an island, which had Maories on it, and they were discovered there, and visited by Pakehas. It next describes that these Pakehas oppressed and killed this Māori race, and took possession of their island. However inapplicable for his purpose, the truth of this really is, the crafty writer knew with fullest certainty, that just as every silly weka (Fern hen) immediately answers to the decoyer’s voice so every ignorant and thoughtless Maori would, as an echo, surely say: “That island is like New Zealand, and its Maories are like us, and those Pakehas from Spain and France, are like these English Pakehas here!” He then informs you that these Pakehas from France and Spain, so cruelly continued to oppress the unhappy islanders, (Hayti) that they rose upon their oppressors, and made themselves free.”
whenua, me te whakatu i a ratou pirihi mana’. This could be interpreted as either
‘and their [intention to] stop the practice of land sales, and to establish their
policemen’ or ‘and their [intention to] stop the practice of land sales and
establishment of their policemen’. That the writer noted that it was ‘their [own]
policemen’, and that the Kingitanga had attempted to establish their own judicial
system indicates that the first interpretation is more likely. However, Te Karere
Maori has Te Hokioi saying Haiti ‘hanga ana te ture kia kaua te whenua e hokoa, te
whakaturanga o nga Porihi’, that is, ‘made a law to stop the sale of land and the
establishment of Police’. Needless to say, with the Kingitanga fighting for its
survival and its press no longer operating, it was not in a position to correct the
deliberate misquoting. The supposed ignorant Kingitanga reader, according to Te
Karere Maori, was meant to identify with the statement, saying

Have we not laid down law to stop land being sold? Have we not called out to the whole
world our emergence possessing mana? Have we not called out that the Pakeha judge
and policeman will not be welcome above us.\[LP\] 167

The writer then sought to further destroy any comparison of the two colonised races,
by pointing out the slave status of the black Haitians. Rather ingeniously, he then
asked, having driven out the Pakeha, ‘how could they “put in force regulations
prohibiting the sale of land to them, when there were no Pakehas left to sell land to?”’
He then suggested that the Haitians had established a police system to restrain their
evildoers, ‘as all good Maories ought to do.’ 169

The article then argued that Te Hokioi’s statement that the Spanish had invaded
in the name of Queen Isabella was a deliberate ‘comparison of our noble Queen
Victoria and us’ by omitting ‘that Queen Isabella had a husband named Ferdinand,
who was the King of Spain’. However, it is likely that the Pakeha writing this
critique, if reasonably educated, was aware of the twin Spanish crowns of Castille and
Aragon, and that Isabella, as Queen of Castille had sponsored Columbus on his

167 Te Hokioi, 26/4/1863:2; Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:10. ‘...and putting into force regulations
prohibiting the sale of land, the establishment of police...\[TKM\]’

168 Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:10. ‘...kiahia ianei tatou i whakatakoto ture kia kaua e hokona te
whenua? Kiahia ianei tatou i karanga ki te ao katoa to tatou putanga i runga i te whai mana? Kiahia ianei
tatou i karanga ekore e paingia te kai whakawa Pakeha, me te pirihimana i runga ake i a tatou?'; ‘Have
we not proclaimed to the world our independence? Have we not refused to receive Pakeha magistrates and policemen over us?\[TKM\]’

169 Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:10. ‘...me pehea e takoto ai i a ratou ture kia kaua e hokona te whenua
kua kore noa hoki he Pakeha o taura motu hei hoko whenua.’, ‘Te pera hoki nga Maori whakaaro pai
katoa.’
voyage of discovery. Moreover, to the writer of the article, any comparison to the Spanish was odious to any true Englishman. When ‘idle and wicked Spanish’ found gold, they enslaved the natives of the island and worked them to death, whereas the English ‘dig for it manfully themselves.’

*Te Karere Maori* again rewrote *Te Hokioi’s* passage detailing the cruelty of the French adding yet more gory details. It then asked ‘When did the English seize your children, or crucify you Maories, or throw you into the sea, or tie you between strong horses to tear your bodies asunder?’ Had Te Rauparaha not been treated humanely despite having ‘murdered noble Englishmen’? Had he not been treated like a *kāhā*, once wild but now tamed? Indeed, it suggested ‘you may be thankful the English came and not the French or Spanish.’

The article then listed the succession of Englishmen who had arrived to do good for the Māori. First Captain Cook, who brought a variety of foodstuffs; then English missionaries who saved souls and ended cannibalism; then peaceful English traders, and settlers who ‘show[ed] you how to turn your wilderness into fruitful fields.’ Finally came the governors. Grey had been both a friend and a father to the Māori. He had left them in a prosperous state, but returned to find them poor and hateful towards the government and its laws. Without naming any individuals or groups, blame for this change of heart was laid.

We did not teach you these evil *tikanga*, but there were [other] people who did. They say they are good friends, no; those [people by you] are enemies to us and to you.

Māori were exhorted to return to the fold before it was too late and they lost the goodwill of Pākehā.

The writer then concluded with his own parable, that of the wolf, an animal, he said, that lives in France and Spain.
That animal just goes about in the wilderness and hilltops. What it likes is laziness and stealing his neighbour’s things; the lambs and sheep. So, the owner of those sheep constantly thinks about guarding [them], and has a strong and watchful dog placed to look after those sheep.\[LP\]

It would have been clear to Māori that the government was the sheepowner and Māori rejecting it were deemed to be wolves. One day, a kind dog invites a hungry wolf to join him, and enjoy the food and warmth his master provided. However, enquiring about a mark upon the dog’s neck,

the dog said “That is the sign of my neckpiece because my master ties me up sometimes lest I bite his friends. This is a fault of mine to bite my master’s friends, because I mistakenly think they are enemies, and my teeth are quick to bite.” [LP]\[178\]

Here, the Māori reader would have understood that the collar represented the government’s mana and the laws it wanted Māori to accept. However, the wolf would accept no restraint and returned to its life of idleness and hunger. The article concluded:

what happened to him afterwards wasn’t known. It was that the wolf did not like work and did not want to be friends with people living nearby his haunts. It is thought, he was shot for stealing his neighbour’s sheep, or he died from being mauled by the dog which spoke to him and made friends, or he died incapacitated and starved, the result of its laziness, because that is what he liked, and he did not cherish the things that would improve him.\[LP\]\[179\]

Those who resisted the government could therefore expect war from the government, aided by the settlers and kūpapa Māori, or at the very least to fade away as a people in

\[176\] The wolf and its habits would also have been familiar to Māori through the Bible. See Gen 49:27; Isa 11:6, 65:25; Jer 5:6; Hab 1:8; Zep 3:3; Mat 7:15, 10:16; Luke 10:3; John 10:12; Acts 20:29. Te Haeata had also printed a version of story of the boy who cried “wolf”. Te Haeata, 1/11/1859:4.

\[177\] Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:14. ‘Haereere tonu taut kuri, i roto i te koraha, i roto i te keholeko. Ko tana i pai ai, ko te mangerere, ko te tahae i nga mea o tona hoa, i nga reme, i nga hipi. Na, ko te tangata o aua hipi e mahara tonu ana ki te tiaki, he kuri kaha, he kuri oho re a te tangata ra e whakarite ai hei tiaki ia aua hipi.’; ‘[that animal] which roams in freedom amongst the woods and rocks, and loves to live in idleness and to steal his neighbours lambs and sheep, who is thus compelled to guard his property from the enemy by strong and watchful dogs.’

\[178\] Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:14. ‘Ano ko te kuri “Ko te tohu tena o taku hei, na te mea e herea ana au e tahi rangatira i etahi takiwa kei tahuini au ki te ngau i ona hoa ake. Ko taki hara hoki tenei he ngau i etahi o nga hoa o taku rangatira, ko te mea ia, e moehewa ana au, hua noa he hauriri, koia i tere ai aku niho ki te ngau; “O, there I wear my collar, said the dog, for my master sometimes ties me up, for fear that I may bite his friends, a fault which, I must candidly confess, I have at times, though by mistake, committed.”

\[179\] Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:14. ‘Ko tona peheatanga i muri iho kihai i mohiotia. Ko te mea, kihai ano tawa wuruhi i pai ki te mahi, a kihai i pai kia whakaho ki nga tangata noho atu i paihaki o ona kainga. E whakaroohia ana, i puhia ranei i te tahaetanga o nga hipi o tona hoa, i mate ranei i te ngaungau noataanga a te kuri i korero ra ki a ia, i whakahoar a; i mate ranei i runga i te hawataanga, i te kawenga hiakai, te tukunga iho o ona mangeretanga, na te mea, ko tana tera i pai ai, a, kihai i manakitea [manaakitia] nga mea hei whakanui ake i a ia.’; ‘What became of him is not known, but as he would not work and would not be friendly with his neighbour, it is most probable that he was justly shot whilst stealing his neighbour’s sheep, or, at last, he may in anger, have been worried to death by that very dog who had once been so friendly disposed to wards him; or, perhaps, he may have perished
dearth and poverty. As the government had just begun a war with the Kingitanga, then the reader could have assumed that their “wolf” would soon die violently, or be compelled to wear the dog’s collar.

*Te Karere Maori* thus countered *Te Hokioi*’s identification with Haiti in a complex, if not subtle, manner. It first provided an account of Haitian history which appeared dispassionate in order to render its own arguments more authoritative. However, it was selective in what facts were presented to hide the suffering of the whites. The second article tried to reach Māori on an emotive level, by an extensive use of metaphors which it thought would appeal to Māori. The writer attacked *Te Hokioi* for deliberate deception, by pointing out inconsistencies in its version, although he was prepared to stoop to misquoting the text to strengthen his arguments. Because *Te Hokioi* had attempted to liken the colonising processes experienced by Haitians to those of Māori, *Te Karere Māori*’s ‘Voice from Afar’ sought to contrast it by extolling the virtues of Englishmen compared to the French and Spanish. It then concluded with its own parable of the wolf which represented the savage and wild state of nature, and the farmer and his dog who stood for progress and civilisation. The farmer also is the ‘established’ side of order, while the wolf exemplifies the disorder that Māori had rejected in accepting Christianity. If propaganda has predetermined ends, then *Te Karere Maori* was attempting to eliminate Māori support and sympathy for the Kingitanga, so that Māori would accept governmental authority, and thereby facilitate colonialism. It tried to elicit scorn for the Kingitanga, whilst also inducing a sense of gratification in the government’s Māori friends, and fear in those who opposed it.

**Conclusion**

Each of the Māori language newspapers of the mid-nineteenth century wished to influence the thoughts and behaviour of their Māori readers. Each had its own agenda, whether to facilitate colonisation, to gain Māori acceptance of governmental mana, to revive Māori enthusiasm for religion, or, in the case of the Kingitanga, to bolster its own administration at the expense of the government’s. Thus they can justly be called weapons of propaganda. As the opening quotation of this chapter

"miserably at last, but more quietly, in that idleness and starvation which he loved so well, that it had always prevented him from loving anything that was better."
shows, the newspapers took their role seriously. However, they presented their aims quite openly, and the readership was well aware of the position each newspaper was coming from.

Although some Māori wrote to newspapers run by Pākehā in order to get their own views published, *Te Hokioi*, the mouthpiece of the Kingitanga, was the only newspaper under Māori control. As such, it attempted to garner support for its vision of a Māori state under a Māori king, autonomous from Pākehā authority. The government was the most prolific propagandist because it possessed more money, staff, and easy access to printing presses. Its principal print propaganda vehicle was the newspaper printed by the Native Department as *Te Karere Māori*, and briefly as *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*. It was also responsible for *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke*, and McLean was the driving force behind *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*. Despite the different emphases of the Pākehā-run newspapers, the following chapters will show that there was a uniformity in what they desired: Māori who were Christian, law-abiding, industrious, loyal to the Crown and endeavouring to embrace Pākehā notions of civilisation.

There are a variety of techniques that propagandists can employ in order to persuade their target audience to accept, or internalise, their messages. It is doubtful that the editors and writers of Māori language newspapers applied these techniques with the scientific precision and understanding of twentieth century propagandists, but they were utilised nevertheless. They attempted, at times, to gain empathy by employing the oral language and allusions that Māori were accustomed to. All newspapers appealed to the highest power, God, to lend authority to their voice. They printed letters of endorsement from Māori in the hope that it would induce others also to support their cause. They denigrated individuals and practices they considered offensive, and heaped praise on those they considered worthy. They omitted others’ points of view. Counter propaganda also occurred. Because the Kingitanga stood alone against the tide of Pākehā colonisation, its paper, *Te Hokioi*, sought to counter the political themes found in the Pākehā-run papers, notably the promotion of governmental authority and landsales. In its turn, the government established *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* with the express purpose of diminishing the propaganda success of *Te Hokioi*, and with its demise, also used *Te Karere Maori* to attack the Kingitanga. It is the use of these techniques, and the desire to change Māori actions
and thinking, that show that the Māori language newspapers were not journals merely for opinion, but were indeed weapons of propaganda.
Chapter 5: Law

Introduction

Friends, let us now direct our talk onto the Pākehā laws.¹

Chapter 2 investigated the nature of the terminology in which the discourse of civilisation was expressed by Māori and Pākehā. The “civilisation” presented by the newspapers was a set of Pākehā customs, ngā ritenga pai o te Pākehā (the good customs of the Pākehā) that Māori were expected to strive for. This chapter explores the promotion within the Māori language newspapers, of the most important of these “customs”, law and order. By investigating the phenomenon of the earlier conversion to Christianity, this chapter will show how religious ideas underpinned not just the delivery of the civilising messages, especially law, in the Māori language newspapers, but also the nature of the Māori response. The following chapter looks at the other ritenga pai that were promoted to Māori.

When Māori and Europeans first made contact, the cultural differences they encountered in each other were profound. Some early Europeans, such as beachcombers or traders, who settled among the Māori, had to accommodate their behaviour to fit in with their Māori hosts in order to survive, becoming what were known as “Pakeha Maori”.² Of course missionaries and later government officials also needed to be aware of Māori sensitivities to render their activities successful. However, they were expressly concerned with changing Māori, that is, encouraging Māori to modify the way they lived their lives by abandoning Māori usages and adopting what the missionaries considered to be more civilised’ behaviour. As Te Karere Maori told Maori, ‘the missionaries went to work, and they tamed [the Māori], and they became tame’: the government was merely continuing this work.³

Māori used the terms tikanga or ritenga to define the actions and behaviour of people, both of which translate as “custom”, and seem to have been used

---

¹ Te Karere o Poneke, 26/11/1857:2. ‘E hoa ma, me whakahaere to matou korero inaianei ki runga i nga Ture Pakeha.’
² Frederick Edward Maning, Old New Zealand: a Tale of the Good Old Times; and a History of the War in the North against the Chief Heke, in the Year 1845. (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1887; reprint, Auckland: Golden Press, 1973) p 5. Maning also describes himself as a “Pakeha Maori”.
³ Te Karere Maori, 18/7/1863:15. ...ka mahi nga Mihinare, ka whakararatanatia e ratou, ka rarata.”; ‘The Missionaries went to work, and they turned the inhabitants, so that they became docile’.
interchangeably at that time. Behaviours which were considered to be exclusive to Māori were termed *tikanga Māori*. As indicated in Chapter 2, the word *māori* was also used to describe negative human attributes, so *tikanga māori* could also include activities considered contrary to more ‘civilised’ European conduct. Māori were expected to abandon these *tikanga*, and adopt European modes of living. These were often termed ‘*nga ritenga pai o te Pakeha*’. As will be seen, this was a wide ranging set of Pākehā cultural and institutional activities regarding law, religion, politics, land use, commerce and personal habits. However, these Pākehā *ritenga* formed a cohesive set, partly due to their shared alien contrast to pre-contact equivalents in Māori culture, and partly due to conscious linkages that their promoters made between them.

**Ideas of progress**

Although Britons of the Victorian era had various opinions about how and why, there was a general consensus that with the passage of time, human progress was moving towards a purposeful goal. They saw themselves and their civilisation at the cutting edge of this progression. Until the 1860s, many people accepted the Biblical account of creation as historical fact, and that progress was an unfolding of God’s plans. This view of history was presented to Māori, for example, in the 1853 calendar printed by the CMS which contained a historical timeline for the world with creation dating from 4000 BC. While some Europeans saw the various ‘non-civilised’ peoples of the world merely at an arrested position on the ladder of

---

4 According to Royal, ‘*he tikanga tētēhi māhi... e tika ana tērā māhi i raro i tētēhi kaupapa*’ (a *tikanga* is an activity that is *tika* under a particular *kaupapa* [plan, scheme, proposal, policy] [LP]). See Ahukaramu Charles Royal, ‘Te Ao Mārama, The Māori World View’ in *Tū mai* (December, 1999), p 30. *Tikanga*, which is popularly used today, derives from the adjective *tika*, meaning “correct”, “just”, “right”. *Ritenga* comes from *rite*, meaning “resembling”, “equal”, “arranged”, “completed”. This implies that *ritenga* could be existing practices, that may not, in fact, be *tika*, although the two terms appear to have been used as synonyms for ‘custom’. According to Manuka Hēnare, *tikanga* are principles, and *ritenga* are the practices derived from *tikanga*, but this may be a modern interpretation. See M. Henare, “*Nga Tikanga me nga Ritenga o te Ao Maori: Standards and Foundations of Maori Society*” in The April Report: Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, Vol III, Part One (Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988) p 27.

5 Bowler, pp 3, 7-10.

6 Bowler, pp 13, 18.

7 Bowler, pp 31, 50-51, 55, 76-78.

8 *He Maramataka* (Auckland: St. Johns College, 1853), p 15. This was based on the reckonings of James Ussher (1581-1656), the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh, which ‘established the first day of creation as Sunday 23 October 4004 BC’. His chronology ‘was incorporated into an authorized version
civilisation, the accepted biblical view was that primitive societies had in fact regressed due to losing God’s grace. Europeans considered themselves to be highest on the ladder of progress, but other races were able to move upwards when exposed to civilising influences and divine revelation.

According to Peter Bowler, these assumptions were shaken by the Indian Mutiny of 1857-58 when Indians, to whom the British were revealing the advantages of their civilisation, rejected it with some ferocity. The British, in an attempt to understand the situation, attributed the Indian intransigence to the limiting effects of native culture. From this mid-century period also, due to emerging scientific theories in geology, archaeology, anthropology, and evolution many educated people started to doubt the Biblical account of creation and the unity of man. These theories coupled with a nationalistic self-confidence allowed many Britons to develop a belief in their own racial superiority. However, the excesses of racial theory are less evident in this research period than later, such as the turn of the century when educated Māori intellectuals had internalised these beliefs, claiming the position of ‘the most rangatira race of all the native races’ for Māori.

The “civilisation” discourse took place between Māori and the colonial institutions in this intellectual environment, changing from the view that natives merely needed to be exposed to “civilisation” in order to progress, to the idea that their existing culture was in fact a brake to such progress. As indicated in Chapter 2, an ideological dichotomisation of the races, of the rangatira European older brother and tūtiūa native younger brother, occurred in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand. This was tempered somewhat by the Treaty of Waitangi, which nominally gave Māori the full rights of British citizens, and the government policy of he iwi kotahi. However, the Māori culture was deemed to be inferior to that of Pākehā and the civilising discourse was centred on closing this cultural gap.

---


9 Bowler, pp 31, 51.

10 Bowler, pp 32-33.

11 Bowler, pp 59-60, 107-111.

12 Te Pipiwharauroa, 8/1900: 5, ‘...ko te iwi Maori te iwi rangatira atu o ngā iwi maori katoa.’; See L. Paterson, “Ngā Tangi a te Pipi” (400 level dissertation, University of Otago, 1999) pp 16-23.
The metaphor of conversion.

The goal of Pākehā involved in disseminating the message of civilisation was to convince and encourage Māori to reject traditional practices and adopt European ways. Yvonne Sutherland, in her MA thesis on Buddle's newspaper, *Te Haeata*, describes the process as one of 'conversion'. *Te Haeata* was a Wesleyan newspaper so its primary focus was religious, in particular, to reinvigorate Māori passion for religion. Sutherland also uses the metaphor of conversion with regard to the cultural and political messages that the newspaper was promoting. However, although she acknowledges the various Māori correspondents to the paper, her thesis primarily stresses the transmission of information from Buddle and fellow missionaries which 'orientated Māori to the world which interested Europeans.' Her thesis therefore reflects the essentially uni-directional nature of conversion found in *Te Haeata*. Of its approximately 260 items in its 144 pages, about 20 letters, mostly short, came from Māori, a proportion far lower than some other papers. Of the Māori contribution to *Te Haeata*, a quarter were direct exhortations on moral or religious issues, and others, such as obituaries and general news, or letters on political issues, also tended to employ the religious language of the day. For *Te Haeata*, however, conversion was principally a process driven by Pākehā.

The model of religious conversion

Conversion is in fact a suitable model in which to explore ngā ritenga pai, as there are clear parallels between the process of Māori religious conversion, and how Māori experienced other aspects of European culture. Law was the most significant of the ritenga, having both political and cultural implications, and provides ample examples for comparison with the religious conversion experience. This will also

---

13 Sutherland (1999), p 92.
14 Sutherland (1999), p 3, passim.
15 Sutherland (1999), p 45, 60.
16 The use of transliterated “Christian” names by Māori without their indigenous names, the use of pseudonyms, and the transliteration of the names of Pākehā makes a definite figure
17 *Te Haeata* certainly provided less of a forum for Māori opinion than the other prolific Māori language newspapers of the time. Buller's *Te Karere o Poneke* (233 pages) pages contained about 500 items, of which about half were letters from Māori. Of the government's *Te Karere Maru/Te Māumahari Tuarangi* (1127 pages, 1855-1863) more than a sixth of items (although not of space) were Māori letters, not including the 218 pages devoted to the mainly Māori speeches of the Kohimarama Conference in 1860. Although *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri* was in its infancy in 1863, of its 58 items which fall within this research period, about a quarter were letters from Māori.
show that Māori were not passive in their engagement with European culture, but in fact actively participated in the process.

Various ideas have been offered on why Māori converted to Christianity in large numbers from the late 1820s: that Māori society suffered a ‘fatal impact’ in encountering European culture which made their traditional beliefs invalid; that the desire to learn the “magic” of writing drew them towards the missionary teachings; that certain disadvantaged groups used the new religion as a way of gaining influence; that Māori ‘converted conversion’ by creating a Māori Christianity, in the same way they adapted to the market economy; that missionaries were useful and a source of mana for Māori tribes; that conversion to Christianity allowed Māori to discard traditional attitudes to warfare which had escalated with new Pākehā weapons; or that Māori came to genuinely understand the concept of sin. However, no one single cause for conversion is likely to be universal because the personalities of individual missionaries could be crucial, and in the two decades that it took Christianity to become almost universally established over the whole country, conditions varied greatly not only in different locations, but also over time. For this discussion, I am less concerned with why Māori converted, and more with how.

Pre-contact religious attitudes

The traditional Maori world view possessed physical and spiritual domains which were not separated but fused together with few boundaries between natural and supernatural phenomena. As Te Rangi Hiroa stated, ‘Religion was so interwoven with social and material matters that the priests were absolutely necessary to the
proper functioning of Maori society.\textsuperscript{21} Maori life was regulated by the concepts of \textit{mana}, the numinous authority of chiefs, and \textit{tapu}, restrictions affecting individuals and human activity. Both \textit{mana} and \textit{tapu} emanated from divine sources, and the observance of \textit{tapu} ensured the physical and spiritual well being of M\o\-ori people, their society and resources.\textsuperscript{22}

However, the supernatural elements that M\o\-ori had to contend with were often fraught with dangers which manifested themselves in physical form. Physical ill health was generally seen as a failure to observe \textit{tikanga}, as transgressing \textit{tapu}, or as \textit{m\=akutu} - witchcraft.\textsuperscript{23} M\o\-ori guarded their wellbeing by observing \textit{tikanga} (correct behaviour) that is, by observing \textit{tapu}, and by \textit{karakia} (incantations) and rituals which were strictly adhered to lest the hapless practitioner be punished by the deity to whom he had appealed.\textsuperscript{24} At times, when encountering a \textit{hara} (offense, \textit{tapu} violation) M\o\-ori might require \textit{utu} (compensation, revenge, restoration) to maintain a state of \textit{ea} (psychic equilibrium).

There was a unity of spiritual and material elements in traditional M\o\-ori society, with a strict, legalistic adherence to form in order to maintain spiritual and physical well-being. Of course, M\o\-ori life was ordered by human reciprocal relations, but religion fulfilled some of the roles of law as understood in the West.\textsuperscript{25} The Christianity missionaries introduced was not dissimilar: it was promulgated through a set of rules to live by, under a God actively involved in human affairs, who could punish sinners now or at a later Judgement Day. M\o\-ori converts accepted and adapted this Western religious system of regulating human behaviour, but their understanding of it was heavily influenced by their previous beliefs.\textsuperscript{26}

Characteristics of religious conversion

M\o\-ori conversion to Christianity was characterised by a number of features. Of course, it originated from missionary agency, but religion, along with other aspects of P\=akeh\=a knowledge, such as literacy, was initially spread from the missions into more

\textsuperscript{21} Te Rangi Hiroa, \textit{The Coming of the Maori} (Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1952) p 476.

\textsuperscript{22} Irwin, p 58.

\textsuperscript{23} Te Rangi Hiroa, pp 404-6, 408.

\textsuperscript{24} Te Rangi Hiroa, pp 489-504.


\textsuperscript{26} Irwin, p 57.
distant regions by enthusiastic Māori themselves, and established missionaries were aided by a considerable number of Māori teachers. Some of these individuals included chiefs who sought to enhance their mana through association, and even ex-slaves who also sought to lift their social standing.\(^{27}\)

Christianity was not seen just in terms of abstract faith by either Māori or missionaries but was, like traditional spirituality, tied to daily behaviour. It involved a set of rules, tikanga, or ture (laws). For example, when the Ngāti Haua chief and later kingmaker, Wiremu Tamihana, established a Christian village, his code of conduct was heavily based on the Ten Commandments.\(^{28}\) Living as a Christian also included abandoning practices now considered obnoxious, such as polygamy and cannibalism.\(^{29}\) Christian chiefs often led the way. As Lange notes, ‘[I]ntegrating Christian religious authority into the existing structure of local leadership...had practical advantages for the missions and their advance, as well as being consistent with traditional Māori understandings of power.’\(^{30}\)

With a desire to live according to God’s laws, Christian groups often formed new villages, separate from heathen relatives.\(^{31}\) However, these ture were often interpreted by Māori in accordance with their own cultural understanding,\(^{32}\) which was probably not helped by the missionary use of Māori terms, such as tapu, to define biblical concepts. Some of these rules were subtly ignored or adapted, yet with others, including extreme interpretations of scripture, the prescribed form was rigidly followed, often to the chagrin of missionaries.\(^{33}\) This strict adherence to form often caused missionaries to doubt that the adherence of Māori to Christian belief was truly heart-felt and transforming.\(^{34}\) As Canon Stack put it, ‘with a strict conformity to the outward observances of religion there is little real spirituality of mind.’\(^{35}\) As the newspapers told Māori, they needed to be sincere and their faith should be in the heart, and not just on the lips.\(^{36}\) Māori religious enthusiasm was sometimes fleeting,

\(^{27}\) Lange, pp 281-287.
\(^{29}\) Ward, p 14.
\(^{30}\) Lange, p 288.
\(^{31}\) *AJHR* 1860, E1C, p 22.
\(^{32}\) Owens (1983), p 45.
\(^{33}\) Owens (1983), p 36.
\(^{34}\) Ward (1997), p 22.
\(^{36}\) For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855:32; 1/11/1855: 15; *Te Haeta*, 1/12/1859:2
leading not only missionaries but also newspapers, to complain about backsliding.\textsuperscript{37} At times indigenous syncretic or adaptive religious movements, the “prophet movements”, emerged as Māori, disenchanted with Pākehā and missionaries, sought to interpret God’s word for themselves. However, the most significant of these movements arose in response to war and land loss and occur later, outside of this research period.\textsuperscript{38}

Genuine faith cannot be discounted. However, the conversion of Maori was informed by their traditional world view, where ritual and belief were concerned with efficacy in terms of providing spiritual and physical protection, and with regulating social life. Christianity offered ‘ora’ (life, well-being) and ‘oranga tonutanga’ (everlasting life). That Māori believed that Christianity would provide succour to both body and soul, and models for social behaviour in the modern world, is both a logical and likely reason for Māori conversion.

In 1840, under the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori became British subjects, at least in name. Increased Pākehā immigration led to increased trade possibilities, but also challenged the now Christianised Māori world view. The benefits Māori thought would accrue from Christianity did not appear to be materialising: they often followed the missionary strictures more closely than their Pākehā neighbours, but Pākehā seemed to be richer, less prone to disease, more knowledgeable and more secure in terms of body, soul and property. Many, over time, came to the conclusion that they needed to turn to what both the government and missionaries were now promoting – ngā ritenga pai o te Pākehā. Of course these customs included religious beliefs, but also encompassed education, commerce, the individualisation of tribal land, personal habits, clothing and housing. One of the most significant aspects of these ritenga was Te Ture, the rule of law.

Therefore, if temporal answers were not met (wealth, health, knowledge), then the spiritual message must be called into account to some extent.\textsuperscript{39} According to Parsonson, this sort of disappointment in the results of conversion in Polynesia lead to an almost universal, although in most cases temporary, rejection of the missionary

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{37} For example, see Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:5-6; 1/12/1855:14; Te Karere o Poneke 19/4/1858:4; Te Haeata, 1/3/1862:3.
\item\textsuperscript{38} These are detailed in Bronwyn Elsmore, \textit{Mana from Heaven: A Century of Maori Prophets in New Zealand} (Auckland: Reed Publishing, 1999), pp 3-136.
\item\textsuperscript{39} Ward (1997), p 87.
\end{itemize}
message. Protestant missionaries in New Zealand were certainly concerned with falling attendance and increasing worldliness among Māori. Maori responses varied: some turned to Catholicism, which was deemed to be less close to governmental structures; some turned to traditional beliefs; some incorporated the more temporal European ritenga. For those tribes who saw or sought benefit in being closely allied to Government, the acceptance of law and other ritenga was a good option. As seen below, such an acceptance was not done at the expense of Christianity, but rather as an addition to their new religious world view.

Te Ture
The conscious linking of law and religion

Ward suggests that ‘[t]here was inevitably some confusion of church and state law in Maori eyes, especially as the state system of justice was represented as based on Christian principles.’ This assessment perhaps overstates the ‘confusion’ while minimising the ‘representation’. Religious imagery and modes of conceptualisation informed the Māori world view of the mid-nineteenth century. However, Māori made a fairly logical interpretation of the available information as government officials and missionaries presented the material in a way that they knew would appeal to Māori religious understanding.

Māori also saw church and state operating together: the early officials and missionaries worked together, and sons of missionaries, such as Walter Buller, found government employment. Certainly the messages that Māori received from the Māori language newspapers, both governmental and evangelical, strongly linked the Queen and her law with religion. In 1858, a book of laws was prepared and distributed to chiefs and assessors, and extensive excerpts were printed in Te Karere o Poneke. The book was also available to other Māori at the cost of 10/6. As seen in the introduction, this law book explicitly stated the link between Law and Religion.

41 For example see Te Haeata, 1/2/1861:3; Te Karere Maori, 31/5/1856:5-9; 31/10/1859:5-6.
42 Ward (1997), p 76. See also Paora Tūhāere’s words in Te Wananga 29/9/1877:374.
43 Sir William Martin’s friendship and collaboration with Bishop Selwyn is one example. See Guy Leonard, Sir William Martin: The Life of the First Chief Justice of New Zealand (Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1961), pp 59, 63, 81, 89.
44 For example, see Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1856:3; 31/10/1859: 4; 31/3/1860:1-5; 20/8/1862: Te Karere o Poneke, 20/9/1858:2; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/4/1861: 2; 2/9/1861:3-5; 15/10/1861:1-2.
45 The book was also available to other Māori at the cost of 10/6. See Te Karere Maori, 16/8/1858:1.
Whether the Law be Human or Divine, it ought to have the same fountain, that is, GOD. Divine Law was revealed by God Himself; and good Human Law is built up by man upon Divine Law.[source]

The two laws were presented as progressive events: the missionaries brought God’s law, and this was followed by the Queen’s Law. The Governor even claimed to be presenting law to Māori for their consideration in the same way that missionaries had revealed the Gospel. As indicated in Chapter 3, the promoters did not expect Māori to fully understand the details. Instead, Te Karere Maori used the metaphor of the sailing ship – Māori did not understand all its workings at first, but could still see its value. Law, it stated, was like Christianity and was being presented as a gift rather than an imposition. The 1858 law book also illustrated some of its discussions on law with Old Testament quotes, particularly from Deuteronomy. The law was also shown to be efficacious, to be ‘this upright law, through which England grew, became great and civilised, and its people came to live in peace, health, and wealth.’

The Māori language newspapers reinforced these messages. Law, like religion, was presented as a voluntary option.

However, do not think that it is the Governor’s thought to impose these, the Laws, on places where the people don’t desire them. The Governor does not think like that. But it is like the giving of Christianity by the missionaries, which were given for the Māori tribes to take up, or push away. It was up to them. Likewise, this is the second of the great treasures the Piikeha has brought here, and displayed for them to take hold of or to reject.

This “offering” of law would not have appeared unusual to Māori as it reflected previous governmental practice. The Native Exemption Ordinance of 1844 had not

---

46 Ko ngā Ture o Ingarani: The Laws of England (Auckland, 1858) p i. ‘Ahakoa Ture ATUA, Ture tangata ranei, kia kotahi ano tona take, ko te ATUA ano. Ko te Ture ATUA, he mea whakaatu mai na Te ATUA: ko te Ture tangata i pai, he mea hanga e te tangata ki runga ki te Ture ATUA.’


48 Compare also McLean’s explanation of a truncated legal system for ‘those tribes who have not yet been accustomed to the administration of English law.... Some of the chiefs have expressed a wish that there should be but one law. This is much to be desired by all but is not so easily attained. A child does not grow to man’s estate in a day.’ See, Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:8.

49 Te Karere Maori, 16/8/1858:1-3.

50 Ko ngā Ture o Ingarani, p ii. ‘...tenei Ture tika, nana a Ingarani i tupu ai, i nui ai, i rangatira ai, i whiwhi ai tona Iwi ki te pai, ki te ora, ki te rawa, e noho nei.’

51 Te Karere Maori, 16/8/1858:2-3. ‘Otira, aua e meinga, he whakaaro to te Kawana kia hapaina enei nga Ture ki runga ki nga wahi kahore e matenuitia e ona tangata. Kahore a Te Kawana whakaaro para. Erangi, he mea pera me te homaitanga o te Whakapono e nga Mihinare; homai ana hei tango ma nga Iwi Maori, he i ketu ranei, nana te whakaaro. Waihoki ko tenei, ko te rua o nga taonga nui a te Pakeha i kawe mai ai, ka whakaaria nei hei kapo mai mana, he i whakaparaha mai ranei.;’ ‘It must not, however, be supposed that it is the intention or wish of the Governor to enforce these Laws where they people do not desire it. As they were left free to receive or reject Christianity offered them by the
only exempted Māori from many penalties, but gave chiefs much of the responsibility for ensuring cases came before the courts, and Grey’s more pro-active Resident Magistrates Ordinance 1847 was largely ineffective. It was clear to Māori that successive governments were unwilling to enforce the law in Māori districts, for example, by suppressing feuding and murder. Indeed, when feuding over land was getting out of hand in Taranaki in 1858 – events which helped fuel the first Taranaki War – Governor Browne issued a proclamation stating that he would not interfere unless the fighting spilled over into Pākehā owned land.

According to the Māori language newspapers, the ultimate penalties for hara were the responsibility of God, whose powers were couched in human institutional terms: ‘Jehovah is the Governor of the whole world.’ He was also ‘Te Kaiwhakawha’ (The Judge) whom Māori would meet on ‘te ra whakawa’ (Judgement Day). God as Judge was a common theme in the Wesleyan newspaper Te Haeata, but also appeared in the government’s Te Karere Maori. Grey himself informed Māori he would not act unjustly, saying ‘but how would I be on the judgement day...?’

The newspapers told Māori that Law was based on Christianity, but also linked the exercise of that law to a notion of divine sanction: not only did the Queen also possess a divine right to rule, but God had also given India to Englishmen to run, and had also appointed them as ‘guides’ to the Māori people. Indeed, European colonisation was even portrayed as fulfilling Biblical prophesy of Japheth dwelling in the tents of Shem.

Shem was the source of the Jews, of the people whom God had chosen, and to whom he was well affectioned: hence the saying, “The God of Shem.” Shem was also the ancestor of the races of Asia, that is of the land to the eastward of Canaan. Now Japheth (the men

Missionaries, so they are now free to accept or refuse this second boon. See also Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1857:2; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/10/1861:1-3.


53 See Ward, pp 82-83, 110.

54 Te Karere Maori, 15/2/1858:1-4; Te Karere o Poneke, 29/3/1858:2. See Chapter 7.

55 Te Haeata, 1/3/1862:3 ‘Ko Ihowa ra te Kawana o te ao katoa.’

56 Te Haeata, 1/8/1861:2

57 Te Haeata. 1/10/1860:1, 4; 1/11/1860:1; 1/12/1860:2; 1/8/1861:4; 1/3/1861:3.

58 Te Karere Maori, 1/1/1855:9; 5/2/1862:8; 20/4/1863:16.

59 Te Karere Maori, 5/2/1862:10, ‘Ka pehea koia au a te ra whakawa...?’

60 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1855:1; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/10/1861:3-4.

61 Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1858:2; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/10/1861:6; Te Haeata, 1/1/1862:4.
of Europe) has dwelt in his tents ... for the men of Europe abide in many of his kaingas, which have been taken by them.62

The efficacy of Law

The newspapers portrayed the rule of Law as efficacious for human development, and that England had become great through its adoption.63 According to McHugh, English contemporaries saw the law as having evolved to a point of perfection and ‘Englishmen thought of themselves as being in something of a constitutional Promised Land.’64 An extensive article in Te Manuhiri Tuarangi gave a history of England before and after the advent of Law which Māori were to compare to their own state. The people of England were insecure, illiterate, poor, hungry and diseased when living without Law. However, like the House of Israel, the Law was now written in the hearts of Englishmen.65 Their population had multiplied, and the Queen now had many powerful warships.

These are some of the blessings bestowed by our Almighty Father to his children who obey rongo him, and he will be just as kind to all peoples who wish to listen to his Laws. When the law of God is empowered, man listens to the good laws established by the sages in accord with what they thought in olden days, because those are blessings for us, as the pathway of these laws proceeds along the Laws of God.66

These blessings were available to Māori. Indeed the Queen was sad that Māori had not yet availed themselves of the law: she only desired that Māori have security of their material goods and ‘possess the benefits in the law and living justly, so that all men may live, lest they die, lest their bodies be abused’.67 Just as Christianity had allowed Māori to ora (live), they could now also ora through the rule of law.

62 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 2/9/1861:10. ‘Ko Hema te pu o nga Hurai, o ta te Atua iwi i whirihirihia i, i pai ai; no reira taua kupu nei “Te Atua o Hema” Ko Hema ano hoki te tupuna o nga iwi o Ahia, ara o tera whenua i te taha ki te rawhiti o Kanaana. Na kua noho a Hapeta (nga tangata o Uropi) ki ona teneti ... he maha nei hoki ona kainga kua nohoia nei e nga tangata o Uropi, kua riro mai hoki ki a ratou.’ See Gen 9:27.

63 Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1856:3; Te Karere o Poneke, 13/9/1858:2.


65 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 2/9/1861:1-5. This metaphor derives from Hebrews 8:10.

66 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 2/9/1861:4. ‘Ko etahi enei o nga painga ka ata tukua mai e te matou matua kaha rawa ki ana tamariki e rongo ana ki a ia; a ka pera ano tona atawhai ki ngā iwi katoa e hiahia ana ki te whakarongo ki ona Ture. I roto i te whakamananga o te ture o te Atua, ka whakarongo te tangata ki nga ture pai i whakaturia e te hunga to- hunga ki te whakaaro o namata, no te mea hoki, he painga era mo tatou, ta te mea, ko te huarahi o enei ture e haere ana i runga i ngā Ture o te Atua.’; ‘These are some of the blessings granted by our Almighty Father to his obedient children, and he will be equally gracious to all others who obey his will and in so doing obey laws made by wise men in the old days for our good, which, are never in opposition to the Law of God.’

67 Te Karere Maori, 16/12/1861:12. ‘...kia whiwhi ki te pai i roto i te Ture i te noho tika, kia ora ai nga tangata katoa, kei mate, kei whakakononga tona tinana...’; ‘...should have the benefits of law and order; that the lives and persons of all men should be safe from destruction and injury...’
Divine consequences of rejecting Law

With law, government and the Queen so closely linked with God, it was natural that any resistance to the Queen’s law would be seen also as resistance to God’s will. This message was heavily promoted during the first Taranaki War in 1860 by Te Haeata. While some Anglican clergy were, at this stage, prepared to endorse Te Rangitāke’s rights in Waitara, and to criticise Governor Browne’s precipitous actions, the Wesleyan clergy threw their support behind the Governor. Te Haeata stressed God’s role of judge, along with the notion that fighting the Crown was a sin against God. The newspaper also suggested that resistance was futile as God had the ability to deflect bullets from their target, which was perhaps the origin of a similar Pai Mārire belief a few years later.

The government newspapers were a little less strident in invoking the divine wrath upon Māori. However, failure to accept the law and do as God wanted would bring punishment, or as Te Karere Maori quoted ‘[t]he Lord maketh a fruitful land barrenness for the wickedness of them that dwell therein.’ The Kingitanga was also presented as standing against God’s will. Te Karere Maori, in an extended article on the movement, made a clear link to the poor decision of the Jews in electing Saul as their King.

And so their wish was allowed to happen. Saul was made king. From that their misfortune began because that was a course of insubordination to Jehovah, the King of Israel. Now let us compare this with the Māori. The article then listed the benefits of the Queen’s government. To the suggestion that Māori should have their own King:

So we say this is an assumption of superiority. According to the Scriptures “No man can serve two masters,” and the “house divided will not stand.”

68 Te Haeata, 1/10/1860:1, 4; 1/11/1860:1; 1/12/1860:2; 1/8/1861:4; 1/3/1861:3.
69 Te Haeata, 1/4/1860:1; 1/5/1860:1; 1/12/1860:4; 1/1/1861:1, 2; 1/5/1861:4; 1/6/1861:1; 1/7/1861:1; 1/8/1861:1; see also Ko Aotearoa, 1861:15.
70 Te Haeata, 1/3/1862:3.
71 See Elsmore, p 176.
72 Te Karere Maori, 31/5/1856:4; ‘A ka whakaururutia e Ihowa te whenua hei utu mo te kino o te tangata i noho i runga.’ See Ps 103:34.
73 Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1860:2. ‘Heoi ra, tukua ana to ratou hiahi kia puta. Na, whakakingitia ana, ko Haora. No reira hoki i timata ai to ratou mate, no te mea he tikanga tutu tera ki a Ihowa, te Kingi o Iharaira. Na, me whakarite tenel ki nga Maori.’; ‘Well, their request was granted, and Saul was made King. From that time on began their sorrow. It was a spirit of rebellion against JEHOVAH. Let us apply this to the Maories.’
74 Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1860:2-3. ‘Koia matou i mea ai he whakakake tenei. Ki ta te Karaitiurere, “E kore hoki e pono te mahi ki ngā rangatira tokorua,” me te “whare hoki ka wahia e kore ia e tu.”’; ‘This
The Jews had rebelled by choosing a King to rule in the place of God. By implication, the Māori had rebelled by choosing a Māori King in the place of the English Queen. By inference, the Māori King was the lesser temporal power in contrast with the divine Victoria/God. Indeed, a disapproving God had caused the demise of Pōtatau, the first Māori King.

Their king was established, then heaven's power took action and that king was removed.75

In a similar vein, Gorst's *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* published an anti-Kingitanga letter from “Whakaaro Na Mohio”. This writer, most probably a Pākehā, portrayed the Queen and King as Manichean opposites, even linking them to the eternal struggle with the words ‘Satan divides, Christ unifies’.76

It is therefore clear that the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers, when promulgating their messages concerning law and religion, were prepared to do more than merely suggest that law was based on Christian principles. Law was presented as religion had been: it possessed its own book, as well as supplementary tracts in the form of newspaper articles,77 individuals or tribes had free will to accept it into their lives and receive subsequent benefit, but would suffer God’s wrath if they chose not to. Direct links and less than subtle inferences also made it plain that it was the Queen’s law, rather than any that Māori might develop, which would receive this divine favour.

The Māori Response

By the mid-nineteenth century, Māori were deeply influenced by Christianity. This was not merely that they thought religious thoughts, but that religious language coloured how they saw the world. They were not only familiar with biblical exemplars and imagery, but with an absence of contemporary terms, transferred the

———

75 Te Karere Maori, 30/6/1860:7. ‘Tu ana tana kingi—nawai a, ka whai tikanga to runga atu kaha, riro ana tua kingi!’; ‘They made themselves a King—a higher power interfered and took him from them.’


77 Prior to the 1858 law book, the Chief Justice, Sir William Martin, at the request of Governor Fitzroy, produced *Ko nga tikanga a te Pakeha* (Auckland: 1858), a set of instructions on English laws and customs. *Te Karere Maori* also published accounts of trials, partly to instruct Māori, partly to justify decisions which Māori might have resented. For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 1/5/1855:1-11; 31/1/1856:1-4; 29/2/1856:4-15; 14/4/1862:4-9. There was also extensive publication of an arbitration case between two hapū, described as a whakawā (trial) over which Grey presided.
biblical lexicon onto the contemporary political situation. This meant that acceptance of law and other *tikanga* required a form of conversion, which formed an extension to their earlier acceptance of Christianity.

Many Māori considered that the Queen, and through her the governor, were directly responsible for the arrival of missionaries and the spread of the Gospel. The advent of religion, then law, was seen by some as a natural progression which would lead onto wealth and civilisation. Hoani Meihana Te Pohoi of Manawatu expressed this progression through Māori metaphor.

So, the older brother, religion, has become indigenous, and after will be his younger brother, the law.

Given that the government and missionaries consciously blended religion with the rule of law, it is hardly surprising that many Māori ‘assumed the law and the gospel to be one.’ This can be seen in the ubiquitous linkage of law and Christianity in many Māori letters to newspapers and reported speeches, especially at those at Kohimarama. Even those Māori employed to uphold the law sometimes saw the religious side to their role. For example, when Rihari Hekeawai, a constable from Wanganui, stopped Henere of Ngāti Tū from acquiring ammunition for a *taua* in 1858, he stated his authority, saying ‘because I am a constable of the Law of the Queen, and of God’.

The missionary God who interposed himself into human affairs had become firmly established in the Māori world view. Several Māori wrote letters thanking the government hospital for saving their lives, but they were explicit in attributing the

---

78 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/8/1860: 3; 14/7/1860: 22, 26; 30/11/1860: 18, 47; 1/5/1862: 21; *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 15/11/1861: 15.
79 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 28/6/1858: 3; *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860: 16; 1/7/1862: 9. The “advent” of Christianity varied. For example, the first mission was established in Northland in 1814, but Octavius Hadfield did not set up his mission at Otaki until 1839. See *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Vol 1, pp 169, 224.
80 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 15/11/1858: 6. ‘Na, kua tangata whenuatia te tuakana, te whakapono, muri iho ko tona teina, ko te Ture.’
81 Ngata & Sutherland, p 345, cited in Henare, p 33.
success of the doctor to God’s agency.\textsuperscript{84} God’s punishment on Judgement Day also weighed on Māori minds and they considered the wages of sin (death) to be the obvious cause of the decrease in Māori population.\textsuperscript{85} Many Māori interpreted events in terms of God’s will, in the same way as the newspapers presented them. For example, if God, as \textit{Te Karere Maori} suggested, had sanctioned the British government,\textsuperscript{86} then resistance was therefore a sin. Himiona of Tūhourangi told the assembly at Kohimarama of his misgivings about Browne’s aggression over Waitara, but then considered, ‘The Lord chasteneth whom he loveth. This is the chastening of which I approve for those who persist in doing evil.’\textsuperscript{87} This was echoed by Hēmi Matini of Whāingaroa.

In my opinion this is the punishment of God that the people may be brought to repentance. It is right that the Governor should punish our sins.\textsuperscript{88}

Similarly, the actions of Kingitanga supporters were seen in terms of sin,\textsuperscript{89} and Hone Wetere of Kāwhia repeated the assertion that Pōtatau had died due to his taking the reins of kingship.\textsuperscript{90}

\textbf{The parallels between conversion to Christianity and Law.}

A number of parallels show that Māori reacted to temporal law in a similar way to their conversion to Christianity several decades earlier. Law had its own unofficial missionaries, such as Tamati Wiremu Upo Haepaia, a Wesleyan lay preacher in Wellington. For 19 years he had learnt Pākehā ways, but with feuding over land causing lawlessness in his home in Taranaki, he returned in 1858 to give his people the benefit of his knowledge. His answer was to abandon Māori customs and he told his people.

\begin{quote}
When we decide to enter into the Pākehā ways, we should together enoble the Law as a kindness for the people, so that we see the benefits for the body.\textsuperscript{91}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 18/10/1858 suppl:2. ‘...no te mea he katipa ahau no te Ture o te Kuini, o te Atua hoki...’
\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/6/1858:4; 6/11/1858:4.
\textsuperscript{85} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 10/12/1957:4; 8/11/1858:2-3; \textit{Te Karere Maori} 30/9/1859:5; 15/12/1860:15; 28/2/1861:17; 16/12/1861:16; \textit{Te Manuhiri Tuarangi} 15/3/1861:5.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/1/1860:11; 5/2/1862:24.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/7/1860:35. ‘E whiu ana te Ariki i tana i aroha ai. Ko te whiu tenei i pai ai ahau mo nga tangata e tohe ana ki te kino.’
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/9/1860:32. ‘Ki taku whakaaro na te Atua ano tenei whiu, kia mohio ai nga tangata ki te ripeneta. E tika na kia whiu te Kawana i o tatou hara.’
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/7/1862:12.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Te Manuhiri Tuarangi}, 15/8/1861:23.
This did not involve any rejection of the moral authority of religion to which Māori had already subscribed. As he saw it, ‘the Governor’s law is crying to the law of Christianity for them to grow together until the end of the world.’

Just as syncretic religious movements emerged from missionary teaching, some Māori were not prepared to accept colonial control of the administration of law and order. The Kingitanga created its own magistrates and emerging system of law which stood outside of the Queen’s Law. The results were variable, but one success was Wiremu Tamihana’s rūnanga at Matamata which employed a fusion of Māori tikanga, English and Biblical law. However, the King’s justice was galling to those Waikato Māori still loyal to Queen Victoria. Just as Māori Christians had in the past separated themselves from their heathen relatives, Fenton noted in the late 1850s that the loyalists were deciding to set up new settlements ‘where law and order can be carried out without interruption from the Kingites.’

Even when Māori accepted British law, Māori sometimes interpreted its workings in traditional ways. This was problematic, particularly with inter-racial violence, as the customary Māori demand for utu tended not to differentiate between the actual perpetrator and his kin. Colonel Wynyard, when acting Governor in 1855, travelled to Tihorewaru, a kāinga in Waikato, to appease Māori there over a murder of one of their number by a Pākehā. The Acting Governor, as leader of the Pākehā iwi, was held personally responsible for the murder, and his visit was interpreted as a peace mission. For many of the chiefs present, a suitable payment for the murder was a flour mill. However, one speaker considered a metaphorical killing was the required payment.

Ropati starting up and dancing before his Excellency for a moment, said—I am a man, I wish to be a man, and live in peace. O, the Governor, I will spear you, I will kill you. This is my spear; I will pierce you; there (striking the spear into the ground before the Governor). It is done, you have my only weapon.

91 Te Karere o Poneke, 25/10/1858:3-4. ‘Ka whakaaro tatou kia uru ki roto ki nga ritenga Pakeha, me whakarangatira tahi tatou i te Ture hei atawhai mo te iwi, kia kite ai tatou i nga paihia mo te tinana.’
92 Te Karere o Poneke, 19/7/1858:2. ‘...kei te tangi te ture o te Kawana ki te ture of te whakapono kia tupu tahi raua a taea noaia te mutunga o te Ao.’
93 Stokes, pp 89-90.
94 AJHR 1860, ElC, p 22.
95 Te Karere Maori, 13/3/1855:1-5, 9. The chief murdered was probably Hemi of Waikato. See Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1855:19.
96 Te Karere Maori, 1/3/1855:8. ‘Ka whakatika a Ropati; harihari ana ki te aoro a te Kawana a ka mea:—Ka tangata au, e mea ana au kia whakatangata i ahau, kia noho pai iho. E te Kawana, maku koe e wero, ka mate koe i au. Naku tenei tao, ka werohia koe (werohia te whenua). Ka oti, kei a koe taku patu.’ This account was originally printed in the New Zealander. It was based on English notes made
When a Māori, Erietara, was shot in the bush near Patumahoe in 1860, suspicion quickly fell upon a local Pākehā. An enquiry was hastily called together with both Māori and Pākehā investigators who could not find evidence to link anyone to the killing. However, a large hui of South Auckland and Waikato Māori assembled and criticised the Māori investigators, calling for utu. This may merely have been an outpouring of grief, but it was soundly condemned in Te Haeata. The Māori investigators were then defended by the prominent Waikato chief, Tamati Ngāpora, and the crowd dispersed.97

The government was aware of the depth of Māori feeling in these cases and presented a number of high profile trials in Te Karere Maori in an attempt to show the fairness of British justice. Considerable coverage was given to the trial of Walter Huntley for the manslaughter of the Māori woman, Te Kopi, with extensive explanations on the difference between murder and manslaughter.98 Charles Marsden, although quite likely mad, was less fortunate than Huntley and was hanged for the murder of the Māori woman, Kerara Rangiahipari of Ngāti Whakaue. In the latter case, the judge’s summation was translated for the Māori audience sentence by sentence. The newspaper account comprised parts of the proceedings verbatim, no doubt forming the basis of the printed account of the trial provided to the chiefs. A number of Māori attended the public execution, and a grandiloquent letter, also printed in the newspaper, was sent to the chiefs of Ngāti Whakaue. No doubt, they felt gratified at the utu dispensed, and the government probably had few qualms about the death of a poor, mad, Catholic, Pākehā woodcutter.99

Many Māori still saw justice in terms of their own tikanga, and at times ‘converted’ it to their own ends. In one extreme case in Te Tai Tokerau, the assessor, Maihi Parāone Kawiti, was dismissed from his position for his involvement in a case of mākutu where the alleged sorcerer was murdered.100 However after ‘confessing his sins’, he was subsequently forgiven by McLean at Kohimarama.101

by the interpreter, John White. Therefore Ropati’s statements above were translated back into Māori from the English notes. There may be some similarity between Ropati’s actions and the spearing actions involved in the pihe dirge at a hahunga ceremony. See Te Rangi Hiroa, p 425.

97 Te Haeata, 1/11/1860:1-2, 4; Te Karere Maori, 15/12/1860:14.
98 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1855:1-11.
100 Te Karere Maori, 31/10/1859:1-5; 15/11/1859:1-2, 4-5. This case was also discussed in Te Haeata, 1/10/1859:2-3.
As previously noted, there were doubts that Māori truly felt the transforming nature of Christianity, and similarly, aspersions were cast, by both Māori and Pākehā, on the sincerity with which Māori accepted the law and other Pākehā customs.\(^{102}\) John Gorst, the magistrate appointed to Waikato, considered that most of the Māori there who were prepared to take positions as assessors generally did so out of cupidity, and some were even paying over a portion of their salaries to the Māori King.\(^{103}\) Gorst was also critical of the small Waikato hapū, Ngāti Whauroa, whose allegiance to the Kingitanga evaporated when the King’s judges ruled against them in a case over an eel weir. He regarded their demand for a British flag, a mail contract and salaries for ten official positions in return for loyalty to the government as unreasonable.

It was said to them that this was the best way they would be known, their upholding the Queen’s laws. The fruits [of this] would be to see what they really wanted, and if they were firm in this, then perhaps the Governor would observe the appropriateness of their actions, and [they] would then get a flag.\(^{104}\)

**Salvation for the body**

Traditional Māori religious belief was concerned with maintaining ora, physical and spiritual wellbeing. Conversion to Christianity merely transferred the responsibility for that ora to God. However, the grafting of the idea of Law onto the Māori world view allowed a dichotomy to develop between the needs of the body and soul. As Temuera Amohau stated at a meeting called to establish law amongst the Te Arawa tribal confederation, the object was ‘the acceptance of the Law as safeguard for the bodies, as it is clear that the guardian of our souls is God.’\(^{105}\) These two parallel systems of law, God’s and the Queen’s, were essentially separate but fused together, like the lead and wood of a pencil. Expressions that the Queen, Governor or Law were the source of ora[nga] for the tinana, while Christianity remained the

\(^{102}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 15/2/1860: 1, 5-6; 1/7/1862: 11; 20/8/1862: 16.

\(^{103}\) Gorst (2001), p 20, 45, 85, 103-5.

\(^{104}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/5/1862: 9. ‘Korerotia ana ki a ratou, ko te tikanga pai tenei e mohiotia ai ratou ko to ratou whakamana i nga ture o te Kuini, ko nga hua ia e kitea ai to ratou tino pirangi, a, ki te au pu ratou, tenei ake pea, ka titiro te Kawana ki te tika o to ratou mahi, ko reira pea riro atu ai he kara.’; ‘They were told that the best way to show their zeal for the Queen was by obeying her laws, and if they did so perhaps at some future time the Governor would give them a flag as testimony to their loyalty.’

\(^{105}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 29/2/1860: 5. ‘...ko te whakaaetanga ki te Ture hei tiaki mo nga tinana, e marama ana hoki te kai tiaki o o tatou wairua, ko Te Atua.’; ‘...the recognition of them of the law as guardian of our bodies; as we now acknowledge GOD to be the keeper of our souls.’
oranga of the wairua were common both in letters to the newspapers, as well as in public speeches.\textsuperscript{106}

Māori saw deep correlations between the two systems. This was, to some degree, partly of the government’s own making. Its espoused race policy was that New Zealand would be he iwi kotahi, one amalgamated people of Māori and Pākehā living peacefully together, as brothers. The governor was presented as the nation’s father, and the Queen as a more remote mother. The obvious analogy for the Queen was with God the Father. According to Taurau Te Tirarau of Parawhau in a written statement at Kohimarama, the temporal authorities had become the new trinity.

All we approve of is the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that is to say, the Queen, the Government, and the Law.\textsuperscript{107}

For Heremi Matua of Ngāti Apa, law would give everlasting life.

This is what I hope for, approval of the Queen's laws. I desire the laws, because they will give me life for ever.\textsuperscript{108}

Just as human agents represented the divine authority, so too did the governor represent the Queen. Some Māori felt they had been ‘saved’ by the governor who had the power to ‘wipe away sins’.\textsuperscript{109} Appeals to the governor as father sometimes resemble religious prayers.\textsuperscript{110} The religious metaphors employed were also prevalent at Kohimarama in 1860. Governor Browne and McLean were both called on to lead like bishops, and the conference was compared to a sacrament\textsuperscript{111} within a wider covenant.\textsuperscript{112} Parakaia Te Pouepa of Ōtaki even alluded to the last supper of Christ when discussing a dinner at which the chiefs and Governor attended.

\textit{[This is] like Christ, at the end of his work when he ate together with his disciples: it was the affirming of his love to the Apostles. Where can you fly to now? [You] have eaten together with the Governor.}\textsuperscript{[LP]}\textsuperscript{113}
Some felt they had little choice in accepting of law into their lives. As Wiremu Tipene of Te Uriohau stated,

This was the day I was saved, the preaching of the Gospel. I will cling to the Word of God as a father to me. When the Law of the Queen came as guardian for my body, we were all warm. The gates of death have been guarded by the law of God, and of the Queen. I looked, that was a sign of life for the all people of this island who are suffering. I say, religion will guard my spirit, and the law of the Queen will improve my body: here I will cling to.

Of course not all Māori embraced the viewpoint that accepting the synthesis of these authorities also meant, at least in principle, accepting colonial rule. The Kingitanga based itself on Christian foundations without feeling any need for governmental involvement. No doubt, there were perfectly valid political reasons for tribes to “convert” to the Queen’s Law. Other Te Uriohau speakers, although no less religious in their tone, were quite explicit that their tribe was small and defenceless and needed government protection from neighbouring tribes.

Conclusion

Māori possessed a holistic world view, where the spiritual and temporal concerns impacted upon each other. The spirit world was appeased or cajoled, and forms and rules were followed in order to safeguard physical wellbeing. Māori regarded the Christianity of the nineteenth century missionaries in a similar fashion. However, increased contact with Pākehā caused many Māori to doubt the total efficacy of God’s Laws for their physical wellbeing, with some turning to the Queen’s Laws to mind their temporal condition. This re-evaluation required a new conversion of sorts – not just spiritual, but also political. The Māori language newspapers were not only a conduit for the gospel of Law to be relayed to Māori, but, in some cases, a forum for a Māori response. The newspapers provide a window on the processes happening at that time. Some of the forms of this new conversion mirrored those of the first conversion to Christianity. Māori now considered that God would look after

114 Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860:51. ‘Ko te ra tenei hei whakaoranga moku; ko te kauwhautanga o te Rongo-pai. Ka piri au ki te Kupu o te Atua hei matua moku. Ka tae mai te Ture o te Kuini hei kaitiaki mo toku tinana, ka tahi ka mahana katoa. Kua tiakina e te ture o te Atua o te Kuini nga kuwaha o te mate. Titiro atu ana ahau he tohu ora tena mo nga tangata mate katoa o te motu nei. Ka mea ahau ko te whakapono hei tiaki mo te wairua, ko te ture o te Kuini hei whakapaipai mo te tikanga, ko konei au piri al;’ ‘The day of salvation was the preaching of the Gospel. I will cleave to the Word of God as a parent for me. When the law of the Queen came as a protector of my body then all were warmly clad. The laws of God and the Queen guard the gates of death. I beheld that this is a sign of salvation for all men threatened with death in this island. I said, Christianity will guard the soul, and the law of the Queen will improve our temporal condition [bodies] : there I will take refuge.’
their souls, and the Queen’s government and laws their bodies. However, the spiritual and physical domains could not be totally separated: they still interacted upon each other. Given the way that the government and newspapers presented the law to them, the biblical lexicon available to them, and their world view at that time, it would have been hard for Māori to comprehend it in any other way.

Chapter 6: Society and Culture

Introduction

The preceding chapter explained that both the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers and the Māori correspondents to these papers closely linked law with religion. Religion and law were both elements within ngā ritenga pai o te Pākehā, the collection of European customs through which Māori could attain the same levels of "civilisation" as their Pākehā tuakana. The newspapers often presented these ritenga as a single concept and many Māori also accepted them as such.¹ For example, Hāre Parata of Waiwhetu wrote of Te Karere o Poneke, 'What I think is, the reason this press was established was to seek knowledge of Pākehā customs. I really like Pākehā custom.'² This chapter surveys the presentation of these other ritenga by the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers, which encompassed housing, clothing, food, commerce and land use. Much of this discourse was a continuation of the missionary endeavour to introduce Western 'civilisation',³ but the newspapers extended this civilising mission to facilitate colonisation by incorporating such matters as electoral issues, roads and mail and land individualisation. As Richmond, the Minister of Native Affairs averred, 'the civilization of the Natives...[and]...the settlement of the country by Europeans...truly viewed, are ultimately inseparable.'⁴

The government wanted Pākehā settlers to progress and become prosperous, and for the new colony to be defined by British ideals and practices. While some settlers believed that Māori could not be easily be 'amalgamated' with Pākehā,⁵ in the pre-war period the government, through its policy of he iwi kotahi, promoted inclusion of Māori within this Western civilisation rather than exclusion. The government considered this good not only for the whole country, but specifically for Māori themselves. Progress in adopting Pākehā ritenga varied from district to district.

¹ This is evident particularly around Wellington, as can be seen in Māori letters to Te Karere o Poneke. For example see Te Karere o Poneke, 17/9/1857:1, 3, 4; 24/9/1857:2, 3; 15/10/1857:2; 22/10/1857:2-3; 29/10/1857:3; 5/11/1857:4; 19/11/1857:2-3; 3/12/1857:4; 10/12/1857:2, 4; 17/12/1857:2-3; 24/12/1857:3; 25/1/1858:2; 25/1/1858:4; 8/2/1858:2-3; 22/2/1858:2-3; 31/5/1858:2-3; 5/7/1858:2-3; 26/7/1858:3-4; 16/8/1858:3; 4; 13/9/1858:4; 8/11/1858 Suppl2.
² Te Karere o Poneke, 3/5/1858:4. 'Taku i whakaaro ai, te tikanga i whakatakotoria ai tenei perehi, he kimi i te mohiotanga ki nga ritenga pakeha. Kanui toku pai ki te ritenga pakeha.'
⁴ AJHR (1860) E1, p 7. This statement was made with regard to the Native Territorial Rights Act of 1858, subsequently vetoed by the British government, which would have allowed direct purchase of Māori land by settlers.
Wellington was one region where Māori were considered to be fulfilling their potential. As *Te Karere Maori* saw the situation:

If Pākehā and the Māori tribes think along the same lines, the country cannot but advance. So, the people are following the *ritenga* of their enlightened friends, and that will be a boon to them. The Māori people are a race receptive to all things, therefore, [we] are anxious that they learn not only Pākehā occupations, but also learn the sound [rika] reasoning of their friends from overseas. The Pākehā living in Wellington are *rangatira*, and so, if our Māori friends do not advance in knowledge and quality, it is their own fault.[LP]  

This chapter not only explores links between the various *ritenga* promoted, but also investigates how they impacted on Māori society, for example in terms of race relations, and the changing social status of *tūtūa* (commoners). While all the Pākehā-run newspapers exhorted Māori to embrace European customs, two papers in particular have provided most of the data: *Te Karere Maori*, because it is the largest and longest running newspaper of this period, and *Te Karere o Poneke*, because it was especially active in promoting *ngā ritenga pai* and because of its extensive correspondence from Māori readers on these issues. However, a shift appears in the content of *Te Karere Maori* from the Kohimarama Conference and through Sir George Grey’s second governorship, where political concerns became more important. Consequently, *Te Karere Maori* placed less emphasis on trade and land reforms and more in gaining Māori acceptance of the Queen’s *mana* through Grey’s *Tikanga Hou*.⁷

**The effectiveness of the message**

Māori were prepared to adopt and adapt certain Pākehā *ritenga*, such as Christianity and literacy promoted by the missionaries, and many gave their approval, at least in theory, to accepting the concept of law. Māori were certainly more

---

5 For example, see Fox, p 69.
6 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855:8-9. ‘Ki te whakaaro tahi nga Pakeha me nga iwi Maori, ekore e kahore te kaka o te whenua. Na, e aru ana nga tangata ki nga ritenga o a ratou hoa matau, he painga tens mo ratou. He iwi ako te tangata Maori ki nga mea katou; no konei i mahara iho ai, kaua ratou e ako i nga mutu anake o te Pakeha, engari me ako hoki ki nga whakaaro tika, o a ratou hoa whakatarawahi. Ko nga Pakeha noho ki Poneke he rangatira, mo konei, ki te kahore e kake ki te matau ki te pai, nga hoa Maori kei a ratou ake ano te take i he ai.’; ‘The country must advance when the aboriginal inhabitants go hand in hand with their civilized and educated Brethren: and as the natives are most imitative beings, we hope that they will not only learn the industrial arts, but that they will copy the virtues of their European friends. The class of settlers established at Wellington are of the highest order; it will be the fault of the natives, therefore, if they do not improve.[TRM]’  
7 These also known as the ‘New Institutions’ were designed to introduce Magistrate’s courts and limited self-government into areas still held by Māori under Native Title. They are discussed in Chapter 8.
resistant to other aspects of Pākehā culture, or, as in using the blanket as clothing, adapted them to Māori purposes. According to Owen, 'There can be little doubt that much of the disease and depopulation which occurred in the 19th century could have been avoided if Maoris had altered their diet, clothing and housing in time.' It was not that the missionaries did not try to improve Māori living standards, but that 'changes in housing, clothing and diet [unlike literacy] involved economic and social changes of a profound nature.' Owens implies that Māori were not able, or prepared, to alter their lifestyles even with regard to 'literally matters of life and death'.

However, the demands of Christianity had meant profound social change, for example in the status of slaves. As shown below, many Māori were also prepared to undertake the economic change from subsistence farming to full scale involvement in world produce markets. Māori were prepared to change, but the benefits of such changes needed to be seen to be meaningful to their lives. For example, the benefit of agricultural production was wealth creation, but Māori could still engage in the process at a tribal, rather than individual or family level.

There are various reasons why Māori might not have adopted certain ritenga Pākehā. Much advice, although worthwhile, was often delivered in a vehement or superior tone, and used moral rather than practical arguments. Sometimes the information was contradictory. Many Māori were also not wealthy enough to live in the fashion expected of them. At times, setbacks, especially in commerce, would no doubt have dented enthusiasm. Some Māori were more concerned with the stresses to tribal cohesion from social change than with any desire for immediate financial betterment, while others, such as the Kingitanga supporters, were resistant to measures which might facilitate governmental control and undermine their own autonomy. However, despite these reasons, many Māori were still comfortable advocating ngā ritenga pai o te Pākehā.

**Food, feasts and clothing**

The centrality of food to pre-contact Māori life is reflected in the huge number of whakataukī alluding to agriculture, food gathering, eating, food division and hospitality, abundance and dearth. Food production and gathering was vital to the

---

8 Owens (1983), pp 40-41. 'He Pukapuka na te Rata o nga Tangata Maori o Poneke' is an example of missionary concern for Māori health in the CMS Almanac, *He Maramatakahaere*, 1845:18.
economics of pre-contact Māori society and its importance was not related merely to sustenance, but also to hākari, lavish feasting, in which tribal mana was maintained. Best suggests that they ‘were often but the result of an ostentatious desire to excel the efforts of some other clan or tribe’. Te Rangi Hīroa deems that a tribe’s reputation rested on its hospitality, and ‘visitors had to receive the best or shame enveloped the community.’ Parsonson propounds that food resources (and the control over them) were more important to Māori hapū than the mere ownership of land, and the harvesting of these resources strengthened ownership claims. Therefore, food exchanges ‘advertised their competitive capacity, and defined their political and social relations with their neighbours’ with ‘the most lavish feasts ... provided purely for competitive purposes’. Schwimmer sees the hākari less in terms of competition, but that it ‘provided the village with a goal and a stimulus to work, obligations were repaid, the monotonous round of ordinary life was broken, social and economic contacts were established, and military alliances maintained.’ Māori continued with lavish feasting, despite the cultural and political changes arising from Pākehā settlement, as many of the social imperatives for hākari still existed.

Introduced ‘Pākehā’ crops, in particular the potato, were easily grown, extending the areas which could be cultivated and allowing Māori to abandon some traditional foods, such as fern-root. This affected daily diet. For example, in 1855, Te Karere Maori noted that some Auckland Māori, their crops failing due to their absence in the gumfields were ‘obliged to live upon fern-root’ as if it were now just a last resort food. The Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers considered the use of Pākehā foods by Māori as a progressive step indicating that Māori were embracing “civilisation”. For Māori, the provision of Pākehā food could enhance mana, and they sometimes bought this food for feasting, rather than growing it themselves. For example, at a hui at Puketāpapa in 1858 Māori spent £107 on ‘3, 600 loaves (21b.), 1

---

10 Te Rangi Hīroa, p 375.  
13 Elsdon Best, Tuhoe: The Children of the Mist (Auckland: Polynesian Society, 1925: reprint, Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1972) p 9; Te Rangi Hīroa, p 112. The most popular fruit and vegetables included: potato, maize, pumpkin, squash, peach, cherry, watermelon. Pork and flour were also used extensively. The cultivation of potatoes extended to areas, such as Otago, which were unsuitable for the kumara. See Bill Dacker, The Pain and the Love: Te Māmā me te Aroha: a History of Kai Tahu Whanui in Otago, 1844-1994 (Dunedin: University of Otago Press 1994) pp 31-34.  
14 Te Karere Maori, 1/1/1855:5. ‘...anga ana ki te kai aruhe hei oranga.’
ox, 1 pig, 9 bags sugar, with a plentiful supply of tea and butter’ and ‘bread and cheese, sweet biscuits and tea’ for Pākehā visitors.16

On a practical level, in an attempt to mitigate the high rate of Māori mortality, the newspapers tried to change Māori dietary patterns, although such advice was often linked with other “health” issues including hygiene, clothing, housing, immorality and the over-working of women.17 Māori ate ‘bad food’, and mothers and young children in particular needed ‘good food’.18 Milk was considered a good food, as evidenced by the health of the Māori of Tūranga, and the children at Gorst’s school at Ōtawhao. Combined with potatoes, milk was particularly healthy, which explained why the Irish ‘thrive and multiply’.19 According to the newspapers, one of the worst ‘bad foods’ was kānga pirau (rotten corn),20 where corn was steeped in water for long periods and allowed to soften, then cooked to a porridge consistency. Te Rangihiroa suggests this was an adaptation of a traditional treatment of karaka berries, but while ‘very palatable...the odour was somewhat distracting’.21 However, according to the newspapers of the time, this feature of Māori cuisine caused akiaki, hori, mahake, koiangi and other illnesses,22 and when ‘[t]he mother eats it as she is suckling her child; the child swallows it in the milk of its mother, and so it devours death.’23 The diseases arising from ‘bad food’ were interpreted in terms of divine punishment.

Nor is this to be wondered at. For God has laid down laws for us, both for our souls and our bodies. If we sin against these laws, we are sure to be punished. ... If it be a law for the health of the body, the punishment will fall upon the body, and there it will show itself in the shape of disease or death.24

---

15 Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1855: 21.
16 Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1858: 1. ‘...3600 nga rohi, 1 kau, 1 poaka, 9 peke huka, me te ti, me te pata. He tavo, he tihi, he pihikete, he ti, nga kai i whakatakotoria ma nga Pakeha i tae ki te matakitaki.’
17 Te Haeata, 1/7/1859:1-2; 1/8/1859:1-2; Te Karere Maori, 15/7/1859:1-5; 15/8/1859:1-4; 15/9/1859:1-5; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:8-13; 1/10/1861:7-11; see also He Maramatakahaore, 1845:18.
18 Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1859:1.
19 Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1859:4. ‘...e pai ana ratou, e tokomaha haere ana.’ See also Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1859:1-4 on the food value of milk.
20 For example see Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1859:4; 15/9/1859: 1-4; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/10/1861:10.
21 Te Rangi Hiroa, p 111.
22 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/10/1861:10. The diseases were not translated in the English text. According to the Dictionary of the Maori Language, hakihaki is an itch or skin disease, mahake is a cutaneous disease although mahake means small [stunted growth?], and koiangi is diarrhoea. According to Te Karere Maori 15/9/1859:2, it also caused ‘swellings in the neck, hips, and sides’ (te kaki puku, te huwha, pupuhi, te whewhe).
23 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/10/1861:10. ‘Kai ana te whārere i te mea e whakangote ana i tana tamaiti, kai ana te tamaiti i tenei piro i roto i te wai o tana whaea, kai ana hoki i te mate.’
24 Te Karere Maori 15/9/1859:2. ‘...ta te mea hoki kua takoto ta Te Atua ture mo o tatou wairua, mo o tatou tinana ano hoki, a ki te mea ka he tatou ki aua ture, ka pa ano tana whiu ki a tatou. ... ka hara
The newspapers also believed that divine displeasure was excited by the lavish feasting of the hākari, as a waste of God’s bounty. Feasting not only led to hunger and debt, but also conflicted with Pākehā mores, and was therefore uncivilised. According to the Rev. Whiteley, God was particularly angry at the waste at a child’s tangihanga when the money could have been used to keep the child alive. Buller’s Te Karere o Poneke, perhaps thinking Māori might take the message too much to hear and not offer the hospitality that Pākehā were accustomed to, did add that it was still acceptable to feed travellers.

Māori provided hākari for traditional reasons at tribal hui, but feasting also featured at the large gatherings that Māori were now holding to discuss contemporary political issues. For example, amongst the many reasons put forward by Te Karere Maori against Waikato Māori holding their own rūnanga was the inevitable wastage of time and food. It appears, however, that hui that were called for pro-government purposes were looked on more favourably. For example, about Hōniana Te Puni’s meeting at Pitone, Te Karere o Poneke said,

the “house” they assembled in was a tent. It measured 160 feet long and 30 feet wide, and was made for this particular gathering. There were 500 people at this hui. Some Pākehā also came …

Well! [how marvellously] were arranged the table, the linen tablecloth, the glasses, the plates, the knives and forks, and the abundance of food—just like it was done by Pākehā. Quite likely if Te Puni had not been supporting the government against the Kingitanga, he too would have been accused of wastefulness.

Some Māori acknowledged that better food and clothing were the result of embracing ngā ritenga pai o te Pākehā. Linking the acceptance of the rule of law with new affluence, Riini Te Hemopō could state, ‘now, for the first time, I am tatou ki te ture mo te tinana, kei te tinana ano te paanga o te whiu, ko te whiu mo te tinana he turotonga he mate.’ For similar comments, see also Te Karere Maori, 15/7/1859: 2

Te Karere o Poneke, 27/12/1858:2, 3; Te Haeata, 2/5/1859:1. 26 Te Karere Maori, 30/9/1856:10; Te Karere o Poneke, 24/9/1857:2; 27/12/1858:2, 3. This view carried into the twentieth century. See Best (1974), pp 104-5.

Te Haeata, 4/1859: 3-4; reprinted Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:8-13.

Te Karere o Poneke, 27/12/1858:2.

Te Karere Maori, 1/8/1861:11.

‘…he teneti te whare i mine ai. Kotahi rau e ono te kau putu te roa o tautau whare, e toru te kau putu te vanui—he mea hanga mo tenei huiluhianga tangata. E rima nga rau o nga tangata o tenei hui. I uru ano etahi pakeha … Ehara! te mahi o te tepu, o te hipoki rinene, o te karaihi, o te pereti, o te naihi me te paoka, me te tini o nga kai—ano he hanga pakeha!’
dressed in good clothes, and eat good food.\footnote{Te Karere o Poneke, 1/11/1858:2 ‘Nonaianei ka tahi au ka kakahu i nga kahu pai, ka kai hoki i nga kai pai.’} Similarly, Tamihana Te Rauparaha of Ōtaki suggested that with individualisation and registration of land Māori would gain better clothes and food.\footnote{Te Karere o Poneke, 15/10/1857:3.} Te Rauparaha also criticised the Māori funeral customs, particularly the wastefulness of the associated hākari, an opinion echoed by Rev. Rīwai te Ahu.\footnote{Te Karere o Poneke, 24/9/1857:2-3; 5/11/1857:2-3.} Yet another Māori from Ōtaki, Hipirini Taiwaraki, railed against the waste of tangihanga, accusing most Māori mourners of only coming for the food.\footnote{Te Karere o Poneke, 22/2/1858: 2-3.} Nevertheless, it is clear that many Māori still considered the hākari as integral to their culture, sometimes proudly announcing the amounts of food, often in terms of tons, the financial costs, and numbers of guests.\footnote{For example, see Te Karere Maori, 30/4/1858:5.} Ngaumutau of Masterton wrote to \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} detailing the competing amounts of food, tobacco, horses, and clothes given out at a hākari by Wi Waka and Te Retimana. Buller noted that he published the letter purely for people to see the evils of the hākari.\footnote{Te Karere o Poneke, 27/12/1858:2-3.} Given that the hākari is still elemental within Māori culture today, few Māori seem to have heeded his call.\footnote{The hākari now occurs at the end of a hui. It is also used to remove tapu from guests at the end of a funeral. See Rawinia Higgins & John. C. Moorfield, “Ngā Tikanga o te marae: Marae practices” in \textit{Ki Te Whaiao: an Introduction to Māori Culture and Society}, ed. Tānia M. Ka’ai, John. C. Moorfield, Michael P.J. Reilly and Sharon Mosely (Auckland: Pearson Educational, 2004) p 83; Rawinia Higgins & John. C. Moorfield, “Tangihanga: Death Customs” in \textit{Ki Te Whaiao: an Introduction to Māori Culture and Society}, ed. Tānia M. Ka’ai, John. C. Moorfield, Michael P.J. Reilly and Sharon Mosely (Auckland: Pearson Educational, 2004) p 89.}

Māori dress changed after contact with Pākehā, with Māori wearing the ubiquitous blankets for daily wear instead of traditional woven cloaks.\footnote{However, Māori still valued woven cloaks for their beauty and continued to use them in gift exchanges. See Te Rangi Hiroa, p 177; Te Karere o Poneke, 27/12/1858:2.} As with food, Pākehā considered the wearing of European clothing and boots to be signs of ‘civilisation’.\footnote{Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:6; 1/9/1855:21.} Sir William Martin, for example, would not receive Māori into his house unless in ‘English clothes’: ‘the minimum insisted upon for men was white trousers and a blue shirt.’\footnote{Lady Martin, p 19; Lennard, p 81.} However, according to \textit{Te Manuhiri Tuarangi}, the poor...
use of modern clothing was one of the many reasons for the Māori population decrease. 41 Petera Kahutia of Tūranga agreed, writing,

I feel assured that the decline of the Maories is caused by the introduction of European clothing, in this manner: one day the Maori is warmly clad, and the next he is without clothing at all; he takes cold, and this becomes the cause of disease.42

According to Te Karere Maori, Pākehā clothing was fine so long as Māori changed out of them when they were wet.43

For some Pākehā commentators, the wearing of European clothing was not enough. For example, “Te Hutana” (Rev. Hutton, a regular contributor to Te Karere o Poneke) criticised Wellington Māori for their lack of alacrity in adopting Pākehā ritenga. As seen above, Wellington Māori were considered to be more “advanced” than some other areas, yet Hutton considered that such advances as cosmetic, suggesting ‘perhaps you think that you make yourselves Pākehā merely by wearing Pākehā clothes.’44 He then provided an adapted fable, in which a kōkako tries to emulate a huia.45 To ensure that Māori readers got the moral, he ended with,

this story is about the Māori person who thinks he is like a Pākehā when he wears Pākehā clothes: but the attributes are not the same: the outside is the same, but the inside isn’t.46

Not surprisingly perhaps, some Māori readers did not appreciate the tone of Hutton’s writings.47 The fable of the kōkako and huia annoyed Watene Te Kahurunga of Aratangata so much, he replied,

I think that the disparagement of our faults in the past, of our Māori-ness, should cease
... We have taken to wearing shoes, shirts[?], and the things we can see, [but] there are Pākehā ritenga that we will never adopt. We will never take up the English language.48

41 For example, see Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:10
42 Te Karere Maori, 30/9/1959:5. ‘...kei te mohio au ki te mate o te tangata Maori e mate nei te tangata. Na nga kakahu o te Pakeha; ko te take o te kakahu, ka mau te Māori i te kakahu ka pā mai te matao, ka waiho, he mate mo te tangata.’ Rather prophetically he also identified the rich, fatty Pākehā food as a health hazard.
43 Te Karere Maori, 15/9/1859:1.
44 Te Karere o Poneke, 12/4/1858:4. ‘E mea ana koutou, na te kakahu pakeha anake ka whakapakehatia ai koutou.’
45 Native birds.
46 Te Karere o Poneke, 12/4/1858:4. ‘He korero tenei mo te tangata maori e mea ana kua rite ia ki te ahu pakeha, me ka kakahu ia i nga kahu pakeha: oira kahore e rite te ahu; ko to waho ano e rite ana, ko to roto ia kahore i te rite.’
47 Henere Te Puni did not appreciate Hutton’s criticism of Māori going to the Aorere diggings, while the Anglican Rev. Riwai Te Ahu considered the Wesleyan Rev. Hutton’s writings to be of poor quality. Te Karere o Poneke, 29/3/1858:3-4; 29/11/1858:2-3.
48 Te Karere o Poneke, 31/5/1858:3. ‘E mea ana ahuia kia whakamutua te hanihani i o tatou henga o mua o to tatou maoritanga ... Kua mau ki a tatou nga hu, nga haara, nga mea ano hoki e kitea nei e tatou–tena ko nga ritenga a te pakeha, e kore rawa e mau i a tatou. Ko te reo o te pakeha e kore e mau i a tatou.’
It is therefore clear that some Māori, probably most, were happy to adapt certain *ritenga* within their lives, but not at the expense of their Māoritanga.

**Housing, sex and politics**

The newspapers considered Pākehā-style housing to be another key indicator of social advancement. As Hutton asked,

> everyone calls out, “Let us proceed along Pākehā ways.” ... Friends, where is the proof of your going in accord with Pākehā *tikanga*? And who is it that has the nice houses with dining rooms and bedrooms?\(^49\)

*Te Karere o Poneke* did name some Māori who were following Pākehā *ritenga* by living in planked housing: Mātene Te Whiwhi, Tamihana Te Rauparaha and Rāwiri Puaha, all influential chiefs.\(^50\) Next month, the paper added Hōniana Te Puni, Wi Hapi and Manihera Te Ngātoro to its list. Unfortunately building houses was more expensive for Māori than buying Pākehā foods and clothing. Besides, the expense of a house went beyond mere wooden planking, as the latter three chiefs were reminded.

Those houses have the same appearance as Pākehā ones. Its windows, doors, chimneys, how wonderful! But the outside has not yet been painted. Perhaps the boards are being left to dry, and then they will be painted. Then it will really look good, and be just like a Pakeha’s. If it’s not painted, it is like a person standing naked, without clothes, and will never be admired by the onlooker, but [will give rise to] the taunt. “Look, what poverty!” But it should be clothed in its whiteness, then we will compare it to a beautiful virgin, who has just been dressed up for her wedding, and is being praised greatly by the onlookers.\(^51\)

Then needed were wallpaper, curtains, rugs, beds, chairs, tables, knives and forks, glasses and teacups.\(^52\) In earlier times, the chief possessed the best *whare* in a Māori village, and was expected to entertain visiting travellers. European style housing was now another representation of the *mana* of the tribe, with their chief in residence.

Pākehā commentators also considered that the existence of separate bedrooms in Pākehā-style houses also promoted morality and good health by discouraging

---

\(^49\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 12/4/1858:4. ‘...koia te karanga o te katoa,—“Kia haere tatou i runga i nga tikanga pakeha.”’ ... E hoa ma, keiwhaea te tohu o to koutou haerenga i runga i nga tikanga pakeha? Kei a wai koia nga whare pai, me nga ruma mo te kai, me nga ruma moenga?’

\(^50\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 17/5/1858:2. That Rāwiri Puaha owned a planked house was significant enough to be included in his obituary. See *Te Karere o Poneke*, 20/9/1858: 2.

\(^51\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 7/6/1858:2. ‘Ko te ahua o aua whare rite pu ki a te pakeha. Ko ona wini, ko ona tatau, ko ona timere—ano te pai!’ Engari ko waho kahore ano i pania ki te peita. E waiho ana pea kia maroke nga papa ka peitatia ai. Ko reira tino whai ahua aī—tino rite aī ki to te pakeha. Ki te kore e pania ki te peita ka rite ki te tangata e tu kau ana, kahore ona kakahu—hore rawa e manakotia e te kai matakitaki, otiia, ko te taunu, “Titiro—ta te rawakore hoki!” Engari me whakakakahu ano ki tona ahua ma, ka tahi ka whakaritea e matou ki te wahina atahua kua oti te whakakakahu mo te marena—whakamoemitinuitia ana e te hunga matakitaki.’

\(^52\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 7/6/1858:2.
communal sleeping. For this reason, missionary instructions to "Maori teachers" stated 'let his house be good, and be divided into rooms; and he should never sleep communally.'\textsuperscript{53} Both missionaries and the Pakeha newspapers considered the communal sleeping to be sinful because it led naturally to fornication.\textsuperscript{54} As \textit{Te Manuhiri Tuarangi} stated, concerning the immorality of Maori girls,

\begin{quote}
[but, the fault is with the parents, who allow them all to sleep together, thus being collected the men, the women, the young men and the girls, ten or twenty of them in one house. This sin was practised much more, formerly, in the whare-puni. The system of sleeping in the whare-puni is ended but the promiscuous sleeping together is not ended: they still mix, and still fornicate.\textsuperscript{55}

For Buller, the editor of \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, there was another reason why Maori should adopt European housing. In 1852, the British parliament passed the New Zealand Constitution Act which set up a general assembly, and six provincial administrations in New Zealand and gave political rights to adult men based on a low threshold of property ownership. Most Pakeha men could reach the threshold without too much difficulty, but the communal ownership of land excluded most Maori from the franchise. However, the ‘occupation of a house of the annual value of £10 in a town or of £5 in country districts’ was the easiest hurdle that Maori could pass.\textsuperscript{56}

Certainly \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} promoted Maori enrolment as voters, giving instructions on the property qualification and where polling stations were situated.\textsuperscript{57} While Buller believed that progress for Maori would eventually come through election to legislative bodies, he also considered fluency in English as a prerequisite to actually standing for office.\textsuperscript{58} However he thought that Maori, as citizens, should exercise their right to vote.

\begin{quote}
Now, let the Maori people hear. This tikanga of writing your name [on the electoral roll] is for you along with the Pakeha: but not all may write [their name].\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{53} He Maramatakahaere, 1845: 16. ‘...kia pai ano hoki tona Whare, kia whakawhairumatia; kaua rawa ano hoki ia e moe huhihi.’
\textsuperscript{54} Te Haeata, 1/5/1860:3; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/7/1861: 8-9.
\textsuperscript{55} Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/10/1861: 9. ‘Otiia, nanga matua te he, nato ratou tikanga moe huhihi; e huri nui ana hoki ki roto ki te whare kotahi–nga tane, nga wahine, nga taitama, nga kotiro–te tekau, te hokorua kei te whare kotahi. I tino nui rawa tenei he i mua i roto i nga whare puni. Kua mutu te moe whare puni, otiia kahore ano i mutu te moe huhihi–e moe nei ano, e tahae nei ano.’
\textsuperscript{57} Te Karere o Poneke, 15/10/1857:2. In Otaki, for example, people voted at Mātene Te Whiwhi’s house.
\textsuperscript{58} Te Karere o Poneke, 18/10/1858:2; 29/10/1857:2.
\textsuperscript{59} Te Karere o Poneke, 15/10/1857:2. ‘Na, kia rongo mai nga tangata maori–ma koutou ngatahi me nga pakeha tenei tikanga tuhihi ingoa: otira e kore katoa e tuhihi.’
It was probably Buller's Wesleyan background which influenced his promotion of Māori participation in the electoral process. Certainly it would have been more politic for him to ignore the issue as he was an official for a government which discouraged such participation. For example, in a fictitious dialogue between “Maori” and “Pakeha” in *Te Karere Maori*, “Maori” posed the question ‘What is the meaning of all the public meetings we have lately witnessed? The white people seem very much excited, constantly cheering one another and running to and fro.’

“Pakehā” answered:

The meetings you talk of, are to us Pakehā, [the act of] selecting, that is, a calling of some of the individuals competent in the concerns of the people, allowing them to advance the policies they like. So, the people who the majority approve of are those who do the job. The reason these tikanga are new here is that the Queen of England has just agreed to her rangatiratanga, to send documents under her sacred seal that the tikanga for the kawanatanga of these islands be acquired by those peoples [iwi] living in these places.

Somewhat ironically perhaps, Māori did not appear to be included in the iwi living in New Zealand. This was reinforced the following month.

We think that Māori people are not able to be jump into these tikanga; and they should not feel gloomy about these elections: they should remain tranquil, because the good policies relating to them will not be forsaken, even if the Government changes many times.

---

60 Protestant dissenters did not receive general political rights in Britain until 1828. See David Thomson, *England in the Nineteenth Century 1815-1914* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1950: reprint, 1971) p 62. In 1852, the Wesleyan missionaries lobbied to have the Treaty of Waitangi recognised by statute if a settler parliament was to be established. See Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, *Correspondence between the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee and the Right Honorable Sir John Pakington: on the Importance of Framing the Bill for Giving a Representative Constitution to New Zealand with Due Regard to the Treaty of Waitangi* (London: P.P. Thoms, printer, 1852).

61 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855: 28. ‘He aha te tikanga o nga tini huiaui e kitea nei i roto i enei ra? E ohocho ana nga Pakeha, e whakao ana etahi ki etahi, oma atu, oma mai.’

62 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855: 28. ‘Ko nga huiauiinga e ki nei koe, he whirihirirangi ki a matou ki te Pakeha; ara, he karangatanga i etahi o nga tangata tohunga ki te whakaaro i roto i te iwi, he tuku ia ia hei hapai i nga tikanga i painga ana. Na, ko te hunga e whakaaetia ana e te tokomaha, ko te hunga ano tera e tu. Te mea i hou ai enei tikanga ki te whemua nei, he mea, katahi nei ano ka whakaae tona rangatiratanga e te Kuni o Ingarangi, kia tuku pukapuka mai i rangua i tona hiri tapu kia riro ai nga tikanga mo nga kawanatanga o enei motu ki nga iwi e noho nei ki enei wahi.’; ‘The meetings you refer to, are called by us elections, that is to say, certain persons who are deemed fit and proper to carry on the public business are on those occasions elected by a majority of the people; and the reason why this is new here arises from the fact that Her Majesty the Queen of England has lately granted a Constitution to the people of New Zealand, in other words, her Majesty has graciously given her consent that the inhabitants of these islands should govern themselves.’

63 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/2/1855: 3. ‘E whakaaro ana matou, ekore a hehe te peke mai te tangata maori ki enei tikanga; a kaua ratou e pouri mo nga mea karangaranga nei; me whakau ratou ki te maritanga, no te mea, ekore nga tikanga pai mo ratou e mahue, ahakoa he tini ke nga rengera o te Kawanatanga.’; ‘We think the native population should not interfere in politics, nor be concerned as regards the issue of elections; they may rest assured that whatever changes take place in the Government, their interests will be carefully guarded.’
Settler politics then got little attention in the official government journal, despite the efforts of the parliamentary government to gain control of Māori affairs from the governor.64 This struggle between governor and settler government was glossed over in 1862, when *Te Karere Maori* reported that parliament would be discussing Māori issues, then added ‘but the Maori tribes may rest assured that their interests will be strictly guarded by Sir George Grey and his responsible advisors.’65 However, the exclusion of Māori from the new system needs to be put in perspective. Successful politicians were required to support themselves financially, which effectively excluded many lower class Pākehā from joining their ranks.66 Many settlers who were qualified to vote did not bother to register, and of those that did, many did not bother voting.67 Neither the governor nor most politicians were interested in encouraging Māori to participate in activities that many Pākehā were not involved in.68

Buller’s promotion of Māori involvement in the electoral process is all the more unexpected because he and his father were partisans of Isaac Featherston, the Wellington superintendent.69 In 1856, Featherston wrote to the central government seeking to limit Māori voting in the Wellington province, implying that Archdeacon Hadfield was enrolling a large number of Ōtaki Māori with a view to influencing electoral outcomes. Stafford, both Premier and Colonial Secretary, replied to Featherston that his fears were unfounded and that the government could not prohibit Māori from voting if they genuinely qualified as electors. Buller, with no bias apparent, published translations of these letters in April, 1858 when the issue of unqualified Māori electors reappeared.70

Buller’s enthusiasm for Māori involvement in politics started to erode from May, 1858 when a judicial review was undertaken to determine which individuals

---

64 This struggle of the settlers to gain direction over (but not financial responsibility for) Māori affairs is recounted in Dalton, *passim*.
65 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/5/1862:3. ‘...otira, kia mohio nga iwi Maori ka tiakina paitia te wahi ki a ratou e Ta Hori Kerei, Kawana, ratou ko ana minita korero tahi.’
66 Graham, p 114
67 A third of the men of the Wellington Province who were entitled to vote did not register, and often more than half of registered voters did not vote. See Dalziel, pp 96-97.
69 Galbreath, p 32.
70 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 26/4/1858: 2-3. The original letters in English are printed in *AJHR* (1858) E2, pp 2-3.
qualified for the Wellington electoral roll. In discussing this, Te Karere o Poneke again stressed the equality of rights of Māori and Pakehā, but with regard to the legal requirement of registration, that is, possession of freehold land or a house with an annual value of £5. It did not apply to ‘people just living in a native fashion [noho maori] in Māori houses.’ By July, the review was completed. The paper again stressed the issue of equality, as the judges had reviewed not only the names of Māori, but also of Pakehā. ‘It was the same as what was done to the Pakehā names—there was just one way of doing it.’ Māori, he suggested, should not be upset at being removed from the roll, nor think that the judges had acted without authority [pokanoa]. Rather,

when it was seen that it is a house built just like a pigsty, with no chimney, windows or character, then the writing of that man [onto the roll] was said to be pokanoa and it was therefore removed.

Buller returned to the issue the following month, distancing himself further from increased Māori participation by suggesting that people needed ‘knowledge’ in order to be able to cast votes properly. It appears likely that the young Buller felt pressure to conform to general Pakehā opinion that Māori were not ready for political activity.

The Māori response

A few Māori, as with food and clothing, wrote letters to the newspapers expressing embarrassment at Māori housing. For Ehekiere, citing Matthew 6:6, the lack of rooms in Māori houses precluded the advent of the Holy Spirit. Such letters were rare, as most Māori probably realised that they could not afford a Pakehā-style house even if they wanted one. Nor do letters to the editors display any great concern with the electoral process. This may have been because the issue was confusing. One correspondent, for example, was worried he had to own a house before he was allowed to subscribe to Te Karere o Poneke. However, the Queen, and her

---

71 Te Karere o Poneke, 3/5/1858:2. ‘... nga tangata e noho maori noa iho ana i roto i nga whare maori.’
72 Te Karere o Poneke, 5/7/1858:2. ‘...ko te kitenga he whare hanga noa iho, me he whare poaka, timere kore, wini kore, ahua kore, ka tahi ka kiia he pokanoa te tuhi i taua tangata, na, ko kona te whakakorenga.’
73 Te Karere o Poneke, 2/8/1858:2. ‘Ma te matauranga hoki ka tika te hoatutanga poati o te tangata e whai poi ana.’
74 Te Karere o Poneke, 12/11/1857:2; Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:19.
75 Te Haeata, 1/6/1860:2-3. Mat 6:6 states ‘But thou, when thou prayer, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.’
76 Te Karere o Poneke, 2/8/1858:2.
representative, the Governor, continued to embody Pākehā mana for Māori, rather than the settler assemblies.

One Māori who did investigate the relationship between housing and politics was Hēnare Wiremu Taratoa who wrote to Te Karere o Poneke about a letter he had written to the governor, asking

him to discuss a way Māori might enter into Pākehā’s politics. [I] also asked him to explain the unity of Pākehā and Māori. But the main issue of my enquiry was to ask about the 7th clause of the laws of New Zealand. The 7th clause related to the various ways people could qualify to vote. However, Taratoa wanted more than Māori just possessing the right to vote: he wanted Māori to participate in decision-making. Unfortunately his original letter was not printed, but Te Karere o Poneke did include the reply written by the Native Secretary. McLean stressed the political equality of the races, saying ‘there is nothing to impede the Māori from standing for this assembly when he has gained knowledge.’

The governor, he claimed, was as a father to Maori, guiding and encouraging Māori along the right path. Perhaps with reference to the Kingitanga, he also stated that no assembly not approved by the Queen could be countenanced by the Governor. Taratoa appeared unconvinced with McLean’s answer, telling the readers ‘but, you can look at the meaning of this letter.’

At the Kohimarama conference, Pāora Tūhaere of Ngāti Whātua also expressed a desire for Māori to join the Pākehā rūnanga, but the prevailing opinion, which Tūhaere also shared, was that the conference of chiefs should become a permanent institution. It was not that the chiefs at Kohimarama did not want to make decisions with Pākehā: they certainly wanted mixed-race juries. However, it is clear that Māori, both those within the Kingitanga and those without preferred higher institutions which catered to Māori language and tikanga. The governor still held responsibility for Māori affairs, and it was more practical for the chiefs to present a

77 Te Karere o Poneke, 8/11/1858 Suppl:1. ‘...kia korerotia mai e ia he tikanga e uru ai te tangata Māori ki o te Pakeha tikanga. He patai atu hoki kia whakamaramatia mai e ia e te whakakotahitanga o te Pakeha, me te tangata maori. Otira, ko te tino take o taku patai, he ui atu naku, mo te 7 o nga upoko o nga Ture o Niu Tiri.'
78 Te Karere o Poneke, 8/11/1858 Suppl:1. ‘...kahore he mea hei arai i te tangata Maori te tu ai ia ki tenei rūnanga ana whiwhi raia i ki te mohiotanga.'
79 Te Karere o Poneke, 8/11/1858 Suppl:1. ‘Otira, ma koutou, e titiro iho te tikanga i roto i tenei reta.’
Roads, Mail and Loyalty

The mail and the roads on which it was carried were also signs that New Zealand was becoming more “civilised”. Despite the benefits that roads could bring Māori, roads also meant increased government intrusion, and were therefore a threat to tino rangatiratanga. An efficient internal mail service was of advantage to the government, in particular when communicating with the various Provincial Councils, and to the increasing number of settlers scattered around New Zealand. The mail steamer service was relatively expensive, prone to irregularity, and in 1862 was put under great pressure when two steamers were wrecked. Consequently, the Post Office made extensive use of overland routes which accounted for about half of all letters posted, even after the activities of ‘insurgent Natives’ in Taranaki permanently halted a vital link in the Auckland-Wellington route in 1861. Because of the poor state of the tracks used and the reliance on inland mail, the government was keen to build roads. Quite apart from the advantages to the Post Office and the easier movement of goods and stock, the presence of roads and mail, according to John Tancred, the Postmaster-General in 1860, would also “exercise a beneficial and civilizing influence on the Native population”.

Rev. John Morgan also used the same message in convincing Māori assembled at Taupō to accept an inland road between Auckland and Napier.

You are a people living in the interior of the country. Those tribes who live near the sea will get knowledge and wealth, while you live in ignorance and poverty. A road would bring good things to you, and enlighten your thoughts; by which means you will procure property and prosper.

---

83 It is clear that Māori MHRs did not adapt particularly well when they did enter Parliament in 1867. See Parkinson, passim.
84 AJHR (1860), D3, pp 10, 23; (1862), D2, p 4; (1863) D2, p 7. The Wanganui to Taranaki link was not reinstated during this research period.
86 Te Karere Maori, 13/3/1858:2. ‘Ko koutou he iwi e noho ana ki te tino tuawhenua, engari nga iwi e noho ana ki te taha moana ka whiwhi ratou ki te mohiotanga, ki te taonga, tena ko koutou e noho kuaro ana, e noho rawa kore ana; ma te rori ano ka puta mai nga tikanga pai kia koutou; ka marama ai o koutou whakaaro, ka whiwhi ai koutou ki te taonga, a ka kake tonu ai koutou.’
As both the CMS missionary at Ōtawhao, and the man credited with ‘establishing and controlling the difficult [postal] services’ south of Auckland, he could quite justly link the two positions together.

I brought the good tidings; had it not been for the good tidings of the Gospel you had still been in darkness to this day; I have also brought the Mail...\(^8\)

*Te Haeata* also saw fit to link the passage of mail with divine messages. God taught Moses to write, which made writing a gift from God. Anyone wanting to impede the passage of mail was therefore acting against the will of God.\(^8\) It also used more pragmatic arguments.

We can’t see the harm of the mail: we think that it is useful for both Māori and Pākehā—as both the Pākehā’s letter, and the Māori’s is carried. Presently, the Pākehā’s [mail] will be taken on the steamer, and the Māori’s will be left behind [as] there won’t be any carriers. What will result from his [the Māori’s] way of thinking. He will soon see the ignorance of his thinking.\(^9\)

The government newspaper also pitched the economic advantages of roads to Māori: produce could be transported in larger quantities, land could be opened up, travel would be easier, and Māori would prosper.\(^9\) Roads were a contentious issue for many Māori, who held a variety of opinions on the issue. For some tribes, roads were seen as a threat to their mana. At Maketū a road being built became an issue over which hapū would have mana over it.\(^9\) However, there could be more serious threats to tribal mana. In Waikato, there was a (quite justifiable) fear that roads would allow military incursions.\(^9\) As Wiremu Tamihana stated with regard to Grey’s road pushing southwards, ‘I am fearful lest the big guns be brought upon that road.’\(^9\)

Wiremu Toetoe, who had earlier supported Morgan’s entreaties at Taupō and had been a postal agent, used his subsequent overseas experience to explain why government roads would be an imposition on the mana of the Kīngitanga.

Now, I have been to the lands overseas and I have seen the kings living in that large land in Europe. The mana of one king does not impose upon another. I therefore thought

\(^{87}\) *AJHR* (1862), D2, p 4.

\(^{88}\) *Te Karere Māori*, 13/3/1858:2. ‘Naku ano te Rongo Pai, naku i kawe mai. Me kore te Rongo Pai, e noho ana koutou i te pouritanga tuaa noatia tenei ra. Naku ano te mera i homai ki a koutou...’

\(^{89}\) *Te Haeata*, 1/9/1860:4.

\(^{90}\) *Te Haeata*, 2/7/1860:1. ‘Kahore matou i mohio ki te he o nga meira: ka hua matou e wai tikanga ana mo te Pakeha raua tahi ko te Maori–kawea ana te rea o te Pakeha, kawea ana hoki to te Maori. Akuanei, riro ana ta te Pakeha i runga i nga Timia, mahue noa ana ta te Maori, kahore he kai kawe. Heahakoa, i tana whakaaro? Meake kia te kuaretanga o tana whakaaro.’

\(^{91}\) For example, see *Te Karere Māori*, 30/5/1857:5; 15/8/1857:4; 16/4/1859:1; 5/2/1862:9; 115/1862:4-5; 1/7/1862:4.

\(^{92}\) *Te Karere Māori*, 16/12/1862:12-13.

\(^{93}\) *Te Karere Māori*, 5/2/1862:17, 24.

\(^{94}\) *AJHR* (1863) E12, p 14. Original Māori text in *Te Hokioi*, 10/11/1862:1. ‘...he tu pato hoki noku kei haria mai nga punui i runga i tāua rori...’
the people were correct in thinking to set up a king for themselves, and that is why I say we should bar the road.95

Māori also commonly believed they would lose title to land through which a road passed.96 This was especially the case when Māori were being paid to build the road. For example, the Tūhourangi komiti of Tarawera stated, some were concerned 'lest you (the Governor) should claim the road as payment for the money and possess all power [mana] over it.'97 They then asserted that both the mana and the road would remain theirs. McLean in reply did not mention the issue of mana, but tried to assuage their fears saying, 'the money paid to those working on the road for the mail will not be considered as a reason to take the land of Māori people.98 Tūhourangi were still not convinced. Parakaia Tararoa raised the issue again at Kohimarama, and received a similar response from McLean.99

Many Māori, however, wanted roads for various practical purposes, and to encourage prosperity. Mail contracts were advertised in Te Karere Maori,100 which many Māori competed for, and successfully performed.101 While the work could be very difficult, as attested in Karehana Te Whena’s account of crossing flooded rivers in order to get the mail through,102 it could also be quite lucrative: the weekly service between Auckland and New Plymouth being paid at the rate of £700 per year.103 On one occasion, the Ngāti Kahungunu chief, Renata Kawepō, allegedly tried to intimidate potential rivals bidding for a mail contract, and when unsuccessful, threatened to stop the whole service.104 Reasonable wages were also sometimes offered for road work. When Wiremu Nero Te Awaitaia started to build a contentious

---

95 Te Hokioi, 10/11/1862:1. ‘...na kua tae a hau ki nga whenua o ta wahi kua kite abau i nga kingi e noho maira i tera whenua nui i Uropi ka ore te mana o te tahi kingi eke ki runga ki te tahi kingi, no reira ka tahi au ka mahara (aue! he tika ano te mohio tanga o te iwi ki te whakatū i te tahi kingi mo ratou, ko ia a hau ka mea me keti te rori[.])’ See AJHR (1863) E12, p 15 for the official government translation.
97 Te Karere Maori, 31/3/1860:5. ‘...kai riro tonu i a koe te huarahi hei utu mo nga moni, me te mana hoki o te rori, kia riro ki a koe.’
98 Te Karere Maori, 31/3/1860:6. ‘...e kore e meinga nga moni e utua ana ki nga kaimahi rori mo te mera, hei take tango i nga whenua a nga tangata Maori[,]’; ‘...the money that is spent on the improvement of the roads for the mail service will not be made use of to set up a claim to the Natives land[.].’
99 Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1860:33-34.
100 Te Karere Maori, 15/12/1857:3-4, 31/3/1859:3-4; 31/12/1859:8.
101 AJHR (1862) D2, p 4. Some delivery times were a little slower for Māori carriers because they would not work on Sundays. Howard Robinson, A History of the Post Office in New Zealand (Wellington: Government Printer, 1964) p.58.
102 Te Karere o Poneke, 24/12/1857:3.
103 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1858:5.
road from Waipā to Whāingaroa, the government was happy to pay four shillings per
day to each worker. However, some Māori were less concerned with money.
Wiremu Toetoe organised the Auckland to Taupō contract, and Te Poihipi from
Taupō to Napier, and both organised road building parties. They were prepared to
offer their services for free, but the Post Office awarded them a £10 gratuity for their
services.

For Māori, roads and mail meant also the intrusion of governmental influence.
Māori were well aware that the Romans had utilised roads and bridges in subjugating
Britain. An acceptance of these services was therefore as much a political decision
as an economic one, and as such required a tribal consensus. For example, when the
government wanted a road through Waikato, Pōtatau, the ariki, would not give
authority unless all chiefs agreed, knowing this was unlikely. Some were prepared
to accept roads, even if they didn’t trust the government fully. As Te Ao-o-te-Rangi
of Tainui told Governor Grey and assembled Waikato Māori at Kohanga in 1861,

I speak thus to you, O Governor, because of the words which you spoke to me about the
roads and the bye-roads: I consent to them. This is neutrality (or friendliness), O
Waikato: I am much in want of my road. Look at my side (of the subject). Let the
Kupapa (neutral native) defer his word (of censure). If you see the guns and soldiers
travelling on the road, the error will be mine, apprehend me, because I shall be in fault:
judge me, convey me to prison, because the Governor and I shall have cleared the road,
allowing the guns and soldiers to pass. If my road is formed I shall be much pleased at
being able to take my potatoes, and wheat, and onions, and other produce to market.

Even in the supposedly “loyal” north, tribal consent was needed for a road for
Kaipara with several tribal meetings and a number of letters sent confirming
acceptance. Māori sometimes linked their acceptance of roads with a reaffirmation
of loyalty or the acceptance of the government’s mana. Browne, when governor, shared this view. In the peace conditions he imposed in 1861 after the first Taranaki

105 Te Karere Maori, 13/3/1862:10. This would equate to £1 per week, or about £50 p.a. This was not
an excessive amount, but no doubt was attractive enough. As a comparison, an “ordinary [Pākehā]
mechanic” earned about £75 p.a. in 1858. See AJHR (1858) E1:52. However, Māori salaries were
considerably lower: under Grey’s Tikanga Hou, an assessor’s salary was set at £30-50 p.a., a warden’s
at £20, and a karere’s (constable) at £10. See Ward (1995) p 132.
108 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:2.
109 Te Karere Maori, 5/2/1862:21-22. “E te Kawana ko taku korero ka hoatu nei ki kia a koe, mo nga kupu
i kii nei koe ki au, ko nga rori ko nga roripeka; e whakaae ana au ki ena. Ko te kupapa tenei, e Waikato;
e mate ana au ki taku rori; tirohia mai taku taha. Taria te kupu e te Kupapa. Ki te kite koe i nga purepo
me nga hoia e haere ana i te rori, nuku tena he; me hopu au, na te mea naku tena he: whakakawia au,
kawea au ki te whare herehere, no te mea na maua ko te Kawana i tahi te rori, i puta ai nga repo me nga
hoia. Ki te tika taku rori, pai toa ake au ki puta ai aku riwai, aku witi, ahu aniana, aku aha ki te hoko.”
110 Te Karere Maori, 31/10/1857:9-10.
War, Te Ati Awa were compelled to agree to provide land for roads and redoubts.\(^{112}\)

When issuing his “Declaration to the Waikatos” in May, 1861 prior to a planned war, Browne reiterated this point in his statement “[t]hat every man, European or Native, under the Queen’s Sovereignty, submit to have roads and bridges made on his land, wherever the public convenience requires them.”\(^{113}\) However, Browne was recalled before his ultimatum could be tested, and war with the Kingitanga was averted for several years.

Generally, the government did not attempt to force unpopular roads upon Māori without some local support. One exception was the road that troops were constructing south from Auckland towards the Waikato. The Kingitanga were certainly displeased with it but as the government had already acquired the lands through which it passed up to the Mangatāwhiri River, they did not have the moral right to intervene.\(^{114}\) The government newspapers used persuasion in promoting roads, belittling those Māori who stood opposed, and praising those who were in favour.\(^{115}\) For example when Nopera requested that Ormond, the Superintendent of Hawkes Bay, repair flood damage to bridges and roads, the letter was printed in *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*. No doubt mindful of the increasingly negative attitude of some Māori to colonisation, the editor added the following note.

*We are pleased at the Māori who are beginning to understand the benefits of roads and bridges. We are very gratified to publish a letter like this, because it shows that the thoughts of Māori are turning to these matters.*\(^{116}\)

Roads and the passage of mail were signs of ‘civilisation’ but for Māori there were also political ramifications. Acceptance meant also agreement to increased governmental intrusion.

---

\(^{111}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 16/4/1859:3-5; 15/7/1861:13.

\(^{112}\) *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 15/5/1861:3.

\(^{113}\) *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 1/6/1861:4. ‘Ko ia tangata ko ia tangata, Pakeha ranei Māori ranei e noho ana i raro i to Te Kuini Mana me whakaae ki te rori ki te arawhata kia mahia ki runga ki tona whenua ki nga wahi katoa e matea ai aua mea mo te tokomaha.’

\(^{114}\) As seen in Chapter 8, the Kingitanga argued that the Māori King should have *mana* over his “piece” and the governor over his own “piece” (i.e. the lands which the government had already bought). The Kingitanga therefore could not intervene to stop the government road even though it was directly threatening the Waikato.

\(^{115}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 16/4/1859:1; 13/3/1862: 9; 14/4/1862:10, 13; 15/5/1863:3, 3-4.

\(^{116}\) *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 25/7/1863:3. ‘E hari ana matou ki nga maori ka timata nei te matauranga o ratou ki te painga o nga rori, o nga arawhata. Ka nui hoki ta matou pai ki te panui i te reta penei; no te mea he mea whakite ia i te whakaaro o nga maori e anga ana ki runga i enei mea.’
Land

As Native Secretary responsible for the publication of *Te Karere Maori*, McLean was able to utilise *Te Karere Maori* in producing propaganda to assist his land buying efforts. The Wesleyan influenced newspapers, especially Buller's *Te Karere o Poneke*, also helped. For Māori, their lands were not merely economic assets, but were also places that had witnessed the deeds of their ancestors, and held their wāhi tapu. The tribal ownership of land linked the members of the group together with a variety of overlapping resource rights. It also excluded outsiders, thus, in the absence of larger polities, land not only reflected the extent of, but also embodied, tribal mana. Māori therefore regarded their lands with feelings more deeply emotional and spiritual than Pākehā settlers, and many were loathe to sell. As Richmond noted,

> [t]he Maori feels keenly the parting with his rights over the lands of his ancestors. ... The soil, with all its memories, and the dignity conferred by its possession, have passed over to the stranger; and in its place he has acquired only perishable goods, or money which is speedily dissipated.

Land selling, therefore, had enormous ramifications for Māori society. However, the increasing numbers of Pākehā arriving in New Zealand created a demand for land upon which to settle them. Under the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Crown had a pre-emptive right to Māori land, supposedly to protect Māori from being swindled in private dealing. This also enabled the Crown to buy land from Māori at low prices, and to resell to Pākehā at a higher rate, thus generating funds for running the government, developing infrastructure, and promoting continuing immigration.

By 1853, the government had acquired 32 million acres of land, almost half the New Zealand land mass, for £50,000. Between 1853 and 1861, Donald McLean performed two roles: Native Secretary, charged with the responsibility for Māori welfare, and also Chief Land Purchase Commissioner. Such was his zeal for his second role that, by 1860, he and his agents had purchased another 13 million acres of land.
Māori land, more than was acquired by purchase, confiscation and land courts in the following thirty years. Unlike Grey, his predecessor, Governor Browne did little to impede McLean’s purchasing activities. As immigration increased, McLean tried to keep ahead of the demand, and became increasingly unscrupulous in his efforts. It was not that there was insufficient land for Pākehā settlement, at least in the Auckland province, but that settlers preferred to pay the 5-10 shilling per acre rate set by Grey’s 1853 Ordinance rather than pay the inflated prices set by speculators who had already purchased much of the available land.

The newspapers called on Māori to sell their “waste” land, that is, surplus lands that they were not using for agricultural purposes. Some settlers advocated Locke’s dictum that “as much land as a man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can use the product of, so much is his property.” The government was not prepared to endorse this thesis, knowing that both Māori and missionaries would oppose it. However, its organ, Te Karere Maori, certainly expounded the view that holding on to waste land by Māori was immoral, that, “the world was created as a dwelling place for men, so according to God’s tikanga, it is wrong for it to just lie as wilderness.” Indeed, the withholding of land by Māori led to war.

Their land is not used to grow wealth and life for the tribe. No, it is as a snare, and to impede the tikanga of goodness and life. Its purpose is as good, but becomes evil, dispatching the person who owns that thing to sin. [This] does not follow God’s command that man’s work is fighting the earth, so that its back[?] be broken, to produce food to strengthen man’s heart. Rather he fights and kills his companion, and by this act there are fewer hands to till that land.

**Notes:**

122 Sinclair (1976), p 53.
125 Sinclair (1959) p 114.
127 For example, see Fox, pp 89-90.
129 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/10/1857:2. ‘I hanga te ao hei nohoanga mo te tangata, na, e he ana ki to Te Atua tikanga kia waiho kia takoto koraha noa iho.’; ‘...as the earth has been created for the use of man, it is against the laws of Providence that it should be kept in a wild state of nature.’
130 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/3/1857:4. ‘Iaianinei, te waiho o ratou whenua hei whakatupu i te whaitaonga me te ora mo te iwi, kahore, hei mahanga ia hei mea ara i atu i nga tikanga o te pai, o te ora. Tona tikanga, hei pai ia, puta ke hei kino, hei tuku i te tangata nona taua mea ki te he. Te waiho i ta te Atua i whakahau iho ai hei mahi mo te tangata, ko te whawhahui ki te whenua ki whai ai tona tara i a ia, ko te whakapita i te kai hei whakakaha i te ngakau o te tangata; puta ke tonu hoa tangata nei ka whawhaitia e ia, ka tukitukia e ia; a ouou iho i tana mahi nga ringaringa mana e ngak i tua whenua.’; ‘At present
This reflected not only the Biblical rejoinder to ‘[b]e fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it’\textsuperscript{131} but also the contemporary belief that the lack of a codified system of land tenure resulted in Māori feuding.

The settler government passed the Native Territorial Rights Act in 1858 which was designed to ‘ascertain the territorial rights of Māori tribes and to enable free grants to be given to Māori of Māori land which had been ceded to the Crown for that purpose.’ However, the British Government was well aware of the complexity of Māori land tenure, and vetoed the Act lest its troops become embroiled in enforcing title decisions.\textsuperscript{132} Nevertheless, the government’s land buying endeavours continued to create rifts between \textit{iwi}, and within them, between those wishing to \textit{tuku whenua} (release the land) and those who wanted to \textit{pupuri whenua} (hold the land). The dissension sometimes erupted into warfare. Prior to 1860 when government troops engaged with Māori over the Waitara block in Taranaki, the newspapers regularly commented on Māori feuding and near warfare in the Wairarapa, Kaipara, Bay of Plenty regions, but in particular in Taranaki where Māori had been sporadically fighting each other for land since 1854.\textsuperscript{133} However, the newspapers were not prepared to acknowledge that government pressure to sell was the cause: it was the ownership of land without fixed title that was supposedly causing the problems.\textsuperscript{134}

Indeed, the sale of land would encourage more Pākehā to settle in New Zealand. Such was the store set on the value of Pākehā, that Northland Māori were told that they would not be getting any Pākehā if they did not desist from tribal warfare.\textsuperscript{135} The newspapers deemed Pākehā to be particularly advantageous to Māori who could benefit financially and materially by selling more at the markets and trading with their

\textsuperscript{131} Gen 1:28.


\textsuperscript{133} For example see \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/5/1855:11-12; 1/6/1855: 1/7/1855:7; 11-14; 31/5/1856:9-12; 31/3/1857:3-4; 30/5/1857:1-2; 31/12/1857: 2-3; 15/2/1858:1-3; 15/2/1858:4-5; \textit{Te Waka o te Iwi}, 1/10/1857:3, 4; \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 31/12/1857:4; 29/3/1858:2; 6/9/1858: 2-3; \textit{Te Whetu o te Tau}, 1/7/1858:3; \textit{Te Haeata}, 1/7/1859:2; 1/10/1859:1.

\textsuperscript{134} For example, \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/6/1855:4; 31/5/1856:9-12; 31/3/1857:3-4; 31/5/1857:1-2; 30/6/1857:1-3; 15/9/1857:1-2; 15/2/1858:4-5.

\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/5/1856:12.
new neighbours. Land, valueless as "waste", would also increase in value with Pākehā settling nearby. Pākehā, moreover, were fulfilling God's command to "occupy" the earth. As Te Karere o Poneke stated,

So we consider that you should give up part of the land for this people, the Pākehā, whom God gave to you as a protecting friend, and to make productive the part which you will not occupy. A by-product of Pākehā settlement, as a number of newspapers declared, was the exposure of Māori to civilising influences.

In order to encourage Māori to sell land, Te Karere Maori and Te Karere o Poneke promoted the individuals and tribes who were prepared to sell. For example, after Governor Browne had discussed the government’s policies with the chiefs of Manawatu, Te Karere Maori could happily report:

The Māori people of that coast are now thinking clearly with regard to the tikanga of selling land, that is, giving up to the Government their lands which just lie [idle].

As for those tribes who had not reached this level of understanding, ‘we doubt not they also will in time have eyes to see the truth.’ The pupuri whenua camp were disparaged by these newspapers as kware (ignorant, uncivilised). Nepia Taratoa was one Manawatu chief unwilling to part with his land, to which Te Karere o Poneke expressed the desire that ‘perhaps soon [he] will turn to the tikanga mārama of his chiefly friends.’ Te Karere Maori also suggested that the promoters of hui to hold back land often did so out for personal advantage.

We have seen many of these meetings, but none of them have ever been attended with good results; and the promoters of them are often the first to offer the land for sale; and not infrequently, unless closely watched, the most greedy to have all the money for themselves.
Te Karere Maori also printed details of many of the large blocks of land acquired by the government. This may have encouraged those already disposed to tuku whenua, but can surely not have been of any comfort to those Māori politically or emotionally against the sale of land.

Te Karere Maori was happy to recount examples of Māori mendacity or greed with regard to land sales. However, it, along with Te Karere o Poneke, also carried the contrasting theme that the government had always acted justly over land, and had never bought land without agreement or payment. Although not always relating to Taranaki, the government newspapers heavily promoted the notion of governmental honesty after Te Teira had offered the Waitara for sale against the wishes of Te Rangitāke and other Ngāti Awa, when Māori concerns about government intentions were heightened. Using historical argument, it insisted that the English had never taken the lands of Indians in North America. Besides, they had learnt from the mistakes of their previous colonising, although unfortunately not in time for the aboriginals of Tasmania and Sydney. Te Haeata also used this argument, saying in the past, invaders merely took land but ‘because England is very kind to you, it says let us buy a piece of your land.’ In fact, the newspapers portrayed an omnipotent Crown who could easily take all Māori land, but chose not to out of a sense of morality.

If this great iwi, England, thought like that, it would not eat scraps, or act secretly, or go along stealthily, but would do its business out in the daylight. If this great iwi, England, thought like that, it would not eat scraps, or act secretly, or go along stealthily, but would do its business out in the daylight.

146 Te Karere Maori, 1/1/1855:731/10/1857:7; 30/10/1858:4.
147 Te Karere o Poneke, 8/2/1858:2; 4/10/1858:2; Te Karere Maori, 15/6/1859:1-2; 31/8/1859:1-4; 31/5/1860:3; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/7/1861:10-11. Te Karere Maori and Te Karere o Poneke both also saw the need to reassure Māori that the New Zealand Native Reserves Act 1856 was not a government attempt to steal Māori land. See Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1858:4-5; Te Karere o Poneke, 10/5/1858:4; 14/6/1858:2.
148 The events in Taranaki will be discussed further in Chapter 7.
149 Te Karere Maori, 1/12/1855:2.
150 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/7/1861:11.
151 Te Haeata, 1/10/1861:1. 'Tena ko tenei, he tino atawhai no Ingarani ki a koutou, i mea ai, me utu tetahi wahi o to koutou whenua.'
152 Te Karere Maori, 15/6/1859:2. 'Me he whakaaro pero to te iwi nui nei, to Ingarani, ekore ia e hamu karaweta, ekore ia e mahi huna, e haere whakapapa, engari, ka mahia nuitia tana mahi i te awatea.‘...had such been the intention of a great nation like England, she would not require to resort to any petty or underhand means for carrying out her purpose; that which she wished to do would be done by daylight.'
Once hostilities had commenced in Taranaki, the government newspaper also insisted that it would continue to act justly once it had defeated Te Rangitāke. It also ridiculed the accusations of the Ngāti Kahungunu chief Rēnata Kawepō that the government had instituted new and unjust methods of buying land in Taranaki which had resulted in war, insisting that its policies remained unchanged and just.

McLean and other government officials occasionally used underhand methods in land purchasing, buying huge blocks of land without regard to the future needs of the Māori sellers. However, Te Karere Maori and Te Karere o Poneke told Māori readers that land sales were voluntary, and that they should only sell lands they did not want. As Buller told his readers, we do not say that you should sell all the land—not at all. But just the waste land [land just lying]; that way a person will get the things with which to work on the piece that remains to him.

As seen below in the discussion on commerce, the Pākehā-run newspapers, at least prior to the Taranaki War, advocated Māori agricultural productivity while large scale land buying continued unabated.

Along with the extinguishment of native title by the purchase of Māori lands from hapū and iwi, the newspapers also promoted the surveying of land so it could be individualised and awarded a ‘crown grant’. Māori were also encouraged to purchase Crown land. Te Rangi, a police constable, for example, bought 19 acres for £95 at Takapuna, land that Māori may have earlier sold for a pound or two. For most Māori, however, an individual ‘piece’ was more likely to come out of dividing existing tribal estates. Of course, this might allow individual Māori to sell their “piece” without tribal approval, but the concept was promoted on the basis of increased productivity and wealth for Māori owners, as well as the guarantee of
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154 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:8. See Chapter 8 for a discussion on Kawepō.
156 Te Karere o Poneke, 15/2/1858:3; 29/3/1858:3; 4/10/1858:2; Te Karere Maori, 15/3/1860.
157 Te Karere o Poneke, 29/3/1858:3. ‘Ehara hoki ta matou i te ki kia hokona katoa nga whenua-kahore. Erangi ko nga whenua takoto noa: ma reira hoki ka whiwhi ai te tangata i nga mea e pono ai tana mahi i te wahi e toe ana ki a ia.’
159 Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:30.
ownership.\textsuperscript{160} As encouragement to others, newspapers featured chiefs who were individualising.\textsuperscript{161} Readers learnt, for example, that Te Hemara of Ngāti Rango was awaiting a crown grant for his land and was busy making money.

We celebrate the work of Te Hemara, and we say, his acts of advancement should stand as an example for the tribes living in lots of other places.\textsuperscript{[LP]}\textsuperscript{162}

For the newspapers, individual ownership was thus a sign of civilisation. Rangiaohia near Te Awamutu, with its mills, churches and wheat fields, was often touted as an example of Māori adopting European civilisation.\textsuperscript{163} John Morgan, the local missionary (and postal organiser) promoted farming in this district, envisaging Māori on small individual family farms in what Kerry Howe describes as ‘an idealistic pre-industrial rural setting’.\textsuperscript{164} The Rangiaohia Māori, at least before the Kingitanga became too prominent a threat, were particularly lauded for their advancement and adoption of ngā tikanga pakeha, and for their efforts at land individualisation.\textsuperscript{165}

Only one Pākehā editor stood out against the government pressure on Māori to sell their land. C.O.B. Davis was editor for some time of Te Karere Māori, as well as three short-lived private newspapers: Te Waka o te Iwi; Te Whetu o te Tau; and Ko Aoteaora. He clearly associated the practices employed by land buyers for the problems over land ownership, saying,

In this provoking of warfare, and secret buying of land, is the Māori or the Pākehā at fault? Which ear of the Pākehā will hear? The ears tingle from [Māori repeatedly] saying that the land does not belong to a single person. They have heard on good authority that the land belongs to everyone: chiefs and commoners, men and women, the old and young. With this knowledge, the Pākehā heads off and offers money to people without the authority to give up the land. If the land is held onto, he [the Pākehā] should not be angry—his anger would be wrong; if his money is all spent, he should not be angry because it is his, the Pakeha’s, own fault.\textsuperscript{166}
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Davis was also happy to print a number of letters from Māori in Te Waka and Te Whetu in which they proclaimed ownership of their land. These letters became a printed declaration that their lands ‘will be held, and never given over to the Pākehā, even if some other person interferes to sell these lands’. With the authority and permanence of the printed word, Māori no doubt saw these declarations as good as a de facto title, in the absence of a crown grant.

Davis also supported the idea of leasing land rather than selling it. While Māori leases were illegal as they would have undermined the purchasing programme, a number of Pākehā were taking on leases in the hope of a law change. Te Karere Maori acknowledged these leases soon after Davis’s article but reiterated their illegal status. While Davis was prepared to advocate Māori concerns in his private philanthropic papers, he was careful to maintain the official government line after being reinstated as editor of Te Karere Maori in 1862.

Māori attitude to Land

Māori chiefs, understood that by signing the Treaty of Waitangi, they were to ‘give to the Queen of England for ever the complete government over their land’. As will be discussed in Chapter 7, whether this was a cession of mana (and to what extent) to the Queen was a moot point by 1860, with Māori holding a variety of opinions on the issue. However, it is clear that Māori of this time considered that their own mana over a piece of land disappeared once it had been sold to Europeans. For example, when Heretaunga Māori sold land at Ohara to the Crown, a correspondent, Te Rou, considered that ‘their land had been sealed to the Queen’. Inia Riwa Te Tua, of Ohara, then wrote that the mana of Heretaunga had gone to the
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167 Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/11/1857:4. ‘...ka puritia nei, e kore e tukua ki te Pakeha, ahakoa poka mai tetahi, atu tangata ki te hoko i enei whenua...’ See also other examples in Te Waka o te Iwi, 1/10/1857:3, 4; 1/11/1857:4; Te Whetu o te Tau, 1/6/1857:2.
168 Ko Aotearoa, 1862:27.
169 Te Karere Maori, 5/2/1862:24.
170 This is a translation of the Māori text: ‘...ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.’ The original English text reads ‘...cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty which the said Confederation or Individual Chiefs respectively exercise or possess, or may be supposed to exercise or to possess over their respective Territories as the sole Sovereigns thereof.’
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Queen, and that the Māori there were ‘living on the wairua of the land’, that is, they had lost the substance of the land. This theme was elaborated on by Harawira Tutawia of Aratoetoe who said, ‘The people of Heretaunga are living on the wairua of the land. It is right, this is the place misfortune does well. This is the misfortune: the transfer and the pain.’

The Kingitanga also held the view that the mana transferred to the Crown once land was sold, and that Queen’s mana resided over Pākehā land, that ‘the mana of King Pōtatau should stand on the parts of New Zealand which we hold, [and] the mana of Queen [Victoria] should stand on the parts which she has obtained.’ Even the small plots of lands acquired by the Crown within the Kingitanga were ‘not clear’, that is, the Kingitanga was unsure to what degree its mana resided on these tiny pockets of land. This was shown when a Ngāti Maniapoto taua led by Patene Poutama came to eject Gorst from Te Awamutu in 1862. The Te Karere Maori reported,

Gorst said he was standing on his own piece [of land] and Patene’s action telling him to leave was wrong... Gorst said that that Ngāti Maniapoto group had appeared with their guns and threatening language on the Queen’s lands, and according to their tikanga, that of the Māori, what they did was wrong.

The argument worked, although Gorst was not as lucky the following year when a Ngāti Maniapoto taua expelled him for his words in the anti-Kingitanga newspaper, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke.

**Land Sales and Settlement**

For those chiefs who were prepared to accept the Queen’s mana, the act of selling land could be seen as an act of loyalty or accepting English law. Hōri Winiata, of Kaipara, told the Kohimarama Conference,
I asked myself, How shall I secure an entrance into the laws of the Queen? When I had considered, I parted with my land (to the Government) so that I might enter. 177

Te Hāpuku of Ngāti Kahungunu stated that he sold land because ‘we all belong to the Government.’ 178 Raniera Te Iho of Wairarapa was even more direct, saying ‘This is my embracing of the Queen, the giving up of my lands.’ [LP] 179 This sentiment was not shared by all: Hōri Kingi Te Anana of Whanganui, for example, was quite clear that he saw loyalty and selling land as two separate issues. 180

Many Māori did want to sell land in order to attract Pākehā trade. Belich argues that tribes that could trade with Pākehā towns at a distance, such as those of Waikato and Taranaki, sold little land. 181 This argument is perhaps a little too simplistic. The transport of produce from the Waikato to Auckland was not easy, requiring various different modes of transport for each shipment. 182 One of the primary policies of the Kīngitanga, which received its greatest support from central North Island tribes, was to resist land sales. However, the Lower Waikato tribes, who were closer to Auckland, were less willing to join the movement than those Waikato more distant from the trading centre, while the more isolated tribe, Ngāti Maniapoto, was most resistant to Pākehā settlement in their region. It appears that those tribes most distant from Pākehā settlement were the most resistant to it. According to Rev. Woon of Whanganui, the fear of Pākehā by interior tribes who seldom saw Pākehā motivated this type of thinking. 183 However, these tribes still effectively retained their rangatiratanga that would have been under threat had their lands been inundated by mass immigration. Certainly the Northland tribes, which had had the earliest contact with Pākehā, were relatively close to Auckland. There were also several Māori owned schooners plying the Whangarei-Auckland run. 184 Yet rather than exclude settlers, Northland Māori made a number of requests that Pākehā settlers be sent to them. 185 Many Māori were therefore happy that their prospective trading partners

177 Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1860:23. ‘Kua mea ahau me pehea taku tapokotanga ki roto ki te ture o te Kuini, ka whakaaro ahau, hoatu ana e ahau taku whenua hei whakatapokoranga moku.’
178 Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860:45. ‘No roto katao hoki tatou i te Kawanatanga.’
179 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:28. ‘Ko taku awhitanga tenei i a Kuini, ko te tukunga i taku whenua.’; ‘I prove my allegiance to the Queen by parting with my lands[.]’
180 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:27.
183 Te Karere o Poneke, 29/10/1857:2.
184 Te Karere o Poneke, 30/4/1857:15.
185 Te Karere Maori, 31/5/1856:12-13; 15/2/1858:5-6; 27/2/1858:1-3; Te Karere o Poneke, 17/5/1858:3; 31/5/1858:4.
would also become their close neighbours. For example, Tamihana Te Rauparaha told the Kohimarama conference that each tribe should have its own Pākehā town.\(^{186}\) However, economics was just one of the factors Māori considered in their decisions on whether to sell land. At Kohimarama, Taiapo of Ngāti Whakaue suggested that land at Maketū be sold, stating that he had asked for a protector in the past but had not received one.\(^ {187}\) Other chiefs from the Maketū area, perhaps in an effort to display their loyalty, made intemperate declarations that they would sink their differences and sell land for Pākehā to settle on.\(^ {188}\) Not only was the ownership of Maketū unsettled, but Christian groups in the past had been harassed by heathens in the area yet received little assistance from the government.\(^ {189}\) Those with less certain claims may have been keen to sell, while others may have felt that the presence of Pākehā neighbours would bring about more security. The deal did not eventuate, as the chiefs, on returning home, found the tribes difficult to convince and realised that a sale would likely result in war.\(^ {190}\) Some Māori were happy to sell off their ‘waste’ in the hope of both economic and social development and often justified their decision with Biblical injunctions that the land should be filled with people and subdued.\(^ {191}\) Others preferred not to sell in order to retain their independence.

The selling of land meant further extensions of the Pākehā frontier into Māori territory, which would then result in further sales and intrusions. Some Māori were happy for this to happen. Ihakara Tukumaru of Manawatū, for example, a keen advocate of Pākehā ritenga,\(^ {192}\) was prepared to sell all his land. He wrote to McLean, stating,

> our thoughts are to sell you our land, although some of the others may not wish to part with theirs. But I think, O friend, that if you and I contrive to start one plank of the vessel, she will soon be altogether broken. If some of the others will hold out, what then? Do you consent to what we say about selling.\(^ {193}\)

---
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Other Māori were concerned about the planks being broken. As Eru Te Matata of Ōtaki wrote to *Te Karere o Poneke*, ‘One is hammering the plank lest it breaks. If it breaks, our vessel will overturn in the water. This is a metaphor for the land.’

**Land Surveys and Subdivision.**

Surveys could become a contentious issue for Māori communities, as they believed land sales would soon follow. The Kingitanga resisted surveys and *Te Hokioi* approvingly gave an account of Waikato people expelling a Pākehā surveyor from Meremere. Those who wanted Pākehā settlers also wanted surveys, and many Māori outside the Kingitanga also welcomed surveys for a number of other reasons. Those chiefs who spoke about surveys at Kohimarama were in favour of both surveys and subdivision (although one chief complained that no surveyor had arrived after having requested one three years earlier). Pāora Tūhaere even suggested the use of newspapers as a means of advertising the provisional decisions. A desire for surveys did not always mean a desire to sell. For example, as Tahana Tūroa and seven other chiefs at the conference wrote in the official Whanganui ‘reply’ stated,

> O Governor, there is only one thing which you will not have from us. The lands which remain to us we will not surrender. ...We have no object in view than that of retaining it for our children after us. We shall be willing to place them in the hands of the Government for the purpose of being subdivided that they may be fairly apportioned among our relatives.

The most compelling reason for subdivision was to stop the *raruraru* (dissension) that arose with the current land purchasing practices. However, some Māori also believed that greater productivity would result from the individualisation of land holdings. Tamihana Te Rauparaha suggested that surveys would allow Māori
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to obtain crown grants, which in turn would allow them to farm their land, resulting in better clothes and food.\textsuperscript{202} This was a dream, rather than a reality for most. However, the people most lauded for their efforts at individualisation, Ngāti Apakura at Rangiaohia, were situated in a strong Kīngitanga centre. While it is likely Rev. Morgan probably had a hand in the project, the government was obviously not involved, as \textit{Te Karere Maori} cautiously reported ‘If this be correct, it is an excellent example’ and suggested that Māori apply to the government for assistance.\textsuperscript{203}

The Rangiaohia chiefs wrote to the newspaper describing how they had taken on European \textit{tikanga}, including the subdivision of land.

\begin{quote}
Our lands which were formerly allowed to run to waste we have now divided into portions, varying from two hundred, five hundred and up to two thousand acres for each individual. These are marked off as runs for cattle and sheep, and for growing wheat, potatoes, oats. Clover, grass, etc., for disposal to the Europeans, and also for the food for the horses.\textsuperscript{204}
\end{quote}

The text above illustrates that, despite the individualisation of the land, it appears that the land usage, including the possible sale to Pākehā, was determined to some extent by tribal decision making. The chiefs wrote again, stating that several hapū at Taupō were also following their system. They considered their project to be worthwhile: ‘there is no evil or death in this system; its result will be \textit{rangatiratanga} and wealth for the individual in this world.’\textsuperscript{[LP]}\textsuperscript{205}

\textit{Tūtūā} rights.

Ngāti Apakura did not divide the lands at Rangiaohia evenly. This may reflect the purposes for which they had marked the land or the relative quality of the land. It may also indicate that rank may have influenced the distribution of the land. Christianity had democratised Māori to a limited extent by removing the \textit{tapu} associated with chieftainship, by facilitating the emancipation of slaves, and by

\textsuperscript{202} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 15/10/1857:3-4.

\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/6/1857:2-3. ‘Ki te mea, he pono tenei kōrero, nui atu te pai.’

\textsuperscript{204} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/6/1857:3 ‘Ko to matou whenua i waiho kau kia takoto kau ana imua, kua mahia e matou i naianei, kua pihitia e matou kia rau rau eka, kia rima rau eka, a tae noa ki te rua mano eka, ma te tangata katoa. I pihitia enei whenua hei nohoanga mo te kau mo te hipi, hei mahinga mo te witi, mo te riwai, mo te oti, mo te koroa, mo te karaie, mo te pare hoki; hei hoko ki te Pakeha; hei kai hoki nga koroa nga karaie ma nga kau, ma nga hipi, ma nga hoito hoki. ‘ (These chiefs included Wiremu Toetoe Tūmohe, postal organiser whose journey resulted in a press for the Kīngitanga which produced \textit{Te Hokioi}. Another chief was Taati Te Waru who was later a Kīngitanga judge.)

\textsuperscript{205} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/9/1857:2-3. ‘Kahore he kino, kahore he mate, ki runga i tenei tikanga; tona mutunga he rangatiratanga mo te tangata, he whai taungatanga hoki mo te tangata i tenei ao.’ [\textit{[I]}here is no evil or death connected with this system, and the end will be, that the men who follow it will acquire influence and wealth in this world.\textsuperscript{[TKM]}]
insisting on the equality of individuals before God. However, missionaries had also used chiefly *mana* where they could to augment their congregations. Similarly, the government and missionaries encouraged chiefs in implementing *ngā ritenga pai* which promoted individualism and were, therefore, antithetical to the traditional tribal hierarchy in which the *rangatira* (and *ariki*) interests were superior to those of *tūtūa* (commoners). As a result of Christianity and *ngā ritenga pai*, *tūtūa* were increasingly prepared, during this period, to assert their rights, particularly with regard to land, at public meetings and in the Māori language newspapers. In this they were also supported by some *rangatira*.206

Although there were several requests that *rangatira* and *tūtūa* cooperate and support each other over land,207 most class-based discussion centred on the tensions between the two groups. *Tūtūa* sometimes considered that they were treated unjustly and their opinions held in low regard, despite their equality as individuals before God.208 Riini Te Hemopo of Wanganui no doubt spoke for many *tūtūa* when he wrote that many *rangatira* promoted bad *tikanga*, adding 'in my opinion, the repression of what *tūtūa* say should stop, rather, it is right that he who possesses knowledge should be elevated.'209 Several chiefs at Kohimarama suggested that the acceptance of law and other *ritenga* by Māori would mean better justice for *tūtūa*.210 However, even modernising chiefs were prepared to pull rank when it suited them. For example, the *kāpapa* chief, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, wrote of a meeting of 500 Māori at Ōtaki which met to discuss Taranaki, that 'the discussions went well, and were in favour of living peacefully. ... However, some loose words came from these *tūtūa* people. They were scolded, and were stopped[...].211

While *tūtūa* were interested in being recognised as the bearers of 'knowledge' and enjoyed the social and political benefits of such recognition, it was rights to land that most interested them, rights which some Māori felt were being withheld. At Kohimarama for example, Hukiki of Ngāti Raukawa declared that *tūtūa* were missing

---

206 For example, *Te Karere o Poneke*, 15/10/1857:3-4.
208 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 10/5/1858:2, 5/7/1858:2, 16/8/1858:3, 13/9/1858:3.
209 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 1/11/1858:3-4. ‘Ki taku whakaaro me mutu te tami i nga kupu a nga tutua, engari mana ka whai mohio ka tika ano kia hapaianga.’
211 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/4/1860:3-4. ‘...he pai anake nga korero he ata noho maire. ... Otira, i puta ano etahi kupu hanga noa iho a nga tangata tutua nei, Riria atu ana, Mutu tonu atu....’; ‘the discussions
out on the benefits of land ownership due to greedy chiefs, a sentiment echoed by Retimana Te Mania and W.H. Te Karore in a written statement from Ngāti Whātua.212 In a letter to *Te Karere o Poneke*, Ihaka Whatarau, a teacher from Papawai, Wairarapa, complained that the government, when buying land, took notice only of the *rangatira* who then claimed all the money. He considered that the *tūtūa* should be able to sell his own piece and receive the money for it.213 In another letter, Ahitara Tangatangata, a *tūtūa* from Moutoa, described how he publicly accused the chiefs of his locality, saying ‘You were selling land duplicitously in the past’. When land was sold, he thought ‘each person should measure out their own piece so that the acreage is known, and that they are clear [about their share] when listening about the [sale] price.’214

However, the land could also be divided up for the use of each tribe member, rather than for sale. Tamihana Te Rauparaha, the Ngāti Toa chief, for example, suggested that lands should be surveyed and subdivided, and ‘the *rangatira* should not interfere with the *tūtūa*’s [piece].215 At Kohimarama, Ihakara, a Ngāti Raukawa chief, spoke in favour of surveying and subdividing land so that poor Māori might be able to make a living.216 Not all *tūtūa* were happy with the prospect. Hori Whetuki of Maraetai, for example, told the conference that the government was concerned only with ‘maunga teitei’ (lofty mountains, i.e. the chiefs) and ‘I am convinced that if the land be subdivided, the chiefs will have it, and I, a man of inferior rank, will be left without.’217

There were, moreover, alternative paths to equity than subdividing the land. Waata Kūkūtai, for example, although not in favour of selling his tribe’s land,218 was a *kupapa* chief of Ngāti Tipa in the Waikato and resistant to the aims of the Kingitanga. Rather than subdivide the tribal land, the *hapū* continued to work in

---


213 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 22/2/1858:3

214 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 19/4/1858:3. ‘Ko koutou e hoko tahae ana i te whenua I mua ... me tini tena tangata tena tangata i tona wahi i tona wahi kia mohiotia ai nga eka, kia marama ai hoki te whakaarongo ki te utu.’

215 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 15/10/1857:3. ‘...kaore e poka atu te rangatira ki to te tutua.’

216 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:39. This was almost certainly Ihakara Tukumaru of Manawatu who wrote letters to both *Te Karere Maori* and *Te Karere o Poneke*.

217 *Te Karere Maori*, 3/8/1860 Suppl:7. ‘...e matau ana ahau ki te whia ia te whenua ka whiwhi te rangatira, ko ahau ko te tutua, ka kore noa iho.’
common. In a letter describing the management of their farm at Kowhanga, Kūkūtai wrote ‘These are our regulations;—whether chiefs or slaves we agree to work equally and divide equally the fruits of our labour.’ Kūkūtai, the high ranking chief, became the ‘kai-whakarite’ (manager) of their farm, showing that some chiefs were adept at maintaining traditional hierarchies through modern guises.

A dominant message from the Pākehā run Māori language newspapers with regard to land was that Māori should sell their surplus to the government, and subdivide and develop what remained. There was no inclination to promote the benefits of leasing. The newspapers also show the diversity of Māori opinion about their most valuable asset. Most Māori, at least until the early 1860s when war became more likely, saw the value of improving their lot through developing their lands. They also saw that land sales were introducing a number of tensions into their society. The ownership of some land was disputed by different iwi and hapū. Within tribes, there was also the division between those wishing to tuku whenua, and those wishing to pupuri whenua, which sometimes led to warfare. For those wishing to hold their lands, it was often an emotional and political attachment, that the land represented their tino rangatiratanga, that determined their position. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 8, this attachment led a number of North Island iwi wishing to form the Kingitanga, where the collective rangatiratanga closely approximated modern nationalism. There was also divisions within tribes about how much to sell, and the rights of tūtūā to land. Māori, for the most part, still lived in tribal communities away beyond the Pākehā frontier. While many were willing to espouse the idea of subdivision, few actually practiced it. The division of land could open up further tensions, and the prospect that the land would disappear piecemeal.

**Commerce.**

Māori commerce flourished from the mid 1840s through the 1850s with wheat and potatoes being the two most important crops. Auckland depended on Māori agriculture to survive, and Māori produce was also exported overseas, for example to

---

219 Te Karere Maori, 28/2/1857:17. ‘Ko a matou tikanga enei:—ahakoa rangatira, ahakoa taurekareka, ka rite tonu o matou mahi me te wehenga ano o nga hua ka rite tonu.’
the Australian goldfields. However, much of this produce came from beyond the Waikato river, in what became the realm of the Māori King. As relations worsened between the Kīngitanga and Government, this trade went into decline by the end of the decade, and had virtually halted by the invasion of the Waikato in 1863.

A number of the Pākehā-run newspapers promoted Māori involvement within the market economy. The exceptions were the Wesleyan Te Haeata, and Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, the government’s rival to the Kīngitanga’s Te Hokioi. Te Haeata did little directly to promote Māori commerce, although it did exhort its readers to work hard and to eschew laziness, and warned of the damage of war to commercial pursuits. It was more interested in spiritual concerns, and disparaged ‘the man seeking the treasures of this world, with no thought of those of the other [world].’

Neither Te Hokioi, nor its nemesis, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, were concerned with commerce and trade, much of which had already ground to a halt when these two ‘birds’ were engaging each other. They were more concerned with issues of sovereignty and mana, and the prospect of war. At one point, a supposed Māori correspondent to Te Pihoihoi, “Na Whakaaro na Mohio”, in discussing the political situation suggested that Waikato Māori ‘fight the land’ instead and return to their former productivity. However, this was more a subtle criticism of the Kīngitanga, reflecting on how agriculture and commerce in the Waikato had declined, than a suggestion to be taken seriously.

Promoting commerce

The government’s Te Karere Maori was the most consistent promoter of Māori commerce, for two principal reasons. First, the Māori input to the New Zealand economy was valued by the government especially in the Auckland province, and Te Karere Maori reflected this relationship in its pages. New Zealand had a favourable climate for agriculture, according to the paper, and Māori could make good money if they employed systematic Pākehā methods. When Auckland millers were forced

---

224 Te Haeata 1/6/1859:4. ‘... te tangata e rapu tonu ana i nga taonga o tenei ao, kahore he whakaaro ki to tera atu.’
226 Te Karere Maori, 1/7/1855:1-5.
to import foreign wheat for local consumption in 1858 due to a lack of Māori product, the paper remonstrated against ‘the great injury’ to New Zealand’s wealth and prosperity.227

Second, the government also wanted to promote commerce among Māori because they perceived that the more wealth and material possessions Māori owned, the less they would be prepared to risk losing them by warfare.228 This process, Te Karere Maori acknowledged, had started with the first missionary, Samuel Marsden, ‘through [whose] efforts the native ferocity of the New Zealander was tamed’ and New Zealand opened up to British commerce.229 So when Taupō Māori declined to become involved in the war, the newspaper was quick to point to their fear that they might lose their flocks of sheep.

So, the sheep became the guardians of peace. [These] tame and quiet animals going about nibbling at the grass on the long plain on the shores of Lake Taupō, these creatures pacified the violent desires of the people leaning to war who would perhaps have rushed eagerly to shed blood.[p.250]

However the accumulation of property did not discourage the relatively rich Taranaki tribes from feuding over land in the 1850s and defending Māori interests at Waitara in 1860.231 As Gorst noted Māori did not own valuable fixed assets that they would feel compelled to defend.

[If there be time to remove the women, children, pigs, cattle and horses, which constitute Maori wealth, the loss of a village is no great blow to the natives ... To burn their standing crop and raupo houses would, no doubt exasperate them, but would scarcely crush them into submission.232

Te Karere Maori’s focus on the market economy changed with the Taranaki War and as relations between the government and Kīngitanga worsened. The government became more interested in shoring up political support from loyal Māori than encouraging Māori productivity. Most of the commercial information which appeared before May 1860 was placed in the Agricultural, Commercial and Maritime

227 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1858:6. ‘...te kino e tau ana ki te whenua nei...’
229 Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:19. ‘...ka marie nga tangata Maori, i ana mahi maka, mahi whakamataku.’
230 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:21-22. ‘Na, waiho ana nga pirikahu hei kai tai ki i te rangimarie. Na etahi kararehe rarata, marie hoki, e katokato haere ana i nga taru o te mania roa, i tai o te roto o Taupo-na enei kuri i whakamowairikorio nga hiahia rihi o o te hunga aro atu ki te pakanga, penei pea, kua rere wharoro ki te whakaheke toto.;’ ‘Thus sheep were the means of maintaining peace; those quiet gentle animals, feeding about on the grassy plains around Taupo lake, kept down the angry passions of those who would otherwise perhaps have dipped their hands in blood.[TEM]’
Reports at the end of each issue, consisting of a list of commodity prices of the Auckland market prices and shipping movements. These were often preceded with comment on the current or expected commercial situations, particularly with regard to the Australian markets, and with a wide range of advice to Māori farmers. The discussions on the market ceased abruptly in 1860 when for five months Te Karere Maori was devoted to reporting the speeches of the Kohimarama Conference. The rebranded Te Manuhiri Tuarangi in 1861 published planting information and market prices several times, but commercial news was no longer the priority it once was. Interestingly, McLean’s Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri which was produced in 1863 for the “friendly” Māori of Hawkes Bay contained shipping news, even after the invasion of the Waikato. This indicates that that newspaper perhaps considered that Māori there would continue to ship much of their produce out of the region.

The morality of wealth

Part of Te Karere Maori’s mission in this pre-war period was to promote the idea of commerce. For example, in an article in Te Karere Maori entitled “Why Men ought to Make Money” Māori were told it was their duty to make money, to save it and spend it wisely. They were also encouraged to grow wheat or potatoes. Te Karere o Poneke also promoted the accumulation of money.

It is the opinion of the world that [money] is a sign of chiefliness. The man who possesses a lot is termed a rangatira, while the man who is poor is termed a tutua. The paper suggested the way to make money was by buying and selling for a profit, owning shares and gaining interest through lending or bank deposits. Some wealthier Māori took shares in larger ships, and a chief named Hemara advertised that he had £200 to lend for 3 years at 10%.

233 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/10/1861:11; 15/11/1861:16.
235 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1856:4-7.
236 Te Karere o Poneke, 10/12/1857:2. ‘Ki tate ao whakaaro ko te tohu ano ia o te rangatiratanga; ko te tangata kua whihini nui ka meinga he rangatira, ko te tangata e rawakore ana ka meinga he tutua.’
237 Te Karere o Poneke, 22/10/1857:2; 25/10/1858:2; 8/11/1858:2; Te Karere Maori, 1/2/1855:7, 25/10/1858:2.
238 Te Karere Maori, 1/1/1855:11; 1/2/1855:6-7.
239 Te Karere Maori, 16/12/1862:28.
Māori were not to pursue wealth at the expense of Christian morality. While *Te Karere Maori* encouraged Māori to make money, they castigated those who overcharged Pākehā travellers.

That sort of person would not be happy receiving the money, because the scriptures say, “All the things you like, do the same to them”, and as this person does not act like this, he cannot rest with an easy heart, yes, he has turned away from God’s laws.

Similarly, Davis wrote in *Ko Aotearoa* on the topic of money, citing I Timothy 6:10, then added.

One of the great sins of this age is the hunger and infatuation for money, the desire for “filthy lucre” (1 Peter 5:2) emerging from all our works, and, although we hide our worship for gold with false words, our activities will never be hidden from him, seeing into the corners of our heart. And so, let the Māori think on what is written in this book (newspaper), working for the “food that perishes” (John 6:27) is correct, but when working for [the needs of] our body, we should turn to look to the other world, with regard to the words that are written, “Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth, understanding, for the merchandize of it is better than the merchandize of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold.”

Virtue was recognised. For example, the Ngāti Pou chief, Tomo, was lauded for paying an extra £100 to the builders of his flour mill at Tuakau after they had exceeded their contracted price of £350, an act of Christian virtue, which may yet have also added to his mana. Te Karere Maori warned Māori against covetousness, and pondered whether Māori were neglecting their churches in

---

240 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1856:6. ‘A kahore ano hoki he ahua reka ana whiwhi tenei tu tangata i te moni; no te mea e meana te karaiture, “Ko nga mea katoa e pae koutou penatia atu hoki e koutou ki a ratou” a kahore tenei tangata e penei kahore te tangata e noho ngakau marie; ana, tahuri-ke aia i ngā ture o Te Atua; ‘Such a man is not really happy when he does get his money, for the Bible says, “Do as you would be done by?” and this man does not do so, and no man is happy, who disobeys the laws of religion.’

241 *Ko Aotearoa*, 1/1861:13-14. ‘Ko tetahi o nga hara nui o tenei takiwa, ko te hiakai torere ki te moni; ko te hiahia ki te “taonga kino” (I Pita, v–2.) e whakapurero ake ana i roto i o tatou mahinga katoa; a, ahakoa tanu tatou ki nga kupu patapate kau, mo to tatou karakia ki te koura, ekore ano a tatou mahi e ngaro i a Ia, e kite nui nei i nga koki o te ngakau. Ko tenei, kia mahara nga tangata Maori e koreropapa i tenei pukapuka, he tika te mahi mo’ te Kai memeha’ (Hoani, vi–27 ) otiwa, i roto i te mahi mo te tinana, me ahu ano te titiro ki tera a o te mahara hoki ki te kupu kua ote te tuhituhi–7 Ka hari te tangata kua kitea nei i ia e te whakaaro nui, me te tangata ano kua whihili ki te mataranga. Pai atu hoki te hokohoko o tera i to te hiriwa e hokohokona nei, ona hua i te koura para kore.” (Whakatauki, III–13, 14.); ‘One of the great crimes of the present age, is the intense thirst after gold. The desire for “filthy lucre” occupies a most prominent part in all our actions, and although we may find many excuses for our idolatrous worship of gold, our motives are fully known to Him with whom we have to do. Let it be the study of our Maori readers, while they very properly work for “the bread which perisheth,” to look beyond present gratifications, remembering that it is written, “Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth, understanding, for the merchandize of it is better than the merchandize of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold.”


favour of commerce.\textsuperscript{244} It also suggested to Māori men that they should not neglect the health of mothers and children, as these were more important than money.\textsuperscript{245}

This contradictory attitude to amassing wealth is seen in particular with regard to gold mining. \textit{Te Karere Maori} regularly pointed to new goldfields opening, both overseas and within New Zealand, as a potential source of wealth for Māori farmers.\textsuperscript{246} The mineral itself within New Zealand also brought wealth to the country, and Māori were expected to cooperate by allowing its extraction. On one occasion the paper criticised the Māori of Hauraki (Coromandel) for not allowing gold prospecting in their area.\textsuperscript{247} In contrast, it lauded the "Old Witch", Taurua Te Tawaroa Makuini of the Patukirikiri tribe who agreed to diggings on her land.

Taurua agreed to that place where the people dug gold at Whangarahi, and right up to her death, she did nothing to impede that gold digging, so that Taurua was called at that place the \textit{rangatira} and guardian of the Pākehā gold diggers at Wairau.\textsuperscript{248}

Although Māori themselves dug gold, even as far afield as Melbourne,\textsuperscript{249} the government did not want Māori to become involved as workers in the industry, apparently for pragmatic reasons. Māori were the backbone of agriculture in the Auckland province, and they did not want Māori to be following Pākehā to the diggings and further depleting the work force.\textsuperscript{250} There may also have been concerns that Māori might have been corrupted by the turbulent nature of the diggings, or have succumbed to disease there. Certainly, \textit{Te Karere Maori} suggested that Māori were not strong enough for this type of work.\textsuperscript{251} However, there was also a feeling that grasping for wealth was somehow immoral. Davis in the English section of \textit{Ko Aotearoa} demonstrates the evangelical distaste for fortune-hunters.

\textsuperscript{244} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/11/1855:15. These comments may have reflected the thoughts of the editor of the time, Charles Davis, who was more evangelical in nature than some other editors.

\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/11/1859:2-3.


\textsuperscript{247} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/7/1856:14.

\textsuperscript{248} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/1/1857:7-8. 'Ko te kainga i keri ai nga tangata i te koura i Whangarahi na Taurua i whakaae, a, taeanoatia tona hemonga, kahore kau ana tikanga kia araia e ia taua mahinga koura, pera ia kua karangatia e Taurua i reira hei rangatira hei kai钛 ki mo nga Pakeha keri koura, i Wairau.'; 'The locality known as the Wynyard Diggings belonged to Taurua, and up to the time of her death not the slightest obstacle was offered to their working, nor any advantage taken of her novel position as Chieftainess of the Coromandel gold diggers.'

\textsuperscript{249} See \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/1/1855:28-29.

\textsuperscript{250} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, for example, lamented the departure of Pākehā settlers to an Australian goldfield in 1856. See \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/7/1856:14. It also commented on the shortage of labour in Auckland once the Aorere diggings opened in the Nelson province. See \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/10/1857:15.

\textsuperscript{251} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/11/1859:4.
The burning lust for gold evinced by thousands now running hither and thither, goading one another on in frantic excitement regardless alike of health and Christian duty, that they may, if possible, in the unseemly scramble, secure a few handfuls of the precious ore, practically ignores, or treats with indifference, the solemn fact that man is personally accountable to that Great Arbiter who will "bring every work into judgement, with every secret thing whether it be good, or whether it be evil."\(^{252}\)

*Te Karere Maori* encouraged Māori to continue farming instead.\(^{253}\)

But the best sort of gold for all men is what is contained in wheat, corn, potatoes, flax, wool, cattle, and such things; because you can always exchange them for money, and be sure of a profit for your labour. Think of that, and be industrious in cultivating your land, that you may obtain wealth for yourselves and your children. But never let us forget the true riches laying up treasure for ourselves in heaven, so that when this world is left behind we may all be possessed of everlasting life.\(^{254}\)

Once the Aorere goldfields opened up in the Nelson province, the pages of *Te Karere o Poneke* raged with debate over Māori involvement. Despite running advertisements for gold buyers and sailings to the diggings,\(^{255}\) the editor positioned the paper against Māori gold digging, portraying it as hard work for little reward, prone to stoppage through inclement weather and flooding.\(^{256}\) Several Māori wrote letters to the paper lamenting the lack of Māori success on the goldfields.\(^{257}\)

In March, 1858, the paper published one of Æsop’s fables, “Ko te Kuri maori me te Ahua” (the native dog and its reflection) which had been rendered into Māori by Hutton, who linked the fable directly to those who had gone to Aorere. This met the approval of Epiha Poiha of Waikanae who stated,

> I said to some of our [people], Don’t go to the Diggings, you won’t get any gold and you’ll use up all your money on food. When [they] returned, there was no fortune in their hands. So I had a laugh at that.\(^{258}\)

However, the chief Henere Te Puni of Pitoone was indignant, especially at being compared to a dog. He declared that his people had come back with 9lb 2oz of gold, and asked,

> Which is better: [for a person] to sit about lazily, and not going to seek sustenance for himself? My friend, the thing that makes a man a dog is that drink, rum.\(^{259}\)

---

\(^{252}\) Ko Aotearoa, 1862:6.

\(^{253}\) Te Karere Maori, 1/7/1855:1, 30/9/1857:14.

\(^{254}\) Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1859:4-5. "Engari, ko te koura pai ma nga tangata katoa, ko te witi, ko te kaanga, ko te riwai, ko te muka, ko te huru hipi, ko te kararehe, me nga mea penei; e puta hoki te koura i e nei, ka riro mai hoki te moni mo e nei ki te hokohoko. Whakaarongia tenei, a kia kaha kia ahuwhenua ki te ngaki i o koutou whenua kia whiwhi taonga ai mo koutou kia haere koutou ko o koutou tamariki. O tira, kei wareware te "taonga pono," engari, purangatia he taonga ma tatu ki te rangi, mo te mahetanga o tenei ao i a tatou, ka whiwhi katoa tatou ki te oranga tonutanga."

\(^{255}\) For example, see Te Karere o Poneke, 17/9/1857:1, 15/10/1857:1, 22/10/1857:1, 29/10/1857:1.


\(^{257}\) Te Karere o Poneke, 29/10/1857:2-3, 25/1/1858:3-4.

\(^{258}\) Te Karere o Poneke, 19/4/1858:4. "Kua ki atu au ki etahi o matou, Kaua e haere ki te Tikini, e kore koutou e whiwhi ki te koura, ka pau a koutou moni mo te kai. No te hokinga mai kahore he rawa i nga ringaringa. Heoti ka kata au ikonei."
The concept of amassing wealth was presented in a contradictory fashion because Māori were expected to participate within the market economy yet still retain the Christian ideals of selflessness and moderation. However, for many Māori the fruits of this world were just as attractive as those of the next.

Unstable Markets

*Te Karere Maori* and *Te Karere o Poneke* offered Māori some information on general commercial matters, such as the relative sizes of bushels, the purpose of insurance, and the dangers of debt. However, there was also a concerted effort to explain the market economy to Māori. As seen in Tables 2 and 3, the price of the principal Māori products, flour, wheat and potatoes, fell from the second half of the 1850s, which was disconcerting to Māori used to higher prices. *Te Karere Maori* cautioned Māori in December 1856 that it was better to work hard than to discuss prices and grievances, as the previous high prices were an aberration, deriving from the Australian gold rushes. It also maintained that Pākehā traders were not attempting to cheat Māori in their dealings. Much of the commercial discussion centred around the need for Māori to accept lower prices; because the dealers and shippers also needed to be able to make a profit, because New Zealand prices were affected by slumps and competition from overseas, because Pākehā immigrants could not afford to settle here, and to seize or improve the export market. In short, Māori should balance the good years with the bad, and in the meantime settle for small profits from quick returns.

---

259 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 29/3/1858:3-4. 'Ko tewea te mea pai–ko te noho mangere, kaua e haere ki te rapu i tetahi kai mana? E hoa, engari ano te mea hei whakakuritanga mau i te tangata ko te kai nei ko te rama.'


261 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/7/1858:3.

262 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/9/1856:1-3, 31/8/1858,1-4; *Te Karere o Poneke* 22/10/1857:2. See also *Te Whetu o te Tau*, 1/7/1858:3.

263 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1856.

264 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1856:3-4. See also *Te Karere o Poneke*, 31/5/1858:3.


267 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/6/1856:15-16.

268 *Te Karere Maori*, 16/11/1857:5-8, 15/5/1858:5-8, 15/6/1858:6-8, 30/6/1858:6-8, 15/3/1859:3.


Māori were interested in the market prices, but as *Te Karere Maori* admitted, predicting future prices was difficult.

Markets are like other things, and the reason why they go up and down is not known, but we consider that it will not be long before the prices will be firm.\[LPJ 271\] The fall in prices saw a decline in the amount of Māori produce, particularly wheat, being sent to Auckland. As early as January 1856, *Te Karere Maori* was imploring that Māori should not hold back their wheat crops in the hope of procuring an increase in the price.\[272\] While Māori relented that season, the accusation of keeping back wheat became a constant refrain for the rest of the decade.\[273\] Māori were told that holding back their wheat would be injurious for the country,\[274\] that it would be bad for shipping,\[275\] and that the millers were complaining that they would have to import wheat from overseas, a matter of shame for Māori farmers.\[276\] *Te Karere Maori* urged Māori to increase production. This occurred when prices were rising, but readers were also urged to grow more even when prices were unsettled.\[277\] Māori were to produce wheat to feed the miners flocking to Australian goldfields, the many Pākehā immigrating to New Zealand, and even the French colony of New Caledonia.\[278\]

---

\[271\] *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1857:7. ‘E pera ana nga Makete me era atu mea, he mea ano ekore e mohiotia te take i kake a i, i hoki a i; oti a, e mea ana matou ekore e roa ka mau tonu nga utu.’; ‘Markets, like other matters, are sometimes not easily understood. They are subject to strange agitations, such as present exist; but we think we can discern a more steady and healthy state of affairs at hand’.

\[272\] *Te Karere Maori*, 31/1/1856:15.

\[273\] For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 31/3/1856:12; 31/7/1856:4, 15/3/1859:5-7, 15/12/1858:6-7.


\[275\] *Te Karere Maori*, 31/8/1858:7.


Table 2

Flour Prices, £ per ton. Jan 1855-May 1861.
Source: Te Karere Maori/Te Manuhiri Tuarangi.
(Last price of month used. Average used when price range provided.)

Table 3

Price of Wheat (shillings per bushel) and Potatoes (£ per ton)
Jan 1855-May 1861. Source: Te Karere Maori/Te Manuhiri Tuarangi.
(Last price of month used. Average used when price range provided.)
It is clear that the government was unsure of exactly what was happening with agriculture in the Māori districts. In 1857, *Te Karere Maori* asked Māori growers to write in giving information about their crops so that exporters could prepare. It admitted in February, 1859 that the government was not actually sure whether Māori were keeping their wheat back in the hope of price rises or whether they had not bothered to grow the amounts they had previously done. It later intimated that the wheat shortage was either caused by insufficient harvests, or due to the increased number of Pākehā consumers. However, the government put the blame firmly on the Māori growers. As the decade ended, Māori were criticised for their “mahitamaki” at not providing the wheat New Zealand needed, by refusing to grow or for holding back their supplies.

There is no manly [tangata] attribute in this course. Prices are like other things, they go up and down, and if we behave like children, our money will fall into other hands.282

After the high market prices prior to 1856, Māori were no doubt dejected at the lower prices that followed. As noted above, Māori valued *Te Karere Maori* for its market price lists and most likely the financial analyses that accompanied them. The health of the New Zealand market, at least the cropping sector dominated by Māori, depended heavily on exports to Australia. A number of variables influenced what prices Māori would receive, for example, the success or failure of Australian crops, foreign competition, the viability of gold fields, and local and world depressions. Māori had little prior knowledge of these overseas factors in order to prepare, and were not in any position to influence them. The commercial reports, while consistently urging Māori to produce, were honest in their appraisals of what Māori could expect for their main export crops of wheat and potatoes. As seen in Table 4, in the years that the paper was publishing these reports, over half gave an overall negative projection, and less than a third would have given Māori a reason to feel

280 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/2/1859:7.
282 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1859:3-4. ‘Kaore he ahua tangata i roto i tenei mahi. Era ano e pera tonu nga utu, he mea ano ka neke he mea ano ka hoki; a, ki te pera tatou me nga tamariki, ka riro ke o tatou moni ki nga ringa ke.’; ‘There is no manly forethought in conduct like this. Prices will rise and fall. If we are children enough to grumble and lose heart, we must be content to see our profits go into other hands,’
283 As discussed below, dealers deemed the quality of Māori wheat and flour to be lower than that imported, or produced by Pākehā.
optimistic about their produce. Low prices and market negativity cannot have helped but lower the morale of some Māori farmers.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Optimism and negativity expressed about the present or future in the economic monthly and fortnightly Agricultural, Commercial and Maritime Reports in *Te Karere Maori*, 1855-1860.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Positive or Optimistic Opinion Expressed

Overall Negative or Pessimistic Opinion Expressed

Conflicting or Neutral Opinion Expressed

No opinion expressed
In the face of low prices for the main Māori commodity crops, *Te Karere Maori* promoted diversification in order to motivate Māori to remain in the market economy.\(^{284}\) It suggested the processing of indigenous products, such as flax and *kauri* timber,\(^{285}\) and in 1857 promoted the growing of oats and barley.\(^{286}\) Also favoured that year were various horse feeds, especially for the Australian export market.\(^{287}\) The following year, it was dairying and the associated production of fattened pigs.\(^{288}\) *Te Karere o Poneke* promoted the poultry industry, including turkey production.\(^{289}\) However, *Te Karere Maori*, and several other newspapers, consistently urged Māori to embrace pastoralism, particularly sheep for wool. Often included with this advice was a call for all Māori dogs to be killed.\(^{290}\) This was encapsulated in one extended article, entitled ‘Death to the Dogs!!’ which appeared in *Te Karere Maori*. Māori dogs, suggested the writer, were thieves and sheep killers, and a hindrance to good race relations.

[S]o I say “Kill the dogs” because the right thing is to unify these two races in line with the principle of the love of the older and younger brother.\(^{[LP]}\)

Besides, said the newspaper, using dogs for pig hunting also had a malevolent effect on the men who practised it. So, for those Māori for whom the transportation of wheat was too onerous, they should utilise their dogs to catch all their wild pigs. The dogs should then be killed and the pigs sold. The money earned could be used to buy the sheep. The writer then followed with advice on eliminating scab and the necessity for good shearing practices. If this was not enough incentive for the Māori readers, the writer then suggested that the Bible had nothing good to say about those who fed pigs, but held the shepherd in high esteem. Christ, moreover, was both a shepherd and the Lamb.\(^{292}\) However, unlike pigs and cattle which could forage in the bush,

---

\(^{284}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1856:1-2.

\(^{285}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1856:12-13, 31/1/1857:10-11, 18/7/1863:5-6. *Kauri* are large native trees, classified as *Agathis australis*.


\(^{288}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/8/1858:6.

\(^{289}\) *Te Karere o Poneke*, 17/12/1857:2.


\(^{291}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 30/5/1857:3. ‘...koia au i mea ai, “Whakamatea nga kuri” ta te mea ko te mea tika me whakakotahi enei iwi eru i runga i te tikanga o te aroha o te tuakana o te teina.’; ‘Then I say “death to the dogs”’ because the two races, ought to be unified as one nation in brotherly love.[TEA]

\(^{292}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 30/5/1857:2-7
sheep needed grass, fences and protection from dogs so few Māori actually turned to sheep farming.293

Commerce and race relations

When Māori entered the market economy, it meant interacting to a greater extent with Pākehā settlers. Fox, representing a settler view, was in favour, considering that ‘the surest method of civilizing the native, was to promote intercourse between him and the settler.’294 Sometimes the races mixed harmoniously. Taimona Pita Te Ahuru, for example, wrote to Te Karere o Poneke about working with a Pākehā in Wellington. ‘My Pākehā’, he said, ‘is very good – he is kind to me, and I to him.’ More Māori, he suggested, should turn to ‘mahi pakeha.’295

However, when dealing with Pākehā, Māori often felt that they were being cheated.296 Ngāti Porou chiefs, writing their ‘replies’ to the governor at Kohimarama, complained of traders who refused to pay in cash and paid for Māori produce with rotten clothing.297 Grievances also arose when Pākehā did not pay the prices listed in the newspapers. On one occasion, this led Wiremu Kingi and Tutepakihirangi of Wairarapa to brandish the market prices of a newspaper at a Pākehā merchant as proof of his dishonesty.298 Te Karere Maori and Te Karere o Poneke, both printing market prices, tried to justify these inconsistencies, and maintained that Pākehā were not trying to cheat Māori.299 However, when Te Karere o Poneke investigated the case of an undersold pig in Wellington, it conceded ‘the sale price was different [to the listing] either from the poor quality of the pig, or the hard nosed attitude of the Pākehā.’300 Pākehā could also be quite aggressive with Māori. The New-Zealander, for example, tells of Edmonds, a Pākehā who boarded and attempted to take by force

293 Hargreaves (1959), p 68.
294 Fox, p 77.
295 Te Karere o Poneke, 1/11/1858:3. ‘Kanui te pai o taku pakeha–tana atawhai ki ahau, me taku hoki ki a ia.’
296 Te Karere o Poneke, 15/10/1857:4; 10/12/1857:3-4; 31/5/1858:3; 15/11/1858:3; Te Karere Maori, 25/2/1862:9; 20/7/1862:6.
297 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:49, 51.
298 Te Karere o Poneke, 15/11/1858:2-3; 13/12/1858, Suppl:2.
299 Te Karere Maori, 15/11/1858:2-3; 13/12/1858, Suppl:2.
300 Te Karere o Poneke, 15/11/1858:2-3. ‘...na te kina ranei o te poaka, na te pakeke ranei o te pakeha, i kawea ketia ai te utu i te hokonga.’
a vessel owned by Ngāti Pikiao in pursuit of a debt of £30.\textsuperscript{301} Cases such as this were not published in Māori newspapers.

It is clear that not all Māori understood Pākehā or the market, but their misunderstandings were no doubt also coloured by their perceptions of Pākehā prejudice. As The New-Zealander admitted that ‘our intercourse with the natives has been characterised by too much of what we may call a “d—d nigger” tone’. This attitude, it implied, the Māori were well aware of, and it behoved all settlers ‘from time to time, to do a little towards the work of weakening the state of repulsion from ourselves in which the Native race is now held.’\textsuperscript{302} Commercial activity may have led to more contact with Pākehā, but not necessarily the harmony anticipated in the policy of he iwi kotahi.

**Shipping and the canoe trade**

Maori brought considerable amounts of their own produce into the Auckland and Onehunga markets on their canoes. The high point in the value of goods carried occurred in 1854 at £16,000.\textsuperscript{303} Te Karere Maori blamed a drop of almost £4000 the following year on a fall in kauri gum prices.\textsuperscript{304} Figures compiled by Sinclair from 1852-1857 show that the canoe traffic declined with only three quarters of the 1854 number of canoes arriving in 1857. However, they carried less than half the value, due to lower commodity prices. A comparison of third quarter returns indicates that while Auckland was always the more popular destination, the number of canoes visiting declined, while Onehunga maintained more regular traffic.\textsuperscript{305} Te Karere Maori published the third quarter returns of 1857 a breakdown of which indicates that Onehunga was favoured by Waikato tribes who sent 95 canoes, while Auckland had 148 canoes, mostly from Auckland and Hauraki tribes, although canoes also came from Ngāti Maniapoto in the south, Ngā Puhi in the north, and Ngāti Whakaue to the east.\textsuperscript{306} As it was eventually the Waikato which withdrew most from agriculture,\textsuperscript{307}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[301] The New Zealander, 5/5/1863:3.
\item[303] Sinclair (1952) p 133.
\item[304] Te Karere Maori, 31/3/1856:14.
\item[305] Sinclair (1952) p 133-4.
\item[306] Te Karere Maori, 15/12/1857:7.
\item[307] This is discussed further in this chapter.
\end{footnotes}
the decrease in canoes to Auckland can most likely be attributed to increased use of coastal shipping.

Some Māori tribes were keen participators in this coastal trade, as seen in the Māori language newspapers. For example, *Te Karere Maori* states in 1855 that the Māori of Tūranga ‘possess some good schooners varying from 20 to 60 tons burthen’, despite the fact they had lost six vessels totalling 154 tons.\(^{308}\) Similarly the paper reported in 1857 that in Northland, Captain Tautari and Mr. H. Williams had purchased vessels together, which were running alongside a 40 ton vessel owned and run by the chief Te Tirarau.\(^{309}\) On the West Coast, the Ngāti Maniapoto tribe purchased the *Aoteaoa* in 1857 for £420.\(^{310}\) Not all Māori owners kept up with the paperwork. *Te Karere Maori* listed 22 Māori owned vessels, mainly from the Bay of Plenty, which were liable for confiscation due to not being registered with the Collector of Customs in Auckland.\(^{311}\) This trade was rather small scale, involving mainly trade between Auckland and minor ports. However, *Te Karere Maori* did highlight one unusual voyage, that of the Ngāti Whātau chief, Pāora Tūhaere, to Rarotonga and Mangaia in the Cook Islands in 1863 in the 56 ton *Victoria*, valued at £1,400. Tūhaere brought back ‘oranges, lime juice, arrowroot, coconuts, bananas and coffee\[LPJ\]’ which the newspaper estimated would gain him £330 profit.\(^{312}\) This account was reprinted in *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri* who described the voyage in glowing terms.

The voyage that Paora Tuhaere undertook there [can be described as] a Pākehā tikanga, that is, trading ... However, all people are able to follow the example set by Paora, of gathering wealth...\(^{313}\)

The newspapers generally favoured Māori ship ownership. For example, the Tūranga Māori were described as ‘this energetic tribe’ who ‘are also excellent sailors’.\(^{314}\) The government was also prepared to lend money to Māori tribes for the purchase of these ships.

\(^{308}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855:7. ‘He kaipuke ataaahuana nokei a ratou, 20 tana o etahi, 60 tana o etahi.’

\(^{309}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 30/4/1857:15.

\(^{310}\) *Te Waka o te Iwi*, 1/10/1857:3.

\(^{311}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 16/8/1858:6-7. (Repeated, *Te Karere Maori*, 31/8/1858 wh 4-5, 30/9/1858 wh 5-6, 30/10/1858 wh 4-5, 16/11/1858 wh 5.)

\(^{312}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 15/5/1863:1-3. ‘...he orani, he wai-raima, he ararutu, he kokonata, he panana, he kawhi...’ See also *Te Karere Maori*, 18/7/1863:4

\(^{313}\) *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 27/6/1863:1-2. ‘Ko te haere a Paora Tuaheere i haere ai ki kona, he tikanga pakeha - are, he hokohoko. ... Engari e taea ano nga tangata katoa te whai i te tauira whakawhairawara kua oti te whakatakoto nei e Paora...’

\(^{314}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855:7. ‘...he hunga matau tenei ki te rere moana.’
It is gratifying to learn that, during the past year, several small vessels have been purchased by the tribes living near Auckland. The Government has assisted them with loans, amounting in the aggregate to about £1, 200.\textsuperscript{315}

However, there was a degree of ambivalence on the part of the government's \textit{Te Karere Maori} towards Māori owning coasting vessels. Pāora Tūhaere may well have been lauded as much for the example of a pro-government chief going about his business as the government slid from its renewal of war in Taranaki to a full scale invasion of Waikato, as for his ground breaking entrepreneurism. In 1858, the paper printed a letter from Rev. Thomas Chapman promoting increased agricultural activity, which expressly discouraged Māori ship ownership.

I know of a tribe who have spent more than £3,000 in vessels, nearly all of which have been wrecked, or allowed to lie by and rot, for the want of money after they were injured to repair them - while some were wrecked from ignorance of the captain; or from going to sea with rotten ropes and sails. ... Leave vessels to the pakehas.\textsuperscript{316}

This theme was repeated the following year in a \textit{Te Karere Maori} editorial, which pointed out that Māori vessels would never recoup their outlay due to wreck or want of repair. It suggested rather that Māori should buy titled land from the government.\textsuperscript{317}

\textbf{Flour Mills}

Māori also invested heavily in flour mills. Although government sometimes lent money for their erection, particularly within the Auckland Province,\textsuperscript{318} mills were an expensive asset for Māori tribes, costing up to six or seven hundred pounds.\textsuperscript{319}

The cost of construction was just one of the problems. Take for example the chief, Te Pohipi, at Taupō.

Pohipi is building a mill here. It is to be a very great mill. The stones are four feet in diameter; and he is now having the iron work made in Auckland. These stones are enormously heavy; but they were dragged all the way from Matata to Taupo by Maories - that is more than 100 miles. The carrying of those stones cost Pohipi 200 pigs, for food for the carriers, He has been a long time getting the mill built, but he will not give up; he perseveres, and now the Government is going to get a millwright to put it up. So we hope

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{315} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 31/12/1860:2. 'E hari ana matou kite ki te korero nei, i te hokohoko kaipuke nga iwi Maori e noho tata nei ki Akarana, i tenei tau ka pahemo nei. Hoatu tarewa ana e te Kawanatanga nga moni, hei mo apiti mo a ratou, £1, 200.'
\item \textsuperscript{316} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/3/1858:4. 'Kotahi te hapu e mohiotia na e au, ka toru ona mana pauna kua poto atu hei utu kaipuke; ko aua kaipuke, kua tahuri etahi kua pirau noa iho etahi i te kore moni hei utu mo te hanganga o nga mea i pakar. He kuare no nga kai whakatere te take i tahuri ai etahi, ko etahi i tahuri i te pirau o nga hera o nga ropi. ... Waiho ma te Pakeha te mahi kaipuke.'
\item \textsuperscript{317} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/12/1859:1-2.
\item \textsuperscript{318} Hargreaves (1962), p 103.
\item \textsuperscript{319} For example, see \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 20/7/1862:4, 1/6/1863:16.
\end{itemize}
it will soon be done, and Poihipi will have the satisfaction of having his corn ground at
his own mill.\textsuperscript{320}

The newspapers did not merely report on mills, but were also involved indirectly in the actual business. \textit{Te Karere Maori}, for example, was wrapped in an page of advertisements, including those of Pākehā millwrights and mill managers.\textsuperscript{321} Charles Sanderson, an Auckland engineer, also advertised in \textit{Te Karere Maori} for tenders for the iron-work for Te Poihipi’s mill at Taupō.\textsuperscript{322} Māori also utilised the newspapers themselves in order to advertise for mill managers. Māori at Aotea, for example, wrote several letters to Charles Davis, published in \textit{Te Waka o te Iwi}, wanting a Pākehā to run their mill, the second of which requested a Frenchman.\textsuperscript{323} \textit{Te Waka o te Iwi} in its short ‘news’ section made mention of a number of mill construction projects.\textsuperscript{324} It is possible that Davis may also have been involved in these, as he also published advertisements which imply he was acting as an agent, or at least as a facilitator, for Pākehā millwrights and shipwrights.\textsuperscript{325}

The ownership of a mill was often tribal even when the name of one particular chief was associated with it. However, ownership could be more formalised. The mill at Kāwhia, for example, was owned by listed shareholders mostly of Ngāti Hikairo who had invested small sums ranging from 5 shillings to several pounds, but also investors from other hapū and iwi.\textsuperscript{326} Occasionally a mill also helped iwi come together. Nepia Tararoa, for example, wrote to McLean saying,

\begin{quote}
I have done what you said, and I have concluded the business of ourselves and Ngāti Apa. We live together, and work together in the Mill at Rangitikei. That difficulty of ours is finished.\textsuperscript{327}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{320} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/5/1862:6-7. ‘E hanga ana a Te Poihipi i te mira ki tenei wahi. He mira nui rawa atu. Ko te whanui o nga kohatu 4 putu; a, e tahuna mai nei nga rino mo taua mira i Akarana. Nui atu te taimaha o enei kohatu; otiia, i toia haere tia mai i Te Matata e nga tangata; te mamao o tera wahi i Taupo, hipa atu i nga maero 100. Ngaatu mo te kai to i nga kohatu nei, 200 poaka; he kai era ma te kai to. No mua noa atu ka timata e ia te mahi mo tenei mira; otiia e tohea tonuitia ana e ia, ekore ia e whakarere i tana i hiahia ai. Ko tenei, kua mea te Kawanatanga kia whakaritea he kai hango mo tenei mira, ara kia whakahoa atu ki a ia. Mo konei, ekore pea e wheau, ka oti; a, ka whakaaro pai noa iho a Te Poihipi ki nga witi ka hurihia ki tona mira ake.’

\textsuperscript{321} See for example, the wrappers of \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/6/1855, 30/8/1856, 30/9/1856, 31/12/1856, 15/12/1859.

\textsuperscript{322} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/4/1862:16.

\textsuperscript{323} \textit{Te Waka o te Iwi}, 1/11/1857:1, 2. Why they wanted a Frenchman is not stated. Perhaps the mill owners were Catholic.

\textsuperscript{324} \textit{Te Waka o te Iwi}, 1/10/1857:3, 1/11/1857:3.

\textsuperscript{325} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/2/1855:11-12.

\textsuperscript{326} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/10/1857:7-8. ‘...mahia ana e au tau kupu; oti ake i a au ta maua mahi ko Ngatiapa, kua noho tahi matou, kua mahi tahi i te Mira ki Rangitikei; kua oti tena rarurarutau o maua.’;
Belich, like Parsonson, suggests that Māori entered into certain commercial activities, such as flour mills, as they were a novelty which spurred competition. A hapū would therefore raise its mana by possessing a flour mill before others had managed it.\(^{328}\) The inference is that once all hapū had acquired their own mill, the ‘fad’ ended, causing the demise of the Māori flour mills. Discussed below are economic and political reasons why Māori milling may have failed, as the argument that competition drove mill ownership does not fully explain Māori interest, and the decline of that interest, in milling. Certainly, the possession of such a taonga could increase tribal mana, but the varying ownership models, which included cooperation, suggest that the mana of a hapū was not always paramount.\(^{329}\) The acquisition of European customs was in itself a source of mana.\(^{330}\) The Kawhia Māori, for example, requested that their share subscription list be published in *Te Karere Maori*. This was acceded to as the request coincided with the newspaper’s own mission to promote ngā tikanga Pākehā.\(^{331}\) Secondly, mill construction in an area did not necessarily stimulate more mills in adjacent areas. For example, a concentration of mills existed in the Rotorua Lakes region, yet does not appear to have stimulated a competitive response in other parts of the Bay of Plenty.\(^{332}\) Thirdly, the first Māori mill was erected in 1846 at Aotea, but had a relatively short life due to overuse.\(^{333}\) However, the Māori of Aotea obtained another mill in 1855, and wrote asking for a Pākehā mill manager in 1857.\(^{334}\) It was not until 1863 that Ngāti Matera at Hauraki or Ngāti Kahungunu of Te Pāwhakairo obtained their own mills.\(^{335}\) This shows that if Māori flour milling was merely a competitive ‘fad’, it was a long lived one.


\(^{329}\) This is supported with research which Hazel Petrie of the University of Auckland is currently undertaking for a PhD thesis. Hazel Petrie, ‘Mana, mania, or moni? Māori ships and flourmills in the mid-nineteenth century’ (Paper presented at the New Zealand Historical Association Conference, Dunedin, 29 November 2003).

\(^{330}\) As discussed earlier in this chapter.

\(^{331}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/2/1855:11-12.

\(^{332}\) For example see map, Hargreaves (1961), p 230.


\(^{334}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/3/1855:11; *Te Waka o te Iwi*, 1/11/1857:1,2.

\(^{335}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 1/6/1863:16; *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 27/6/1863:1; see also *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*, 25/7/1863:1; 8/8/1863:3.
The Demise of Milling and Agriculture.

Maori commercial activity declined markedly in the early 1860s. The Auckland export trade, dependent on Maori agriculture, had fallen from a high of £180,411 in 1854 to a mere £78,546 in 1861. Wheat carried by coastal shipping into Auckland dwindled from 85,116 bushels in 1860 to 36,300 two years later. Small wonder The New-Zealander described Maori industry as ‘land out of tilth—mills out of grist—vessels falling into desuetude and decay’. Hargreaves identifies a number of technical deficiencies that accompanied the decline in Maori agriculture. Maori did not take protective measures to stop wireworm infestations in their potatoes, lost much of their wheat due to poor harvesting techniques, and soon exhausted their soil through overuse, and a lack of fertiliser. Maori also grew an inferior wheat variety known as Hamupake (Humpback) or Awharikana (African) which was often unsaleable. Te Karere Maori and Te Karere o Poneke both spoke out against this wheat variety, and published a circular from grain buyers stating that they would refuse to buy any more of this wheat, and suggesting that Maori obtain good quality Australian seed instead. The quality of the wheat was also often compromised by smut, impurities and weed seeds, and once harvested, was often stored incorrectly.

The quality of the wheat being ground was also a concern to Maori mills. Te Karere Maori, for example, published the Tuakau mill’s ‘ture’ stating that no damp or decayed wheat would be ground there. Such was the low regard held for Maori ground wheat that from 1858 Maori milled wheat was classified as inferior to second grade flour, often commanding a significantly lesser price, as shown in Table 2. At times, Te Karere Maori even actively discouraged from milling their own wheat.

We have spoken often to [our] Maori friends to be industrious in wheat production, but the growing wheat is better than grinding flour. Wheat is a good article to sell overseas, but flour is just a food for this place. The flour of Chile is better than here, and it would not be right to compete with the countries [that have] excellent flour, Chile and Australia. So, let us tell you, a large amount of flour that was ground by Maori was not wanted by overseas, people did not want to sell it, and it was returned here to Auckland.

---

336 The New-Zealander, 13/2/1863:3.
340 Te Karere Maori, 31/10/1856:3.
341 Te Karere Maori, 27/11/1856:14. ‘Kua nui to matou korero ki nga hoa Maori kia kaha to ratou mahi i te witi, engari te ngaki i te witi e pai ake ana tera i te mahi huri paraoa. Ko te witi he men pai tera hei hoko ki nga whenua tawhiti, ko te paraoa ia hei kai ma konei ake. Ko nga paraoa o Hiri e pai ke ake ana i to konei, ekore hoki e tika kia whakataetae tatou ki nga whenua paraoa papai rawa, ki te
In July 1857, *Te Karere Maori* encouraged Māori to send their wheat to the new steam mill established on the Queen St wharf in Auckland by Thornton, Firth and Smith. In September the paper applauded the mill’s export of flour to Australia ‘because we consider the export of the manufactured flour is calculated to be much more advantageous to the New Zealand farmer than the export of the unmanufactured wheat’ now that New Zealand could compete with Australia in terms of quality rather than price.

This denigration of Māori milled flour coexisted with generally positive reports on the Māori acquisition of mills. The government also continued to provide loans for expensive mills, despite *Te Karere Maori* stating in 1857 that Māori milled flour was only good for their own consumption. It is likely that the government encouraged these mills as the repayment of loans locked Māori more deeply into the market economy and further exposure to civilising influences. For example, *Te Karere Maori* had considered that the Hauraki Māori had been lagging behind other tribes. With the construction of a mill in 1863 at Waihou by Te Hira Kake of Ngāti Tamaterā, the paper now considered that ‘they have become alert to the benefits by which man advances.’

Government involvement in mills was also a way of creating a relationship between government and iwi. For example, in February 1855, Colonel Wynyard, administering the government between Grey’s departure and Browne’s arrival, visited the Waikato to placate Māori ill-feeling over the murder of one of their number. The Māori perceived Wynyard and his party to be a peace mission on behalf of the

---

whenua o Hiri, o Atareiria. Na, kia mea atu e matou, he nui te paraoa o Nui Tireni nei na te tangata Māori i huri, a, ko taua paraoa, kihai i paingia, e tawahi, kahore i manako te tangata ki te hoko, a; whakahokia mai ana ki Akarana nei.’; ‘We have more than once recommended our native friends to direct their attention more to the culture of wheat than to the manufacture of flour. The one as an article of export never fails to meet a ready sale; the other cannot in any degree compete with the vastly superior flour of Chili, America, or Australia; and, as a proof, we regret to have to state that a considerable quantity of New Zealand flour of native manufacture, was rejected in the Sydney market and returned to Auckland as unsaleable.’

343 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/7/1857:7.
344 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/9/1857:15, ‘...e mea ana matou, ka utaina atu te paraoa, ki tawahi ka tika, ka whai taonga te kai ngaki, kaua e utaina witiitia.’
345 For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 1/1/1855:6, 1/2/1855:11-12; 1/3/1855:11; 1/7/1855:4
347 *Te Karere Maori*, 1/6/1863:16. ‘Ko tenei, kua tangata ratou i nga painga e piki ake ai te tangata.’; ‘Now, however, they seem alive to the advantages of civilised life.’
collective guilt of Pākehā. The various chiefs all agreed to peace, but they considered a flour mill as sufficient utu.\footnote{Te Karere Maori, 1/3/1855:2-10.} As Karaka said at Tihorewaru,

But the mill is very good. It is not good just for us, but for our children. What use is it to talk of the dead. No, it is the feeding of us, and this is the feeding. Give us a mill.\footnote{F.D. Bell to Edward Shortland 30/12/1862, MS 385, Hocken Library.}

It is likely too, that government loans for mills were made in an effort to either cement loyalty, or to sway wavering Māori to the government side. Many Hauraki Māori had strong links with the Kingitanga. When Edward Shortland was appointed as Civil Commissioner to Waihou in Dec 1862, his instructions read that the Governor desired ‘to restore the confidence of the Native population to the British Government’ although ‘it may take the patient labour of many years to remove the secret causes of dissatisfaction and distrust’.\footnote{Hargreaves (1959), pp 69-70.} Ngāti Tamaterā’s mill at Waihou may well have been one of these early labours.

According to Hargreaves, the construction of mills required a cooperative effort of Māori labour under Pākehā supervision, and Pākehā were also employed to manage the mills. Unfortunately, the mills were sometimes poorly built or the managers unreliable which resulted in short life spans for these mills.\footnote{Te Karere Maori, 1/3/1855:11-12; 31/8/1857:4-5. ‘...ki te kahore he kai titiro no nga mira, ka he tonu a tatou mira.’} The government recognised this problem and appointed H. Boyton as Inspector of Native Mills. In his two reports published in \textit{Te Karere Maori} in 1855 it appears that he worked mainly in the Waikato area, and in addition to his inspection duties also undertook some training of Māori in mill management when he had the time. The government was, at least in 1855, quite involved in Māori milling, with Boyton’s duties also monitoring payments to the Pākehā building the mills.\footnote{Te Karere Maori, 1/3/1855:14-15; 1/12/1855:1-2.} However, this supervision of Māori milling was shortlived once Grey’s first governorship had ended.

Māori saw value in mill inspectors. In 1857, Kāwhia Māori published in \textit{Te Karere Maori} an open letter to Māori mill owners south of Auckland suggesting they collectively pay for a governmental inspector, because ‘if we have no inspector, our mills will go to ruin.’\footnote{Te Karere Maori, 1/3/1855:2-10.} These chiefs also made a more formal request to the
government but this was not acted upon. The government was happy to lend money for mills but was not prepared to facilitate the appointment of an inspector to ensure they operated efficiently.

The decline in enthusiasm for agricultural trade was most pronounced among Waikato Māori. As Gorst noted, 'the natives grow little more than is necessary for their own consumption'. Pearson states that Māori agricultural production and transport systems 'soon dissolved in the face of competition from a European system of farm production which rapidly expanded as immigration swelled.' In the pre-war period, this may have occurred with certain products, such as pigs and poultry, which supplied the local Pākehā market. However, when Māori production declined, The New Zealander, a settler newspaper, acknowledged that although 'wheat, maize, oats, barley, and the like have for years been crops of almost exclusive native culture', it was now time for Pākehā to fill the growing vacuum in crop agriculture. Pearson's argument that Pākehā competition stifled Māori production is more applicable to regions outside of the Auckland province with smaller Māori populations, and after the wars when Pākehā in Canterbury began to produce cheap wheat. It does not explain why many Waikato Māori decided to limit their involvement in the market economy, at a time when they possessed ample land for crops, and with rising immigration an opportunity to sell them.

Sinclair argues that Māori nationalism first appeared in a period of prosperity and immigration, which provided ready markets for Māori. However, this prosperity, along with Pākehā land speculation, created incessant demands for Māori land causing resentment which fueled the Kingitanga. While lower prices may have given Māori another grievance, Sinclair maintains that 'because of the previous progress of nationalism the Maoris were psychologically prepared to reject European agriculture

358 The New Zealander, 31/12/1862:2; 31/1/1863:3.
359 Auckland, although the largest urban centre lacked the 'farming hinterland' that cities such as Wellington possessed. See Gardner, p 61, 65. Wellington's Pakeha farmers also grew their own wheat. See J. Halket Millar, The Merchants Paved the Way: The First Hundred Years of the Wellington Chamber of Commerce (Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1956) p 110. The Wellington settlers also appear to be responsible for the majority of exports from their port. Millar, p 46.
360 Hargreaves (1959), p 77.
along with other European influences’. There is some evidence of this attitude in Waikato opinions on whether to sow their old cultivations with grass seed rather than abandoning them to weeds. *Te Karere Maori* reported ‘that several of our Waikato farmers are enquiring for seed for this purpose. We hope to hear these enquiries become general.’ However, Fenton noted ‘that, hearing of the grass movement, some had resolved that no grass should be sown on their land, for it came from the pakeha, and would bring the name of the Queen upon the land.’ However, it must be remembered that not all Waikato chiefs were followers of the Kingitanga, just as the movement attracted support from outside of the Waikato area. While the Waikato tribes did abandon most of their cultivations in the 1860s, it appears that Māori agriculture in general also declined in other areas, although to a less marked degree.

While Hargreaves notes Sinclair’s argument, he offers a wider range of reasons for the decline of Māori agriculture. For example, some Waikato Māori did not plant the large acreages of former times because of the prospect of war, as they considered, rather fatalistically, that they would be killed in the coming war. However, he also stresses the generally negative economic factors that Māori experienced: their lack of efficiency, problems with the quality of wheat, flour and potatoes, and an inability to maintain their flour mills. As noted above, Māori sometimes received prices below those listed. Given that the listed prices also fell significantly after 1855, Māori cannot have been confident of gaining a fair return on their labours.

The eventual disintegration of Māori agriculture, finally due to war and continual land loss, falls outside of the parameters of this study. More research is required on Māori agriculture over a longer time frame, ideally in local case studies, in which Māori agricultural production is weighed against other evidence, such as land alienation, Pākehā colonisation and production, and Māori political activity. In terms of this thesis, most newspapers actively encouraged Māori to participate in the market economy, and *Te Karere Maori* strove to provide good information, which, as noted in Chapter 1, Māori keenly sought. Naturally, they were disappointed when

---

361 Sinclair (1952) pp 120, 122-123, 131.
362 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/8/1857:1-3. ‘Kua rongo matou, e ui ana etahi o te hunga ngaki whenua o Waikato ki te purapura, hei penei; a ko ta matou tenei e hiahia nei, kia rapu te tini o te tangata ki tenei mea.’
364 *The New Zealander*, 31/12/1862:2; 31/1/1863:3.
prices fell, and when they did not receive listed market prices. However, *Te Karere Maori* was also responsible, over a period of years, for detailing to Māori the vagaries of the Western capitalism: that prices were dependant on a global market over which Māori had no control. The production of crops was an activity that needed planning and time, and Māori were no doubt dismayed when prices dropped suddenly due to the arrival in Australia of too many ships carrying grain or flour, or when Australian farmers enjoyed a bumper crop.  

The newspaper, although trying to encourage Māori production, often presented honest but depressing or uncertain economic appraisal to its Māori readers. It also gave contradictory advice, such as extolling those tribes which invested heavily in mills, but then pointing out that they were little use other than for grinding flour for local Māori use. There is sufficient evidence to point to Māori withdrawing from large-scale agricultural production due to economic factors. The newspapers were not responsible for these factors, but they certainly portrayed them explicitly to their Māori readers, without heed to how Māori might interpret them.

Conclusion

For the successful colonisation of New Zealand, and for the betterment of Māori themselves, the government wanted Māori to engage with European customs, *ngā ritenga pai o ngā Pākehā*, together with a rejection of certain Māori customs. The missionaries had begun, and continued, to promote some of these changes, such as adopting visible signs of European culture, such as housing, clothing and food, along with the laws and beliefs of their own religious world view. Both before and after 1840, these aspects of 'civilisation' co-existed with, while also modifying, Māori tribal structures. However, the implications of British colonisation meant the imposition of the Queen’s law as well as increased Pākehā immigration. Both had dramatic effects on Māori life and extended the nature of the *ritenga* that Māori were expected to adopt. To varying degrees all the Pākehā-run Māori language newspapers of this period sought to promote *ngā ritenga Pākehā*. The government’s *Te Karere Maori* was at the forefront of this work. Its policy of *he iwi kotahi* was predicated on gaining Māori acceptance of law, and of Pākehā settlement. By breaking down the differences between the two races, mistrust would diminish and they could merge into

---

one nation. However, the government did not expect the Pākehā to adopt tikanga Māori but for Māori to become, as quickly as possible, brown skinned Pākehā.

The government wanted Māori to accept roads through their lands. These, Te Karere Maori argued, would allow better access of Māori produce to market, and for the passage of the Queen’s mail. The roads were seen as a conduit of civilisation. However, Māori were well aware that roads also brought Pākehā wanting their land and officials seeking to introduce governmental authority. Māori were also well aware that roads could be used for military purposes, as was proved in Waikato in 1863. Issues such as the roads, and the mail conveyed on them, therefore carried hugely important political implications for Māori hapū and iwi, and not just the benefits of progress promoted in the newspapers.

Pākehā became the Māori’s trading partner, both in New Zealand and Australia. Pākehā ritenga now included servicing this market with agricultural produce. While Māori could use communal work practices to achieve this, the newspapers believed that Māori would be much more efficient in agriculture by individualising their land, and holding government titles. By eliminating Māori arguments and feuding over land ownership, the industrious would be free to develop their land. The government considered that increased wealth would also allow Māori to amass more property which they would be less willing to risk by indulging in war. Land individualisation would allow those who wished to sell their land to Pākehā to do so. This scenario, however, did not eventuate during this research period. The government was often slow to award land titles, and Māori, for the most part, still lived tribally away from European settlement and were in no hurry to introduce change which could further fracture their communities. The newspapers also promoted the sale of ‘waste’ land by tribes. The sale of land would bring increased numbers of Pākehā settlers with whom Māori could trade. Māori would also benefit by increased land values that Pākehā settlement would bring, but also from the “civilisation” that Pākehā would demonstrate to them.

It is clear that the ritenga were interlinked. For example, religion informed much of the discussion with newspapers invoking Biblical injunctions to denigrate wastefulness of Māori feasting, or to support the sale of waste land and the passage of mail. Sometimes the promotion of a particular ritenga was influenced by other concerns. The newspapers considered that Māori should adopt European housing, but
were motivated, on one hand, to stop the immorality of communal living, but also, in the case of Buller, for Māori to qualify as voters and participate in the electoral process. Land individualisation was characterised by the benefits to Māori agricultural production, but the government also knew that it would facilitate the sale of land. The promotion of trade was also tied to increased Pākehā immigration.

The newspapers were almost of one voice in promoting ngā ritenga pai, although several exceptions stand out, showing that the Pākehā messages in the newspapers were not totally hegemonic in nature. Te Karere o Poneke, followed a similar editorial line to Te Karere Maori, although, as stated above, it promoted the idea of Māori as citizen voters. The evangelical distaste for worldliness and the pursuit of wealth sat uneasily with the government's desire to incorporate Māori within the market economy. The Wesleyan Te Haeata, for example, promoted Māori acceptance of governmental authority and the sale of land, but did not encourage Māori commerce, which it considered would lead to a withering of religious devotion. C.O. Davis, whilst editor of his own short-lived journals, advanced the concepts of 'civilisation' along with his evangelical message. He shared Te Haeata's attitude to avarice, but, unlike the other Pākehā-run papers, urged Māori not to sell their land. Even Te Karere Māori gave out conflicting messages on the morality of wealth, and the value of owning mills and sailing ships.

The newspapers, particularly Te Karere o Poneke's extensive correspondence columns, show that many Māori considered ngā ritenga Pākehā as a cohesive whole, incorporating not only lifestyle changes, commercial activity and land reforms but also education, religion and law. This may have been merely lip service at times, as implied by commentators such as Hutton. Māori acceptance, or rejection, of Pākehā customs must be placed within the wider political context of mana and land, and the newspapers show that Māori had a variety of opinions on these issues. Most Māori, whether they professed allegiance to the "Kuinitanga" or to the Kingitanga, lived their lives outside of governmental authority. Acceptance of roads, or the passage of the mail, was equated to an implicit acceptance of future Pākehā intrusion. Half the country's land mass had already been sold to the government, and the government's chief land purchaser, Donald McLean, kept applying pressure to buy more. Some Māori were prepared to sell their land to demonstrate their loyalty to the government, although this was not a view shared by all. Land sales divided Māori into the pupuri
whenua and tuku whenua camps, and fuelled the arguments and feuding over land, a result which most of the newspapers were not prepared to concede. Some Māori did not want to sell, but saw value in surveying, individualising, and gaining title for their lands, as it would lead to agricultural efficiency, and eliminate divisive arguments over ownership. Christianity and education had tended to diminish the hierarchical nature of Māori society, and the newspapers show that tūtūā were now voicing their concerns lest they miss out on their share of the land.

Māori were also interested in another of the ritenga promoted by the newspapers, that of agricultural production for sale. Māori produce, much of it from Waikato, kept Auckland supplied with food and certain crops, such as wheat, found a market in Australia when Australian crops failed or when gold fields were opened. The wheat price was heavily dependent on the Australian market, and Māori received their highest returns prior to 1856. However, while some Māori continued trading, there was a progressive fall in output so that by the 1860s, New Zealand was importing rather than exporting wheat. Māori, particularly in the Waikato, also bought flour mills and coastal trading vessels to carry their produce to market. These both often suffered from lack of maintenance. Moreover, Māori mills generally produced a quality flour which was deemed fit only for their own local consumption. Sinclair suggests that Waikato Māori abandoned commercial activity because of a rising nationalism in which Māori rejected European ways. Certainly the interaction that commercial activity required demonstrated the less pleasant side of Pākehā society. While nationalism may have impacted on agricultural trade and production in the Waikato, there are also a variety of valid economic reasons for the decline: low prices, occasional depressions, overseas competition and the unsaleability of much of the Māori produce. Indeed, Te Karere Maori, the leading advocate of commercialism, presented all the major flaws of the market (particularly the unpredictability of produce prices) to Māori in a way that may well have helped defeat its own purpose. However, the government continued to promote agricultural production up to 1860, and to lend money on mills and ships because these delivered Māori from subsistence farming into the market economy, which was a cornerstone of modern European civilisation.

There is no mention of who would work the individualised Māori farms. If all Māori possessed farms, they would be less willing to provide labour for other farmers, Māori or Pākehā. The vision was
The newspapers presented *ngā ritenga pai o te Pākehā* to Māori in an altruistic fashion, as a set of customs which would be purely of benefit to Māori. It is clear that at least some of the editors passionately believed the message they were promoting. However, the ‘civilisation’ that Pākehā were attempting to sell to Māori ran parallel with the colonisation of the country, of gaining Māori acceptance of the government’s *mana*, and of facilitating increased Pākehā immigration, without regard for existing Māori social structures, or Māori ability to compete commercially with Pākehā.

Perhaps to emulate the small pioneer farms where the family constituted the labour force.
Chapter 7: political issues 1855 to Kohimarama

Introduction

In December, 1861, Grey met with Māori at Kōhanga near the mouth of the Waikato river. Present were the Waikato tribes of Ngāti Tīpā, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Mahanga, and Ngāti Pou. *Te Karere Maori* reported the scene.

Above the Governor’s seat was a figure in human form, carved with *moko*, its head decked with wood pigeon and huia feathers. The body of that personification was wrapped in a fine flax cloak, with the *mere* Okewa in its hand. ... Now, when all the talking was over, Waata Kūkūtai arose, and pointed his hand at the figure, saying “Governor Grey, that is our ancestor, he is from whom we who live here descend, he is our *mana*. He is an ancestor of ours, and [we] give [him] to you, with his cloak and club. There is no more.” The Governor said, “Yes, I will have your ancestor, I will look after him.”

As Grey was aware, this ceremony was more than the bestowing of an impressive souvenir. Waata Kūkūtai was symbolically transferring *mana* of some sort to the government.²

Governmental control over much of New Zealand before the Waikato offensive of 1863 was at best superficial and patchy. The major political issues involving Māori (including land sales) revolved around the government’s desire to extend and strengthen its *mana kāwanatanga*, and Māori resistance to, or acceptance of this.³

While the Treaty of Waitangi was not a major focus in the newspapers of the time, its

---

1 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/1/1862:8. “I runga ake o te nohoanga o te Kawana i noho ai he whakapakoko ahua tangata, he mea ta ki te moko, he mea puhi te mahunga ki te huru kereru, me nga huruhuru huia ano: he mea takai te tinana o tua tiki ki te kaitaka, me te mere Okewa ki te ringa. ... Na, ka oti nga korero katoa, ka whakatikia a Wanta Kukutai, ka tohu tana ringaringa ki tuaa whakapakoko, ka mea, “E Kawana Kerei, to matou tupuna tena, ko ia te take mai o matou e noho nei, ko ia ia to matou mana; he tupuna ia no matou, a ka hoatu nei ki a koe, me tona kakahu, me tona patu. Kahore o muri atu.” Ka mea a te Kawana, “Ae, ki atu a koutou Tupuna,–maku e tiaki.””; ‘Above His Excellency’s seat was fixed an image of full length carved in wood, the tattooing exquisitely performed; feathers of the pigeon ingeniously put together representing the hair; the feathers of the Huia, so highly prized by the Maori, were used as ornaments; the body of the figure was covered with a Native mat of the finest texture, and a stone axe of great antiquity hung by its hand. ... When all had thus spoken, Waata Kukutai stood up and, pointing to the figure which we have above described, said, “Governor Grey, that is our ancestor. We all, these five tribes, take our origin from him; he is our mana, he is our ancestor; we give him to you, we give you also his mat and his battle axe; we cannot give you more.” The Governor said, “I accept him, and will keep your ancestor with me.”’


³ I have used term *mana kāwanatanga* to describe the authority assumed by the Crown. The expression “te mana o te kāwanatanga” is seen more commonly in the newspapers, although Wiremu Nēra Te Awaitaia did refer to “nga mana kawanatanga” in *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860:25. I chose *mana kāwanatanga* to indicate a specific, and new, authority. Dacker, Reilly and Watson employ the much looser term *mana whakahaere*, but this encompasses both *tino rangatiratanga* as well as governmental structures. Dacker et al, p 2.
presence informed the thinking of both the government and Māori. In 1858, Pōtatau Te Wherowhero was crowned the first Māori king, which the government saw as a direct challenge to its mana, and two years later, the government was embroiled in a war with Taranaki Māori over the disputed Waitara block. In response to these two developments, Governor Browne called a selection of Māori chiefs together at Kohimarama to discuss them, and other political issues. Mana was at stake: would Māori or the government have the authority to shape and control their own destiny.

This chapter explores firstly the concept of mana and how the term might relate to the Treaty of Waitangi. Using the concept of mana with its varied layers, it then discusses how the Māori language newspapers portrayed the major political issues affecting Māori from 1855 through to the Kohimarama Conference in 1860. The following chapter discusses the issues after Kohimarama until the cessation of the government’s Te Karere Maori, soon after the start of the Waikato War.

**Mana**

Commentators generally agree that mana is translated as “authority” and “power”. Maori Marsden insists that for a chief to possess mana both of the English terms must be fulfilled: he must not only have authority to act, but the power to effect it. As Hāre Hongi rather poetically described mana.

I speak of potency, the right
To order things as I may deem;
I, nothing wanting, have the might
Which clothes authority supreme.

Traditionally, mana derived from the gods, or was at least inherited from ancestors. Chiefs could possess two main kinds of mana: mana ariki, or power over people through conquest; and mana whenua or power over the land through inter-
marriage with the original inhabitants. Both forms of mana would reside in the subsequent chiefly offspring. While all rangatira possessed their own personal mana, hapū collectively experienced their chiefs’ personal mana. Because the hapū was the apex of real political and social unity within Māori society, mana did not tend to reside in larger, more transcendent groupings such as iwi. Mana of chief and hapū could wax or wane depending on the chief’s successes or failures in both peace and war. Although mana related to chiefly individuals, and through them to their hapū, Ballara suggests that a chief’s mana was bound to land that he controlled. It is clear that the mana relationship between chief and hapū to the land was different to modern Western concepts, more than mere possession as in a land title, and more concrete than the abstract and distant notion of “sovereignty”.

**Mana and the Treaty of Waitangi**

When the British Resident, James Busby, tried to establish a Māori state in the north of the North Island in 1835 to counter the spurious claims of the “Frenchman” de Thierry to a kingdom at Hokianga, he gathered Māori chiefs into a Wakaminenga (assembly) so that they could issue “A Declaration of the Independence of New Zealand.” Significantly, the word rangatiratanga was used to denote “independence”, while kingitanga and mana became “sovereign power and authority”. The chiefly assembly, in whom resided this power and who would frame laws, also had the right to delegate the administration to a kāwanatanga. Rangatiratanga, a gerundal noun formed from rangatira, portrays the personal

8 Walker [Ka Whawhai], pp 45-6; Ballara, pp 139; Best [Tuhoe], p 13. Mana ariki is sometimes also known as mana tangata.
9 Ballara, pp 139, 176, 179; 193; 200; Mahuika, p 45; Te Rangi Hiroa, p 346; Orbell[Encyclopedia], pp 99-100.
10 Ballara, p 204. Certainly mana and land were always closely connected. As stated above, new arrivals derived mana whenua from marriage between tangata whenua. Walker states that the naming of land features was an assertion of mana. See Walker (1990) p 60. Rights to land could only be maintained by ahi kā roa (continuous occupation). Douglas Sinclair, “Land: Māori View and European Response” in Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga, ed. Michael King (Auckland: Reed Books, 1992) p 68; Ballara, p 200.
11 “He Wakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirene.” There does not appear to evidence suggesting significant Māori input into the Declaration. This would have been the case if Owens is correct in suggesting that Busby was “pursuing his own career” in bringing the chiefs together to sign the document. Owens (1997), p 43.
qualities and standing of the chiefs. It is therefore closely related to the word *mana*, the power and authority of chiefs.

When the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840, the British wanted to gain sovereignty over New Zealand, and to formulate an orderly system of buying land. The English version of the Treaty was unequivocal: Māori ceded sovereignty of New Zealand to Queen Victoria in exchange for property rights, and "all the Rights and Privileges of British Subjects". However, according to the Māori translation, the chiefs were allowing the Crown to exercise *kāwanatanga* (government) but were to retain their own *tino rangatiratanga* (pre-eminent chiefly status). Neither of the terms, *kingitanga* or *mana*, used in the "Declaration" appeared in the Treaty, despite initial intentions to deal with the chiefs of the *Wakaminenga*, (who are mentioned three times in the Treaty). That *kāwanatanga* was a term used in the 1835 Declaration to define executive power under chiefly authority, and that, in the absence of *mana*, *tino rangatiratanga* may have been the closest approximation to "sovereignty" available in 1840 has led to conjectures on what Māori made of the deal in 1840.

Certainly, Māori had little part in creating the content or form of either the Māori or English version of the Treaty, just as they had had minimal input into the texts of the Declaration of Independence five years earlier. As Orange states, "the [Māori] treaty text...did not spell out the implications of British annexation." Durie notes that the word *mana* had been used in the 1835 Declaration of Independence to denote "authority and control" and suggests that its omission in 1840 "may have been a deliberate deception." Orange, however, maintains that as "rangatiratanga and kawanatanga each has its own mana" the word would not have been apt. Head goes further, suggesting that in the pre-Treaty period terms such as *mana* and

---

13 See Orange (1987), pp 33-34.
14 For various Treaty texts in English and Māori (with literal translations), see Orange (1987), pp 257-266.
16 For example, see 100 Words Every NZer Should Know. Online. Accessed 16 December 2003. Available from NZHistory.net.New Zealand. http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/Gallery/tereo/words.htm. This webpage of 100 key Māori words was developed by the New Zealand government’s Ministry for Culture and Heritage. It defines "tino rangatiratanga" as "the highest possible independent chiefly authority, paramount authority, sometimes used for sovereignty".
17 Orange (1987), p 42.
19 Orange (1987), p 42.
rangatiratanga did not equate to abstract political concepts, but rather described the immanent qualities of individuals. The terms included in the Treaty had merely been inadvertent additions by the translators of these documents who, searching within an imprecise political register, had been ‘striving for precision’. Moreover, she suggests that Māori had understood the Treaty in the terms in which the translators intended, in contrast to our times ‘where the case has largely been argued ahistorically, signified most dramatically by the great authority scholars are willing to award to present-day Māori language and culture when interpreting that of 1840.’

In contrast, Peter Cleave suggests that “translation” was not the major difficulty with the Treaty, but that ‘two distinct modes of political and cultural understanding [were] being brought into contact.’

The concept of mana by mid-century

Head is correct in asserting that translators could not render European political terms precisely and easily into Māori. Pākehā of the time soon conceded that the two Treaty versions did not match each other well. In 1846, Governor Fitzroy stated that Māori had signed the Treaty ‘[a]fter lengthened and minute explanations, and earnest discussion of the actual import and probable consequences’. However, ‘that the natives did not view all its provisions in exactly the same light as our authorities is undoubted’, and while some would be happy to abandon it, any loyalty the government held was due to ‘adhering scrupulously to the Treaty’.

Sewell, in 1864, suggested that Māori expected to continue ‘to govern themselves according to their own usages, and to retain ownership of the land.’ He questioned the term kāwanatanga, saying ‘they did not understand that they thereby surrendered the right of self-government over their internal affairs, a right which we

---


21 Cleave, p 35.

never have claimed or exercised, and could not in fact exercise." 23 In a similar vein, Sir William Martin, in his 1860 pamphlet The Taranaki Question, maintained that the Treaty of Waitangi neither added nor subtracted from Māori property rights: "[i]t simply left them as they were." Martin also suggested that Māori would not have understood kāwanatanga.

This unknown thing, the "Governorship" was in some degree defined by the reference to its object. The object was expressed to be "to avert the evil consequences which must result from the absence of Law." To the new and unknown office they conceded such powers, to them unknown, as might be necessary for its due existence. To themselves, they retained what they understood full well, the "tino rangatiratanga," "full Chiefship" in respect to all their lands. 24

Māori, therefore, believed that they still retained the mana whenua they had always possessed and it was distinct from, but not necessarily contradictory to the new mana that the government possessed.

Not surprisingly, the government attacked Martin's pamphlet, whose countering pamphlet argued that the Treaty's differences in meaning had been known for years, but the essential gist of the two versions was the same. Moreover,

every successive Governor has been willing, without a critical enquiry as to the Maori and English versions of the Treaty, to adopt the doctrine that it ought to be executed in the sense that it was understood by the Natives. 25

Few discussions about the Treaty appear in the newspapers, outside of the Kohimarama Conference. In 1856, Hokianga chiefs wrote to the governor to say that they would unite to put down any quarrels that might erupt into violence, in effect, pooling their tino rangatiratanga, but anticipating governmental approval. They did this, on the basis of the the Declaration of Independence and the Treaty of Waitangi which they described thus.

Ka kawea atu ano he pukapuka ki Ingarangi, kia Kingi Wiremu; a taea noatia nga ra o Wikitoria te Kuini o Ingarangi, a taea noatia te Tiriti o Waitangi. I penei ra te korero o tāua pukapuka. Ko matou ko nga Iwi o Niutireni i raro mai o Hauraki, ka oti nei te hui hui ki te runanga ki Waitangi, a te ngahuru i tenei

Then again there was another letter sent to England to King William containing our thoughts, which we have continued to cherish even to these days of Victoria Queen of England. These are our thoughts in the Treaty of Waitangi, which Treaty was worded thus:

Another letter was carried to England, to King William, [which held currency] right up to the days of Victoria, Queen of England, and the Treaty of Waitangi. That letter went like this. We, the tribes of New Zealand north of Hauraki, having assembled to discuss matters at

---

24 Sir W. Martin, pp 9-10. This publication was also reproduced in AJHR, 1861, E-2.
25 Notes on Sir William Martin's Pamphlet Entitled the The Taranaki Question (Auckland: New Zealand Government, 1861; facsimile edition, Dunedin: Hocken Library, 1968), pp 9-10. This publication was also reproduced in AJHR, 1861, E-2. Martin's pamphlet was also attacked in C. Richmond, "Memorandum by Mr. Richmond in Reply to a Pamphlet by Sir W. Martin DCL on the Taranaki Question" also found in AJHR, 1861, E-2.
We the tribes of New Zealand residing to the North of the Thames being now assembled in the tenth Moon of the Native Year to make Laws, to protect commerce and prevent war, and protect our Land, since we asked the King of England to become our Parent in this our childhood, let our chieftainship be lost with the Sovereignty of the Land, which is held by the principal chiefs of this Assembly.

This document was also sent to the King of England, and in answer to which he sent the first Governor.

The Treaty of Waitangi was the giving up of the Sovereignty of this Land. (i.e. the document of agreement of the chiefs of New Zealand to the Government of this country.)

The texts above tell as much about Crown motivations as it does about Ngā Puhi interpretations, and provides a salutary lesson for historians who might rely purely on “official” translations. The government wanted to reinforce the idea that the Treaty had delivered sovereignty to them, so states that taua pukapuka (the aforementioned book/document/letter) is in fact the Treaty, when the Māori text implies that it is the Declaration of Independence of 1835. Their argument is bolstered when this Independence is whakakahoretia, “denied”, or “eliminated”. An earlier reader of the copy of this newspaper (since copied to microfiche) also saw the discrepancy, underlined the word, and wrote in a copperplate hand “whakahonoretia”, that is, “honoured”, which makes more sense of the Māori text. Perhaps the orginal letter from the chiefs was not particularly legible, or perhaps it was a willful alteration. However, it appears that the chiefs, recognising the historical importance of the Declaration, with its references to rangatiratanga and mana, saw it coexisting with the kāwanatanga ceded to the Crown.

It is evident that by the 1860s, some supposedly modern interpretations were already being applied to the Treaty debate. The issue of mana also became very important. The dispute at Waitara arose from Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitāke asserting

---


27 The newspapers and documents of the time generally refer to Te Rangitāke as Wiremu Kingi or William King.
his *mana*, which led some Pākehā to expend much energy striving to understand the notion of chiefly rights, or to discount any possibility of his possessing any ‘manorial right’ to the land. James Busby, one of the original framers of the Treaty, did not consider in 1860 that ‘rights’ existed in traditional Māori society, and therefore words such as *mana* and *rangatira* could not apply to such a concept.  

Thomas Buddle wrote in 1860:

> “*Mana*” of the Chiefs. This word means authority, power, influence. It was originally applied to persons and their words or acts, not to land. ... The disputed land at Waitara is claimed by the Māori King party because the King’s mana has reached it—*Kua tae te mana o to matou kingi ki reira*—the mana of our king has gone there. And whenever this mana is gone, the land is held inalienable without the King’s consent. *Kua mau te mana o te whenua* is another expression in frequent use, i.e. hold fast the mana of the land. What does it mean? This is altogether a new application of the term; perhaps it has been adopted in consequence of the Queen’s Sovereignty over the Island having been translated as the Queen’s *mana*.  

Similarly, James Hamlin, thought that *mana o te whenua* was probably a Pākehā construction, or at least understood differently by Pākehā and Māori and had developed through exposure to European concepts. Octavius Hadfield, who included Te Āti Awa amongst his congregation, was keen to downplay any disloyalty on the part of Te Rangitāke, suggesting that the Taranaki War was purely a land issue arising out of the injustices of Governor Browne. Richmond stressed that it was an issue of *mana* and sovereignty, especially since Kingitanga warriors had entered the fray. ‘They were bound to fight for the King’s flag which had been carried to Waitara, and for the sovereignty (mana) of New Zealand.’ While Richmond understood the Kingitanga position, he had no sympathy for Māori aspirations for *mana motuhake*. Māori had consistently violated the Treaty, he believed, in not accepting English law, and holding back colonisation.

Buddle’s statement that the colonial authorities used the term *mana* to signify the Queen’s sovereignty to Māori, is supported by evidence from the Māori language.

---

28 *AJHR*, 1861, E-1, Appendix A, p 10.
29 *AJHR*, 1861, E-1, Appendix A, p 11.
30 Cleve Barlow also suggests that the various kinds of *mana* are modern interpretations. See Barlow, p 61.
32 *AJHR*, 1861, E-2, pp 3, 25.
33 ‘I imagine the day will come not long hence, when the preposterous Waitangi treaty will be overruled and as it has been constantly violated on the one hand in the contempt of English law will be set aside on the other and the ridiculous claims of the native to thousands of thousands acres of untrodden bush & fern will no longer be able to damp the ardor & cramp the energies of the industrious white man...’ Richmond-Atkinson Papers, Vol 1, p 103.
newspapers. *Te Karere Māori*, reporting on a Kingitanga meeting at Waiuku in 1860 where the *mana o te whenua* was discussed, stated that ‘from the tenor of some of the speeches it is clear that the speakers had very confused notions on the subject’ and that a paper read out ‘stated that the Pakehas claimed the “mana” over the land to the exclusion of the Maori owners of the soil, and this doctrine was accordingly denounced as unjust to the Maori.’

*Mana, Te Karere* declared, belonged to the Queen who used it to protect her New Zealand subjects by laws, and from foreign aggression.

When the Maoris come clearly to understand what is clearly implied in the declaration that the Queen’s ‘mana’ is over New Zealand, they will regard it as the blessing for which, next to Christianity, they have most cause to be thankful to Divine Providence.

It is not the case, as we said before, that the ‘mana’ of the land has passed to the Pakeha. The Maoris and Pakehas in New Zealand are one people and whatever the Pakeha possesses by virtue of belonging to the British nation is shared by the Maori also. We do not say that New Zealand is “no matou” (our’s [sic] in the exclusive sense, but it is “no tatou” (our’s [sic] in the inclusive sense.).

Traditionally, *mana* may have applied only to chiefs and their deeds. However, chiefs also represented their people, and by extension their land. With both land and *mana* being such integral parts of Māori identity, the links between the two were vital, with *mana* being exercised over the land, but also deriving from the land. Given that the Queen was portrayed to Māori as a chiefly personage with a personal interest in their welfare, and that her government and laws had a divine sanction, it is therefore not surprising that Pākehā chose the word *mana* to represent the concept of sovereignty — a supreme authority vested in a sovereign. Māori, if they accepted this Queen and the Governor, could accept it as a higher form of chiefly *mana*.

However, given that the government had few means to actually impose its will, this *mana* was rather removed from the daily realities of Māori, not unlike the consensual

---

34 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/3/1860:6-7. ‘... a ki ta matou whakaaro kei te pohehe nga whakaaro o etahi o te hunga i korero ki taua hui, he ahua raruraru hoki no ngā kupu.’ ‘... na te Pakeha te kupu nei, kei a ia te mana o te whenua kahore i nga Maori nona ake nei te oneone, a whakahengia ana tenei kupu, meinga ana, he tikanga tahae i te whenua o te Maori.’

35 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/3/1860:8. ‘Ki te ata matauria e nga tangata Maori te tino tikanga o tenei kupu e kiai nei, ko te mana o Te Kuini kei runga o Nui Tirani, ka mea ratou, ko te rua tenei o ngā atawhai nui a Te Atua ki a ratou hei whakawhetanga atu ma ratou ki a ia, ko te Rongopai te tuatahi, ko te rua tenei. Engari, kua oti te mea atu, e he ana te kupu nei, kua riro i te Pakeha te mana o te whenua. Ko nga Pakeha me nga Maori o Niu Tirani he iwi kotahi. Ko te mea e kia ana no te Pakeha, i runga i tona urunga ki ingarangi, no te Maori tahi ano. Ekor e penei, No *matou* a Niu Tirani, engari No *tatou* a Niu Tirani.’

36 See Māori letters to the newspapers accepting the Queen’s *mana*. For example, *Te Karere o Poneke*, 2/8/1858:3-4; *Te Karere Maori* 15/12/1860:6, 11-12; 1/5/1862:17-18.
political authority of pre-contact tribal *ariki*. Māori hapū could effectively exercise their own *mana whenua*, while paying lip service to allegiance to the government.

Unlike ‘sovereignty’ which was, at least theoretically, concentrated in the person of a single monarch whence it spread to governmental bodies beneath her, Māori understood *mana* to be much looser, with more nuances, and less centrally derived. Certainly while few would have disagreed with Bishop Selwyn plea “let there be one *mana*, God’s”, it was less clear how it was divided among His human agents. Some chiefs were willing to publicly accept the Queen’s *mana* over them, especially in the unusual environment of Kohimarama. Indeed, the first of the Conference’s resolutions, carried unanimously, began with,

this assembly agrees, in the determination of the chiefs who sat here; that they have pledged, one to each other, that there should be no discord with regard to the strongly declared statement concerning the *mana* of the Queen... [LPJ 40

The government could view the *mana whenua* held by Māori in different ways. For example, as the government was gaining the upper hand in Taranaki, *Te Manuhiri Tiārangi* was keen to dispel the rumours that the government wanted to overthrow chiefly *mana*, and, at another time, stated that through Pākehā education, the *mana* of Māori could be made permanent. *Te Karere Maori* was happy to print letters from Māori, loyal to the Crown, who asserted their *mana* to their lands. However, the newspaper also suggested that *mana whenua* was largely irrelevant. When rival Maketū hapū were fighting over the *mana* of a new road, *Te Karere Maori* urged them ‘to make the Maketu road at once, for it is the substance, and the question of *mana* they can settle at any time, it being merely the shadow.’ When Māori, such as Te Rangitāke or the Kingitanga, assumed *mana* in defiance of the Crown, then the
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38 *Te Hokioi*, 10/11/1862:1. ‘...kia kotahi te mana ko to te Atua...’
40 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/8/1860:6. ‘E whakaae ana tenei Runanga, i te tikanga o nga rangatira i noho ki roto; kua tino whakaae nei tetahi ki tetahi kia kaua rawa he pakanga ketanga i runga i te kupu kua whakapukina nuitia mo te mana o te Kuini...’; ‘That this Conference takes cognizance of the fact that the several Chiefs, members thereof, are pledged to each other to do nothing inconsistent with their declared recognition of the Queen’s sovereignty...’
41 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/8/1860:6. ‘E whakaae ana tenei Runanga, i te tikanga o nga rangatira i noho ki roto; kua tino whakaae nei tetahi ki tetahi kia kaua rawa he pakanga ketanga i runga i te kupu kua whakapukina nuitia mo te mana o te Kuini...’
42 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/4/1861: 3
44 *Te Karere Maori*, 16/12/1862:12. ‘...hanga te huarahi ki Maketu inaiannei, na te mea, e tinana ana tera; ko te *mana*, waiho i te whanga, ta te mea, he atarangi kau tera.’
government saw that *mana* as a dangerous and destructive force as well as a slight and challenge to the Queen’s own *mana*.\(^{45}\) This was echoed by chiefs both at Kohimarama, and in letters to the newspapers.\(^{46}\) For example, Tamihana Te Rauparaha stated that in the past his kinsman Te Rangihaeata had defied the law, seeing it as an issue of *mana*. In a similar way, Te Rangitāke was attempting ‘to maintain his land-holding influence (*mana-pupuri-whenua*), [and] the “mana” of New Zealand’.\(^{47}\)

Because many Māori were willing to accept that the Queen held some degree of *mana*, the government was keen to ensure that Māori saw that her *mana* was both broad, that is, across the globe, and deep, residing in her laws. One article in *Te Karere Maori*, detailing the visit of Prince Alfred to the Cape Colony whilst Grey was governor there, told of an African chief accompanying the royal party on board a warship. He soon saw ‘te mana o Ingarangi’ (England’s *mana*) and the madness of opposing ‘our great and loving Queen’.\(^{48}\) Queenly *mana* also devolved to her agents, and resided in her laws.\(^{49}\) Magistrates, for example, possessed the *mana* of the Queen,\(^{50}\) and Governor Grey called upon his ‘mana kawana’ in order to impose law and order.\(^{51}\) When Waikato Māori were starting to establish their own ratanga in the absence of effective governmental direction, *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* were not totally dismissive, but suggested that they would be ineffective without the government’s *mana* to back them up.\(^{52}\) Unsurprisingly, chiefs at times called upon the Governor to devolve his *mana* down to themselves.\(^{53}\) Concepts of *mana* may well have changed in the twenty years after the Treaty was signed. With the government asserting its new *mana kāwanatanga*, deriving from the Queen’s *mana*, Māori may well have developed a fuller appreciation of their own *mana whenua*. As discussed in Chapter 6, however Māori conceptualised *mana*, it is clear that they saw their *mana* disappearing once the government had alienated their lands.

\(^{45}\) For example see *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1860:3-5.
\(^{47}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 3/8/1860, Āpiti:23-24. ‘Te take a Wiremu Kingi, e tohe ana ki tana mana pupuri whenua, ki te mana o Niu Tirenī,
\(^{48}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 16/12/1861:11. ‘...to matou Kuini nui, Kuini atawhai...’; ‘our mighty and gracious Sovereign.’
\(^{49}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 3/8/1860, Āpiti:23-24. ‘Te take a Wiremu Kingi, e tohe ana ki tana mana pupuri whenua, ki te mana o Niu Tirenī,
\(^{50}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 13/3/1862:11-12.
\(^{51}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1856:12.
\(^{52}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 5/2/1862:9.
\(^{53}\) *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 1/8/1861:11.
Political Developments before Kohimarama.

The Kingitanga

No-one could claim that kāwanatanga and the effective application of law had eventuated for Māori by the mid nineteenth century. As shown by Governor Browne’s proclamation regarding land feuding in Taranaki, printed in Te Karere Maori, so long as bullets were not flying onto Pākehā land, Māori were free to fight and kill each other without fear of the law. Given that land feuding was most often precipitated by Pākehā pressures to buy land, it is not surprising that some Māori considered that the government was more interested in settling Pākehā, than with Māori welfare. Certainly, it was clear to Māori that the Governor was not prepared to intervene to protect the lives of some of the Queen’s subjects.

It was these circumstances that saw the emergence of the Kingitanga. In Fenton’s words, the Kingitanga was attempting to hold land and to establish ‘a system of order and combination, which may enable them to advance in the social scale, and preserve them from the ultimate fate of subserviency to their European brethren’, under one person, ‘as an embodiment of the “mana”, or sovereignty of the people’. Fenton, a magistrate in the Waikato in 1857-58, certainly considered that the government should ‘interpose its guiding hand’ and cooperate with Pōtatau and the Kingitanga to create a workable system of law. The parliamentary committee that investigated the Kingitanga in 1860 did not think that the Kingitanga’s objects ‘were...necessarily inconsistent with the recognition of the Queen’s Supreme Authority’ and Sewell, one of its members, later suggested that ‘a wise and vigilant government would have turned the King Movement to good purpose’. Even Gorst who, like Fenton, was sent as a magistrate to the Waikato to introduce reforms designed to marginalise Kingitanga considered ‘[u]nder a rude form of government of their own invention they had done more for themselves than we had ever done for them’, and on one occasion in Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, even suggested that the
governors and Kingitanga work together. However, the government proved unwilling to dilute its sovereignty by cooperating with the Kingitanga.

Kingitanga as enemy of the Treaty

Because the Kingitanga was the major political event in the Māori world in the 1850s, it is not surprising that the Māori language newspapers frequently commented on the movement. Apart from the Kohimarama Conference, the Treaty of Waitangi was not a major topic reported in the newspapers, and when it did surface, it was most often related to discussion on the Kingitanga. For example, in an extended article attacking the Kingitanga in 1857, *Te Karere Maori* wrote of the Treaty that the governor:

...secured to the Maori people their lands and all the rights and properties they then possessed, or might afterwards acquire. I ensured to them, equally with the Pakeha, the protection of the greatest Sovereign of the world.\[7EM\]

The Kingitanga, portrayed as trying supplant the *mana* of the Queen, was therefore incompatible with the Treaty of Waitangi. ‘[A] king of New Zealand could not be a friend of the Queen, and his adherents would not be permitted to share in the privileges enjoyed by her obedient subjects.’ This, of course, included protection through the rule of law. There were Pakehā, it suggested, who cynically promoted the Kingitanga in the hope that the Māori race would be destroyed, or who falsely claimed that the settlers harboured unfriendly feelings towards Māori. ‘[B]ut were it true, it would furnish a strong reason why the Maories should remain loyal to the Government, which is their truest friend and protector.’ However, the government possibly felt that the Treaty itself was one of its weakest arguments, and that the Queen’s *mana* and protection could stand alone without such a textual backing.

---

61 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/9/1857:2. ‘...i whakapumau ki nga iwi Maori o ratou whenua, me o ratou rawa, me o ratou ahia noa i rokohanga iho ai e tana Tiriti, me o ratou mea katoa e whiwhi ai i muri iho, a akenei. Na tana Tiriti i whakatuturu kia a ratou rahi ko nga Pakeha te mana o te Rangatira nui o te ao katoa o te Kuini, hei tia ki mo ratou.’
62 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/9/1857:4. ‘...ko te Kingi o Nui Tirani, eha ra tena i te hoa no te Kuini, a, ko ona piringa e kore e tuku kia uru rahi ki nga tikianga e whakawhiwhia nei ana tamariki e noho rongo ana ki a la.’
63 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/9/1857:8. ‘...tena, me i pono, ka tahi ano take nui e tino piri ai ki te Kawanatanga, ki to ratou tino hoa pono, ki to ratou tino Kai-tiaki.’
64 See the arguments used by the Kingitanga against the Treaty in the following chapter.
Consequently in its many attacks on the Kingitanga, the government (and other Pākehā newspapers) seldom advanced the Treaty, preferring a variety of alternative arguments.

**Precedence for the Kingitanga**

That the notion of kingship was a foreign concept to Māori was exploited by the newspapers in their attacks upon the Kingitanga. The article above also deplored the divisions created by the movement over 'a name which their fathers never heard of', whose duties were unknown even to Māori of that time. This was also discussed in *Te Karere o Poneke*, which stated that *rangatiratanga* was a concept known from the Māori past, which could not be said for kingship.

With a lack of kingship within Māori tikanga, the Kingitanga used scripture to justify its existence. Biblical arguments, that Saul had been established as the Jewish King, and that each race should have their own king, were being used even as the Kingitanga was being formed. Wiremu Tamihana often cited Deuteronomy 17:15 in his justifications, as in this letter to the Governor Browne in 1861.

This is it, O friend, look you at Deut. xvii.15. If all the Kings of the different islands (countries) were from Rome only, from thence also might come one also for here. But is not the Queen a native of England, Nicholas, of Russia, Buonaparte, of France, and Pomare, of Tahiti, – each from his own people? Then why am I, or these tribes, rebuked by you, and told we must unite together under the Queen. How was it that the Americans were permitted to separate themselves: why were they not brought under the protecting shade (sovereignty) of the Queen, for that people are of the same race as the English: whereas, I of this island, am of a different race, not nearly connected. My only connection to you is through Christ (Ephes. 11. 13).

The newspapers were quick to attack this position. As *Te Karere Maori* stated in 1857, the case of Saul was an inappropriate example as God himself, albeit reluctantly, chose Saul who in the end turned out to be a bad king. This theme was echoed by the Wesleyan *Te Haeata*, who also suggested that the Old Testament kings

---

65 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/9/1857:5.
66 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 18/10/1858:2.
67 See Stokes, pp 151, 173.
68 This letter was in answer to Browne's ultimatum to Waikato. See Chapter 8.
69 *AJHR* (1861) E1-B; (1865) E11. 'E hoa ma titiro hoki koutou ki a Tuiteronomi xvii.15. Ana no roma anakenga Kingi o nga tini motu, ae, ke reira hoki te tahi mo konei, iana pea no Ingarangi a Kuini, no Ruhi ano a Nikorahi, no Wiwi ano a Ponipata, no Tahiti a Pomare, no tona iwi ano no tona iwi ano, heahea hoki ahau enei iwi i riria mai e koutou, me hui atu tatou ki raro i a Kuini. He aha te take o Marikena i tukua ai kia wehe atu i a ratou, te tukua mai ai ki roto i te maro o Kuini, ta te mea no roto taua hunga i taua momo kotahi, i te Ingirihi. Ko ahau he tangata ke ahau tenei motu, kilai i tata, heoi ano taku tata kia koutou na te Karaiti Epeha ii.13.' Reproduced in Stokes, p 213. See also Stokes, pp 229, 250.
had the responsibility of writing law for Jehovah, an oblique reference to the perceived lack of order within the Kingitanga.\textsuperscript{71} The paper also published an article ‘Kei Whakawiria keta nga Karaipiture’ (Lest the Scriptures be Twisted) in 1861, attacking the three “errors” in the Kingitanga theology, stating that the Old Testament applied only to the Jews; that the Jews had rebelled against God in demanding a King; and that God, not people, had chosen Saul.\textsuperscript{72}

Hutton, in a letter to \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} criticising the Kingitanga, melded the story of Saul to a Māori version of one of Æsop’s fables, where \textit{inanga} asked Jupiter for a king, only to be given a \textit{kōtuku} who then ate them up.\textsuperscript{73} This newspaper was also quite happy to fling Scripture back to denigrate the Kingitanga position.

The Queen is established as a protector, and as a parent for this island. But should there be two? What is the [meaning of] the word of Scripture when it says “No man can serve two masters?”\textsuperscript{74}

\textit{Te Karere Maori} also published a letter from James Busby, arguing that the treaty was a covenant between the Queen and Māori, which allowed Pākehā to fulfill God’s command to subdue the earth and fill it with people. This merited a warning, ‘Take heed, my friends, that ye are not rebelling against God as well as against the Queen.’\textsuperscript{75}

\textbf{Other faults of the Kingitanga.}

The newspapers, \textit{Te Karere Maori} and \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, also attacked the Kingitanga on more pragmatic grounds. Firstly, they accused the movement of divisiveness. \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} suggested that it was

a business which would produce trouble, in as much as the Māori tribes would be divided amongst themselves. Animosity would arise, and they would argue and fight. ... If this Māori King was established, the Māori and Pākehā would be apart, their unity would end completely, and the children [subjects] of the Māori King would be left as enemies of the Queen’s children. Troubles, fighting and a great many other evils would develop.\textsuperscript{76}

---

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/9/1857:6.
\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Te Haeata}, 1/9/1860:2-3; 1/4/1861:3.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Te Haeata}, 1/9/1861:4.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 19/4/1858:4. This fable traditionally related to frogs and a stork, and was revisited in \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/2/1860:1. \textit{Inanga} is the fry of small fish; \textit{kōtuku} is a relatively rare white heron.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 18/10/1858:2. ‘Kua oti te mea ko te Kuini hei taumarumaru, hei matua mo tenei moutere. Oti, kia tokorua kola? Kei te aha ranei te ki o te Karaipiture e mea ana, “E kore hoko e pono te mahi ki nga rangatira tokorua?”’ See Mt, 6:24; Lu, 16:13.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/6/1860:10-11. ‘Kia tupato, e hoa ma, e tutu ana koutou ki te Atua, eharā i te mea, ki te Kuini anake.’
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 3/12/1857:2. ‘...he mahi whakatupu raru raru; inahoki ka whewehewa nga īwi maori i roto ano i a ratou. Ka riri – ka ngangare – ka whawhai. ... [K]i te rite tenei Kingi Maori ka motuhake te pakeha te maori, ka mutu rawa ake to raua kotahitanga, ka waiho ko nga tamariki o te
Similarly, *Te Karere Maori* stated that Māori could not establish the Kīngitanga and expect to ‘remain friends with the Queen’s Government.’ The Queen would not remove her government that unifies the races, and ‘she will not consent to a separation now.’

They also criticised the Māori King for lacking resources and true power due to poverty. *Te Karere o Poneke* asked,

> Where is the money to pay for his man-o-war ships, his soldiers and sailors, and for all his workers [needed] as beffited his Kingly demeanour? What can be done with no money to pay for these things?

Using the same argument, *Te Karere Maori* sarcastically asked ‘Will a Māori king coin stones into money for these purposes?’ The newspaper also considered that Māori lacked the knowledge base to successfully establish their own government.

> It is easy to say, “Let us make a king.” It is easy to say, “Let us build a ship of war.” But the old tohunga would have found it easier to build a man of war, with only their stone adzes and skill in canoe-building, than their children would find it to frame a separate system of government for themselves with their present knowledge and resources. Will they effect in a day that which has cost the English hundreds of years?

Similarly, *Te Karere o Poneke*’s thought that Māori were like a small tree, and still had a long time to grow. Any talk of establishing a Māori kingdom was thus dismissed as ‘child’s talk or ‘child’s play’.

These newspapers also portrayed the Kīngitanga as retrograde, *he huarahi whakahekenga* (a downward path). First, it was backward economically because Pākehā would refuse to trade with Māori who would sink into poverty.

> The Pākehā scattered amongst the Māori, the settler and trader, and carried everything that the heart desires and appreciates. So, let the Pākehā return home, and it would not be long and the Māori would be crying, ‘Return! Oh! Return!’ His blanket would be

---

Kingi Maori hei hoa riri mo nga tamariki o te Kuini—ka tupu he raru, he whawhai, me te tini noa atu o nga kino.

77 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/10/1857:2, 3. ‘...me te mau ano te hoa arohatanga ki to te Kuini Kawanatanga.’ ‘...ekore ia e whakaee kia wehe wehea inaianei.’

78 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 3/12/1857:2. ‘Kei whea he moni he i utu mo ona kaipuke manuwao, mo ona hoia, mo ona heramana, mo ona kai mahi katoa e rite ai toa ahua Kingi[?] E taea ranei te aka i te kore moni he i utu i tenei mea?’

79 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/10/1857:4. ‘Tena iana e oti i te Kingi Maori nga kowhatu e whakaahua he moni mana, hea pera?’

80 *Te Karere Maori*, 30/10/1857:3. ‘He kupu mama te kupu nei, Whakaturia ta tatou Kingi. He kupu mama te kupu nei Hanga tetahi manuwao ma tatou. E rangi ano ia tenei te manuwao e oti i nga tohunga o mua te hanga ko a ratou tokio kowhatu nei anake hea mahi, me to ratou mohiotanga ki te tara, ki te whaihanga i te waka maori. Erangi te manuwao e takoko noa te hanga e aua tohunga maori i tenei e pakiwaitaratia kia hanga e a ratou tamariki, ara, i te tikanga Kawanatanga motuhake mo ratou ake i runga i te wahi iti o te mohiotanga o te whai rawatanga e noho nei ratou inaianei. E oti ranei i a ratou i te rangi kotahi te mea ka rau noa nei nga tau i mahia ai e te Ingarangi Iwi, ka oti?’

81 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 16/8/1858:2.

82 For example, see *Te Karere o Poneke*, 19/4/1858:3.

83 *Te Karere o Poneke*, 3/12/1857:3.
torn, his pipe with no tobacco, his hatchet would be rusty and dull, his clothes shapeless and worn. Oh! Where is the Pākehā store to get new things for himself if this were to come to pass? 84

However, the notion of a Māori-run polity was also an affront to the progress and civilisation so treasured by the Victorians. The “rangatiratanga” they offered Māori was at risk from setting up a Māori king, and would lead to ridicule. *Te Karere o Poneke* considered that ‘nowadays the Māori rangatira have got some class [āhua], but if they reject this kind of *rangatiratanga* for that false *rangatiratanga* they will be left for thoughtful folk to scoff at.’ 85 The paper deemed that Māori of the Wellington province to be more ‘civilised’ than some other regions due to their earlier exposure to Pākehā culture. Despite the Te Āti Awa chief, Wi Tako Ngatata, advocating the cause of the Kingitanga, Buller preferred to gloss over any support or sympathy for the Māori King in the region, announcing that ‘the tribes of this end (of the island) do not support it – their thoughts are clear, in that this talk [of a Māori king] was stopped with laughter at the meeting at Otaki.’ 86 *Te Karere Maori* also considered the Kingitanga to be another sign of Māori apostasy to the tenets of ‘civilisation’, and the benefits of *tikanga* Pākehā.

They take *Te Karere* [Maori], gladly inquire into the articles, and freely agree to them, but it bears no fruit as they return to their Māori condition, “like the dog that returns to its vomit and the pig that was washed by rolling in filth.”

Well, they pay lip service to becoming more important and increasing their reputation amongst the nations of the world. They don’t sincerely seek the path to goodness, knowledge and wealth, but instead turn to wasting time on useless arguments, and thoughtless talk, such as that talk of setting up a “Māori King” 87
Te Karere Maori and Te Karere o Poneke portrayed the Kingitanga as a grave risk to Māori. They would risk losing the protections of the Treaty of Waitangi; they might suffer the wrath of God; and they would lapse back into barbarism from the ‘civilisation’ that Pākehā colonisation offered them.

Taranaki

Events in Taranaki plagued the colonial administration throughout this research period, but it was the attempt to purchase the Pekapeka Block at Waitara in 1860 that initiated a series of wars between Māori and the government that did not end until twelve years later. However, the root of the Taranaki troubles extends back prior to the Treaty and subsequent colonisation. Taranaki Māori were under threat from aggression from Northern tribes which led many, particularly the Te Āti Awa, to migrate south to the Kapiti region. In 1832, Waikato tribes, in possession of firearms, attacked those Te Āti Awa remaining and enslaved most of them. However, they did not settle the area and thereby create firm grounds of ownership. As Māoridom converted to Christianity, the Taranaki slaves were released to return to Taranaki.

The Puketapu feud, well documented by Te Karere Māori, arose out of pressure to sell land, and involved many of the subsequent Māori protagonists at Waitara. In 1854, Kātātore, a Te Āti Awa chief, shot Rawiri Waiaua who was cutting a boundary line to sell land that both claimed. The dispute was complicated with a case of adultery which aligned another chief, Ihaia Kirikumara, against Kātātore. Ihaia’s people later murdered Kātātore on a public road. Beginning in 1854, this dispute continued to flare up for the next four years. While there were repeated exhortations for Māori to adhere to the law, the government did nothing to impose order, except when it threatened Pākehā settlers. ‘[B]ecause the Taranaki natives were not

to their old Maori ways “like the dog to his vomit and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.” They profess an anxiety to rise in the scale of civilization, and to obtain a name among the nations of the earth; and yet, instead of seeking out the path that shall lead them to wisdom, happiness, and wealth, they waste their time over idle quarrels and foolish talk, —such for instance as the “Maori King.”

88 Te Karere Maori, 1/7/1855:8-9.
89 Te Karere Maori, 1/1/1855:7.
90 Te Karere Maori, 15/2/1858:1-2.
sufficiently enlightened to understand English law" a proclamation was issued in 1858. _Te Karere Maori_ gave the following explanation.

So, the Governor has given word about this place. He still says, I will not jump forth; there are two _iwi_; there is only wrong; my soldiers and people will do nothing to either, if they do not come onto the Pākehā settlement to fight, but I will not allow them to carry arms in the Pākehā areas, or to come to fight in my presence.

Although the governor's actions appear even handed, it is clear that Pākehā sympathies lay with the side that favoured selling land. Despite Ihaia being responsible for the murder of the adulterer in 1855, he is described in the _New-Zealander_ as one of the "friendly natives". Despite ordering the ambush of Katatore and others on a public road, Ihaia escaped with only censure. Teira, who soon after offered the Waitara land to Governor Browne, was part of Ihaia's group. Te Rangitāke, who opposed the sale, had been allied to Kātātore. Despite his unwillingness for further land sales, Te Rangitāke expressed a willingness to live peacefully, suggesting to Browne in 1855 that '[t]he European may cultivate the land he has got, and he would cultivate the land he has not sold.'

At the Kohimarama Conference, Donald McLean gave a lengthy speech detailing the "official" history of Taranaki in relation to Waitara, a history in which McLean himself was one of the actors. His account is as follows. In 1839 Te Āti Awa, including Te Rangitāke living to the south at Kapiti, sold Taranaki to the New Zealand Company who made a second payment to members of the tribe actually living on the land. According to McLean, Te Āti Awa considered the land had been lost to Waikato anyway, and they would gain protection and civilization from the

---

91 _Te Karere Maori_, 15/2/1858:1. ‘...he mea hoki kahore ano i marama noa nga whakaaro o nga tangata o Taranaki ki nga Ture o Ingarani...’

92 _Te Karere Maori_, 15/2/1858:2. ‘Na, kua puta te kupu a te Kawana i runga i tenei wahi. Ko tana tenei. E mea tonu ana, Elkore au e peke atu; e rua enei _iwi_, he he anake, ko tenei e kore tetahi, tetahi e ahatia e aku hoia e aku tangata, ki te kore ratou e haere mai ki to te Pakeha kainga whawhai ari, erangi e kore rawa ratou e tukua e au kia mau patu ratou ki roto ki nga rohe o te Pakeha, kia haere mai ki taku aroaro whawhai ai[.]; ‘The Governor has therefore spoken his word. He still says “I shall not interfere. Both parties are doing wrong, but it is not my present intention to employ force against either while they keep outside the limits of the English settlement, but I will allow neither to come armed within these limits. I will not permit fighting in my presence.”

93 _The New-Zealander_, 25/4/1855, reprinted in _Te Karere Maori_, 1/6/1855:11. This was not translated in the Māori text.


95 _Te Karere Maori_, 1/6/1855:12.

96 _Te Karere Maori_, 1/7/1855:10. ‘Ma te Pakeha e ngaki te whenua kua hokona eia, a maku ano e ngaki te whenua i toe mai ki au.’

97 The following two paragraphs are a precis of his speech in _Te Karere Maori_, 31/7/1860:41-52.
Pākehā colonists. Pōtatau, principal chief of Waikato, claiming Taranaki on the basis of conquest, sold Waikato’s claim to the government for £150 and sundry goods. When Pākehā were dividing up their land, some of the former slaves returned, and began to dispute their possession. The New Zealand Company sale was investigated by Commissioner Spain, who reduced the European land to what he considered fair.

This was vetoed by Governor Fitzroy, who decided that:

whether it was land lying inside Wakefield’s [purchase] or in Mr. Spain’s judgement on the land, another payment should be made so that the Pākehā might dwell [there] clearly.

The Governor’s word to me was “Give a payment so that the Māori might live peacefully amongst the Pākehā.”

The settlers were incensed, but, according to McLean, the Queen upheld the Governor’s word. When Grey arrived as Governor he set aside land for Māori out of the land acquired, gave another payment to those in Kapiti, then considered the matter closed. McLean also claimed that Pōtatau, the recently deceased Māori king, had agreed with the details that he was providing. In 1848 Te Āti Awa living in Taranaki offered Waitara for sale. While this was being negotiated, Te Rangitāke made it known that he intended to return and occupy the northern side of the river, which the government allowed him to do.

McLean then detailed a general lawlessness that prevailed in Taranaki, with Māori who had formed land-leagues murdering those who attempted to sell land to the Crown. Governor Browne met with Te Āti Awa in 1859 to encourage them to accept British law. At that meeting, Te Teira offered his small portion of Waitara to the governor. ‘He said to the assembled people “Listen, it is only my land that I shall give.”’

The Governor was at pains to ensure that his ownership was undisputed. Te Rangitāke did not deny Te Teira’s ownership, but refused to accede to the sale.

His attempt to hold the land is connected with the land league and was encouraged by the Maori King movement, otherwise he would not have ventured, as he has repeatedly

---

98 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:44. ‘...ahakoa, whenua i takoto ki roto i ta Wairaweka, ahakoa ki roto i ta te Peina whakaritenga rohe, me ūtou ano, he mea kia noho marama ai nga Pakeha. Ka puta mai te kupu a te Kawana ki a au, Hoatu he utu kia noho pai nga Maori i roto i nga Pakeha.’; ‘...a fresh payment should be given for the land, whether as included in Colonel Wakefield’s purchase or in Mr. Spain’s award, in order that the Pakehas might occupy their land with a clear and undisputed title. The Governor instructed me to give this payment, that the Maories might dwell in peace with the Europeans.’

99 Known as the Pekapeka block.

100 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:47. ‘Ka mea ia ki te huihuinga, “Kia rongo mai koutou: ko tenei, ko taku pili ake ka tukua e ahau.”’
done, to forbid the sale of land to which he never had any claim, not only at Waitara but
at Mokau, at Taranaki, and at other places.\(^{101}\)

McLean pointed out that Te Teira was merely a spokesman for a number of willing
sellers, then gave details of the deed of sale. The governor attempted to talk further
with Te Rangitāke but he refused to meet, and turned away the surveyors sent to ‘cut
the boundary’.

The soldiers then went to protect the survey. William King waited, hoping that one of his
men might be killed, and so furnish a pretext for fighting, and that it might be said that
the Europeans had commenced it. Then a pa was set up on the land. The Officer
commanding the Troops sent a letter to William King in the hope of dissuading him from
compelling hostilities, but it was treated with contempt. Thus did he wrongly provoke the
war which has been carried on since the present. It was then that the pa was
fired upon by the soldiers. After this followed the acts of the Ngatiruanui and Taranaki. I
shall not speak of these as you are well acquainted with the particulars.

Enough. You have now heard the causes out of which the war at Taranaki has
sprang.\(^{102}\)

McLean’s Kohimarama speech sought to justify a land deal considered by many
to be flawed. He implied that Te Āti Awa had already been well compensated a
number of times, although he does not mention that the New Zealand Company’s
dealings had been rendered null and void by vice-regal proclamation, or that Taranaki
Māori resisted unrestricted Pākehā settlement from 1841. McLean also
misrepresented Fitzroy’s payments, implying that it covered a large area of land,
when it was, in fact, an area far smaller than Spain’s determination. Most of the area
was still Māori land. Grey sought to pressure Māori to sell land. With prominent
chief, Te Rangitāke, as a key leader, Te Āti Awa refused to sell, and Grey’s agents
began to encourage lesser chiefs to part with their land. Due to the unsettled nature
of Te Āti Awa’s tribal structure with most tribespeople recent returnees, the land

\(^{101}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:48. ‘No roto i te tikanga pupuri whenua tana pupuri, na te tikanga
whakatu Kingi tetahi i kaha ai ina hoki te rere ke o nga whakaaro ki runga ki te whenua o te tangata ke
pupuri ai. Na te aha hoki i pokanoa ai tana kupu kia kaua e hokona nga whenua kahore rawa nei ona
tikanga i runga i aua whenua, haunanga ki Waitara, puta ke taua kupu pupuri ki Mokau, ki Taranaki, ki
hea ki hea.’

\(^{102}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:50-51. ‘Ka tahi ka haere nga hoia ki te tiaki. E noho ana a Wiremu
Kingi ki reira, e whakaaro ana me kore e patua tetahi o ana tangata kia kitea te take whahai, kia
meinga ai hoki na te Pakeha i tīmata. Muri iho ka hanga te pa ki runga i te whenua. Na ka tae te
pukapuka a te rangatira o nga hoia, kia whakamutua tona hiahia whahai, ka tae atu, akiritia mai ana te
pukapuka. Heoi ano, ko tona he tenei, e whahai tonu nei. No kona te puhanga o te pa e nga hoia. No
muri iho ka tae mai te he o Ngatiruanui o Taranaki, e kore au e whakahua koreru mo tenei e mohio
katoa ana hoki koutou.

Heoi ano, ka rongo koutou ki nga take o tenei whahai ki Taranaki[.]’
purchasing policies proved divisive and resulted in land feuding, but were successful
for the government.\textsuperscript{103} By 1859,

the Government assumed it had recovered most of the land between New Plymouth and
Waitara, save Waitara itself. More particularly, as a result of its aggressive purchasing
policy, the Government claimed to have acquired 75,378 acres in nine purchases over 15
years, all despite a continual opposition so large that it erupted into fighting between
sellers and non-sellers.\textsuperscript{104}

It is in this light, that Te Rangitāke’s determination to hold Waitara must be seen. Not
only did he have a stake in the land concerned, but he was insisting that the land
should not be sold because the tribe itself had not assented to the sale.

*Te Karere Maori* portrayed Māori feuding as a slip to a past barbarism, whether
it was in Taranaki, Wairarapa or elsewhere, and the Māori “system” of land
ownership was flawed, because it operated against God’s wishes, and led to
bloodshed. The only remedy was litigation.\textsuperscript{105} Despite government land purchases
being the principal cause of this feuding, the paper sought to distance the government
from any responsibility, even suggesting that, unlike Cortez in Mexico and Pizarro in
Peru who had manipulated antagonisms between the native peoples in order to gain
control, the government of New Zealand was working hard to bring the warring
factions together in peace.\textsuperscript{106}

The government, keen to staunch any support for either Te Rangitāke or the
Kingitanga, continued to employ *Te Karere Maori* in a propaganda role. The war in
Taranaki soon escalated when five settlers at Ōmata, in the words of the Coroner’s
jury, ‘were most wantonly, ferociously, and in cold blood, murdered, by a Māori or
Maories unknown.’\textsuperscript{107} The culprits were soon identified as Taranaki and Ngāti
Ruanui. Seven were named, and a £100 reward posted for their capture.\textsuperscript{108} The
whole 31 May issue of *Te Karere Maori* was devoted to the political situation in
Taranaki and Waikato, with the Ōmata murders firmly to the forefront. The opening

\textsuperscript{103} For an extensive summary of Taranaki’s modern history, see *The Taranaki Report: Kaupapa
Tribunal website. http://wai8155s1.verdi.2day.com/reports/niwest/wai143/

from Waitangi Tribunal Reports, Waitangi Tribunal website. http://wai8155s1.verdi.2day.com/reports/niwest/wai143/chapt02/chapt02.pdf

\textsuperscript{105} *Te Karere Maori*, 31/3/1857:4; 27/2/1858:3-6; 31/7/1858:3.

\textsuperscript{106} *Te Karere Maori*, 31/3/1858:2-3.

\textsuperscript{107} *Te Karere Maori*, 31/5/1860:4. ‘he mea tino kohuru, he mea kohuru huhua kore, he mea kohuru
kino, he mea kohuru mare na tetahi tangata Maori, na etahi tangata Maori ranei, ko nga ingoa kahore i
mohiotia.’

\textsuperscript{108} *Te Karere Maori*, 31/5/1860:5.
editorial detailed the depraved nature of Māori before they had been saved by the
blessings of Christianity and Pākehā civilisation. Pākehā, it said, would leave them.

There are Pākehā settlers sad at the profitless talk of the Māori about the establishment of
the "King"; they are irritated by the pointless talk about "holding the land", and they are
very angry at the Wi Kingi's [Te Rangitāke] craziness and his interference in trampling
upon Te Teira who wishes to dispose of his block of land, and they are also alarmed at
the wicked murders of Ngāti Ruanui. There are some saying they will go elsewhere:
some have already gone.

Pākehā, the paper stated, had already vacated Kāwhia. A large article also appeared
on a visit by McLean to Whāingaroa where he tried to discourage the Waikato Māori
from turning away from the 'source of life' (Pākehā), and from going to Taranaki to
fight. The Waikato Māori, he suggested, had released their slaves back to Taranaki
on the proviso that they live peacefully, but now they had turned to murder. The
remainerd of that issue comprised letters from Māori writing against Te Rangitāke,
and Waikato involvement in the war. The stage was thus set for a larger propaganda
event, the Kohimarama Conference.

The Māori voice

Charles Davis was sympathetic to both the Kingitanga and to the cause of Te
Rangitāke but his short-lived newspapers, Te Waka o te Iwi and Te Whetū o te Tau,
did not engage with these issues. None of three major newspapers available to
Māori before Kohimarama, Te Karere Maori, Te Haeata, or Te Karere o Poneke were
favourable to mana Māori, so it is not surprising that Māori viewpoints not in accord
with the government's position struggled to be heard. However, Te Karere o
Poneke's liberality in accepting a wide range of Māori correspondence, provides a
slightly more rounded view of Māori opinion.

Some Taranaki Māori wanted Pākehā settlement. For example, according to
several newspapers, Tamati Te Ito, was spending time removing old tapu on pieces of

---

109 Te Karere Maori, 31/5/1860:3. ‘Tera nga Pakeha noho whenua te pouri mai na mo nga korero huahore nei a te Maaorito mo te whakatari “Kingi;” tera te whakatoa e nga korero hanga noa nei, mo te “pupuri whenua,” me te tino whakatakariri a ratou ki te mahi pounamu a Wi Kingi, ki tana pokanoa ki te takahi i a Te Teira e mea nei ki te tuku i tana poro whenua; me te ohohiri hoki ki nga kohuru kina a Ngatiruanui. Tera etahi e mea ana kia haere atu he wahi ke, ko etahi kua haere; ‘The settlers are
grieved to hear the foolish “King” talk of some of the tribes, they are annoyed about the silly “land
league,” they are indignant for Wi Kingi’s wicked interference in Te Teira’s sale of land and his
rebellious bearing, and for the foul murders perpetrated by the Ngatiruanui. Some of them talk of
withdrawing from among them, others have already done so.”

110 Te Karere Maori, 31/5/1860:5-7.

111 However, Davis's sympathies were quite apparent in his annual, Ko Aoteora, published in 1861
and 1862. See Chapter 8.
Taranaki land in order to render them more saleable.\textsuperscript{112} However, some just wanted peace. While the Puketapu feuds were occurring, some Māori wrote to let the government know that they were not participating in the fighting.\textsuperscript{113} Some gave details of the fighting, but most correspondents expressed their sadness at the loss of life, wrote of their peace-making attempts, or the desire of their hāpū to embrace the law in order to keep the peace.\textsuperscript{114} However, Heremaia Te Tuere of Ōtaki clearly implicated land dealing as the cause of intra-tribal fighting in Taranaki and Wairarapa.

This is the reason their activity is wrong: only two people are dealing in the land, one Māori and one Pākehā. It is not good when two people, or [only] ten agree to land being sold to the Pākehā, but the whole tribe should agree on the land they want to sell, then it is alright.\textsuperscript{115}

For some Māori, Kātātore was fully justified in shooting Rāwiri Waiaua for attempting to sell disputed land. In reply to an article by the Pākehā correspondent “Te Hoa Aroha”, Riwai Rakeiōra of Pitoone stated,

Oh “Loving Friend”, I will express what I am thinking to you: if a [Māori] person, or a Pākehā, came in to fraudulently sell your horse or cow, how would you think about that? Would you not seek utu?\textsuperscript{116}

Given the relatively open nature of the correspondence in \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, it is a pity that it did not survive to record the views of Wellington Māori on the sale of land at Waitara.

The Kingitanga also battled for the hearts and minds of Māori in the Wellington province. In 1853, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, after a visit to England where he was presented to the Queen, with Mātene Te Whiwhi, Wi Tako Ngātata and Te Rangitāke promoted the concept of a Māori king.\textsuperscript{117} By the time the Kingitanga was being established, only Wi Tako of Te Āti Awa remained enthusiastic about the project while Te Rauparaha became a firm opponent of the Kingitanga. Both had assisted

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 30/11/1857:2-3; \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 22/2/1858:3-4.
\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 1/11/1855:8; 16/8/1858:10.
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 1/2/1858:3-4; 5/7/1858:2; 30/8/1858 Supp:2; 13/9/1858:4; 4/10/1858:4; 25/10/1858:3-4; 1/11/1858:2, 3-4.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 15/10/1857:3. ‘Tenei te take i he ai ta ratou mahi, he hoko tokoruia i te whenua—kotahi te maori, kotahi te pakeha. E kore e pai kia tokoruia ki a teku ranei nga tangata hei whakaae i te whenua e hokona ana ki te pakeha, engari ma te iwi katoa e whakaae te whenua e hiahiatia ana kia hokona, katahi ka pai.’
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Te Karere o Poneke}, 19/7/1858:2. ‘E te Hoa Aroha, ki toku whakarae e ki atu nei ki a koe, ki te poka mai teatia tangata, pakeha ranei, ki te utu tahae i tou hoihou, kau ranei, me pehea tou whakarae mo tenei? E kore koia koe e rapu utu?’
\textsuperscript{117} The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Vol 1, p 508.
Pākehā settlement,\textsuperscript{118} and both owned Pākehā style houses and wore European clothing. They were thus both aspired to the new cultural rangatiratanga, but represented opposing political camps. Te Rauparaha and Te Whiwhi sought to distance themselves from the Kingitanga, sending several letters in 1857 denying any allegiance to the Kingitanga, and detailing how they had sent away Te Heuheu when he had come proselytising for the movement.\textsuperscript{119}

Wi Tako continued to hold meetings to discuss the Kingitanga in the late 1850s and became the principal Kingitanga leader in the area.\textsuperscript{120} It appears that Wi Tako was promoting the concept of a Māori king with local Māori governors.\textsuperscript{121} Local Māori no doubt suspected Wi Tako’s ambitions.\textsuperscript{122} Honiana Te Puni, at his hui to discuss the Kingitanga, stated ‘word is out that Wi Tako is to be governor, and Ropiha Moturoa is to be king.’\textsuperscript{123} Soon after, Te Rangimairehau of Ōtaki wrote, ‘in the past I heard that Queen Victoria was the Queen, afterwards I heard that Te Wherowhero [Pōtatau] was king, [but] in 1858 I heard that my relative, Wi Tako, was the king.’\textsuperscript{124} Wi Tako was more circumspect, saying that he was merely ‘searching for a tikanga so that we may live as people’.\textsuperscript{125} Comparing the Māori people to a chick within an egg, he said ‘if the bird’s beak does not appear out [from the shell], the egg decays and rots. Indeed, if we do not push our beak out, we will [also] decay and rot.’\textsuperscript{126} The Pākehā, he thought, had given the tools for Māori to take responsibility for themselves.

\textsuperscript{118} Wi Tako had also accompanied Carkeek and Buller to the Chatham Islands in 1858 to help convince Māori there to accept government officials. See Te Karere o Poneke, 30/8/1858:2-3.
\textsuperscript{119} Te Karere Māori, 30/11/1857:12-13; Te Karere o Poneke, 12/11/1857:2-4. See also Te Karere o Poneke, 3/12/1857:2.
\textsuperscript{121} The idea of Māori governors is associated with Wi Tako in several letters. See Te Karere o Poneke, 13/9/1858:4; 20/9/1858 Suppl:2.
\textsuperscript{122} As did Buller. He wrote to McLean stating, ‘Wi Tako, who seems to have an eye for the Kingship, is the great agitator.’ W.L. Buller to D.McLean, 23/10/1858. McLean Papers, Folio 190 [Alexander Turnbull Library].
\textsuperscript{123} Te Karere o Poneke, 27/9/1858:2. ‘I puta atu ai te kupu, ko Wi Tako hei kawana, ko Ropiha Moturoa hei kingi.’ J.C. Richmond also shared this opinion of Wi Tako, describing him as ‘a clever southern man having some pretensions to follow Potatau’. See The Richardson-Atkinson Papers, Vol 1, p 561.
\textsuperscript{124} Te Karere o Poneke, 18/10/1858 Suppl:1. ‘...i mua ka rongo au ko Kuini Wikitoria te Kuini; muri iho ka rongo au ko Te Wherowhero te kingi; i 1858 ka rongo au ko tuku whanaunga ko Witako te kingi...’
\textsuperscript{125} Te Karere o Poneke, 27/9/1858:2. ‘...ka rapu tikanga ahau kia noho ahua tangata ai tatou...’
For the past twenty years, I have scrutinised this business in amongst the Pākehā ways. Now we are unified, that is, the Pākehā and Māori: because of this I say that we should have a portion of this arrangement [government] so that we emerge properly, lest we decay.  

In 1860 Wi Tako Ngātata went to investigate the Waitara dispute for the Kingitanga. As indicated in Chapter 1, Wi Tako had exposed Te Hāpuku’s bellicosity when he had asked Wi Tako for support in his war against Moananui in 1857. He had spoken out against Kātātore’s slaying of Rāwiri Waiaua. Wi Tako also stopped his people going to Taranaki to fight the British army, and in 1863, dissuaded the Kingitanga supporters of the Wairarapa from entering the fray. Wi Tako was essentially a pacifist, and while he did not endorse Te Teira’s claim in his letter to the Kingitanga chiefs of Waikato, he did criticise Te Rangitāke for the war, saying ‘Friends, this wrong-doing belongs to Wiremu Kingi.’ He was even more critical of other Taranaki tribes who had attacked Pākehā settlers, whilst having no direct cause to be involved in the war. ‘Taranaki is also at fault, greater than all the evils of the world.’ Wi Tako was at pains to stop the Kingitanga becoming embroiled over a land issue. ‘Friends, listen to me. The cause of this wrong-doing concerns land only. It is not about the [Māori] King. Do not let the evil Spirit led you into temptation.’

Both Te Haeata and Te Karere Maori used Wi Tako’s letter in their propaganda against Te Rangitāke. Te Haeata dissected each sentence of the letter to imply that Wi Tako was in favour of Governor Browne’s actions in Waitara. To Wi Tako’s suggestion that peaceful activities were the word of God, Te Haeata, alluding to the flag that Kingitanga emissaries carried to supporting tribes, exclaimed:

> Good for you, Wi; hold strongly to what you [believe in]; lift it up to be seen by all the tribes of New Zealand; let this be as a flag for you.
Both newspapers also incorporated other Māori voices critical of Te Rangitāke. *Te Haeata* quoted Mātene Te Whiwhi and another southern chief, Hēneri Te Puni, who absolved Pākehā of any guilt over Waitara.\(^{135}\) *Te Karere Maori* included a letter from four Taranaki chiefs accusing Te Rangitāke of sending false information to Waikato in order to gain their support. The paper then displayed the *whakapapa* of those who had signed the deed for the Pekapeka block to imply that they were not mere commoners. The article’s concluding remarks reflected the government’s attitude: Te Rangitāke had no right to the land but was stopping the sale for political reasons.\(^ {136}\)

Just as Wi Tako continued to promote the Kingitanga,\(^ {137}\) Tamihana Te Rauparaha held meetings in the province to support the government’s position in Taranaki, and to campaign against the Kingitanga.\(^ {138}\) As the war was about to break out in 1863, settlers were again murdered in Taranaki. This tended to pull Māori opinion away from the Kingitanga, much to Te Rauparaha’s glee. In a letter to Mantell, he wrote ‘Wi Tako is in great trouble because his schemes are frustrated.’\(^ {139}\) Wi Tako, unwilling to be drawn into military action, formally withdrew his allegiance to the Māori King the following year.\(^ {140}\)

**Kohimarama**

The initial hostilities in the first Taranaki War began in March 1860 when the government occupied the Pekapeka block, and fighting ceased twelve months later. Early in the war, the Ngāti Ruanui and Taranaki tribes entered the fray, massacring a number of settlers. Crops, buildings and farm animals in Taranaki were looted and destroyed by both sides. As the war progressed, adventurous or militant Kingitanga warriors joined Te Rangitāke’s forces.\(^ {141}\) In response to the worsening political situation, the government invited a large number of Māori chiefs, not considered hostile to its aims, to attend a conference at Kohimarama. As Harriet Browne described it,

\(^{135}\) *Te Haeata*, 1/5/1860:1

\(^{136}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 30/4/1860:3-5.

\(^{137}\) For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 14/4/1862:13.

\(^{138}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 15/4/1860:3-4; 15/12/1860:3-4, 6-10

\(^{139}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 28/9/1863:5. ‘...ka nui te mate o Wi Tako, no te heanga o ana whakaaro.’

\(^{140}\) *Ngā Tāngata Taumata Rau* 1769-1869, p 80.

The Rev. James Buller was less optimistic, writing to McLean that "[i]f by the means now employed, the native mind cannot be satisfied, nothing but physical force will teach them their duty."\textsuperscript{143} Dalton considers that Governor Browne called these Māori chiefs together ‘to counter wild rumours circulating as a result of the war and to gauge the state of opinion among Māori generally’.\textsuperscript{144} The chiefs assembled for a month, from early July to early August, with perhaps 200 of the 250 invitees attending at some point, averaging about 100 chiefs present on a daily basis. Some came with their own agenda, for example, to get the government to agree to lifting the ban on guns and powder.\textsuperscript{145}

_Te Karere Maori_ devoted its pages to the proceedings from mid July through to the end of December, although not all the material was arranged chronologically.\textsuperscript{146} The conference participants discussed a number of issues. However, the government called the chiefs together because of the Taranaki War and the Kingitanga, and these two issues were paramount in the discussions. The Imperial forces had also suffered a defeat at Puketakauere in late June, and while the conference was undoubtedly planned before this, it gave further incentive for the Crown to shore up Māori support.

The Conference and the Treaty

Claudia Orange defines the Kohimarama Conference as a ‘ratification’ of the Treaty of Waitangi in an article in the _Journal of the Polynesian Society_.\textsuperscript{147} She further explores this thesis in her book _The Treaty of Waitangi_.\textsuperscript{148} However, the importance of the Treaty to the conference can be over-stated. It was discussed, but of the approximately 390 recorded Māori speeches and papers at the conference,

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
fewer than 30 refer to the Treaty. When Maori discussed the Treaty, they did so with reference to its implications, that is, to the acceptance of law and governmental power. More than a hundred speeches discussed Māori loyalty to the Crown without any reference to the Treaty. In contrast to Orange, Alan Ward gives minimal attention to the Treaty in his discussion of the Conference, thus providing a more representative account of the discussions. 149

It was the Crown who placed the Treaty on the conference agenda. In his opening speech to the Conference, Governor Browne clearly spelt out how the Crown defined the Treaty, both in Māori and in English.

3. I te whakaaetanga a Te Kuini ki a ia te Kawanatanga o Niu Tirani ka whakatauwhareatia mai tona maru kingi ki runga ki nga tangata Maori hei tiakia; ka whakaae hoki ia mana a Niu Tirani me nga Iwi Maori e tiaki kei tikina mai e tetahi hoa riri Iwi ke; ka whakawhiwhia hoki e ia nga tangata Maori ki nga tikanga katoa rite tahi ki o Ingarananga tangata: a i whakaaetia, i tino whakapumautia hoki e ia ki nga Rangatira Maori me nga Iwi Maori ki nga hapu ki nga tangata hoki, ko o ratou oneone, me o ratou whenua, me o ratou ngaherehere, me o ratou wai mahinga ika, me o ratou taonga ake, o te iwi, o ia tangata o ia tangata: whakapumautia ana e ia ki a ratou hei noho mo ratou, hei mea mau rawa ki a ratou, kaua tetahi he tango, hei whakaho, hei aha, ara, i te painga ia o ratou kia waiho ki a ratou mau ai.

4. Na, he metanga ano ta nga Rangatira Maori i tuhituhia nei o ratou ingoa ki taua Pukapuka ki te Kawanata o Waitangi, hei ritenga hoki ia mo enei pai i whakawhiwhia nei ratou; ko taua metanga he metanga mo ratou mo o ratou iwi hoki;—tino tukua rawatia atu ana e ratou ki Te Kuini o Ingarananga tikanga me nga mana Kawanatanga katoa i a rato u katoa, i tenei i tenei ranei o ratou, me nga pera katoa me meinga kei a ratou. 150

On assuming the Sovereignty of New Zealand Her Majesty extended to her Maori subjects her Royal protection, engaging to defend New Zealand and the Maori people from all aggressions by any foreign power, and imparting to them all the rights and privileges of British subjects; and she confirmed and guaranteed to the Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand, and to the respective families and individuals thereof, the full, exclusive and undisturbed possession of their lands and estates, forests, fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess, so long as it is their wish to retain the same in their possession.

4. In return for these advantages the Chiefs who signed the Treaty of Waitangi ceded for themselves and their people to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty which they collectively or individually possessed or might be supposed to exercise or possess. 151

3. When the Queen agreed to the Government of New Zealand, she covered her royal maru over the Māori people to protect them; she also agreed to protect New Zealand and the Māori tribes from being taken by foreign enemies; she also bestowed upon the Māori people all the tikanga, together and the same as those of English people; and it was agreed that she guarantee to the Māori chiefs and Māori iwi, hapū and people, their land, their grounds, their forests, their waters, their fishing areas, and their own possessions, of the tribe and of each person: she guaranteed [these] to them to dwell upon, and to hold, and not for anyone else to seize, or cause panic over, or anything else, that is, while each of them wanted to hold it.

4. So, the chiefs who signed their names to that document, the Covenant of Waitangi, were intending [it] as the price for those benefits they received. That was a resolution for themselves and their tribes, that they give up completely to the Queen of England all the tikanga and mana of government from them all, and from each of them, and all things like that that are considered to be theirs. 152

150 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:5-6.
He did not suggest that he was taking away the chief’s rangatiratanga, but that the Treaty allowed the Queen’s maru (shade, power, protection) over New Zealand, and that Māori had given up any claim to mana kāwanatanga. The Māori text notes explicitly the sacred and personal nature of the agreement through the term kawenata (covenant), familiar to Māori from the Bible. Browne was thus laying the Treaty down as the political base from which more topical issues could be discussed. After asserting that successive governors had been faithful to this Covenant, Browne then turned to the main issues of the day.

8. There is another thing I want you to look carefully at and give your thoughts to it. In times gone, some people have started to act. Those people are from Māori tribes south of Auckland. What they are doing is to create a new tikanga. Putting forth that tikanga, if completed would drag evil upon the whole group who entered into it. It is said that the thoughts of the creators of that tikanga is thus; that all the Māori tribes of New Zealand be joined to it, that their loyalty to the Queen under whose maru they have lived for the past twenty years be left behind; and that a Māori King should be established, and they should be separate as another people.

While the movement was merely words, he had not deigned to act, but their intention to send warriors to support Te Rangitāke showed the aims of the Kingitanga.

One tikanga of those men is to make themselves chief over the other Māori tribes of New Zealand. They want also to exercise their tikanga over those tribes and the Government also, and the Māori tribes who are unwilling to have them in charge, they will suppress violently.

The Kingitanga was, according to the Governor, an ‘act of disobedience and defiance to Her Majesty which cannot be tolerated.’ New Zealand was one of the few places

---

151 The word occurs 329 times in the Māori Bible. See Barlow (1990), p 100. The two “Testaments” of the Bible are also “Kawenata”.

152 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:7-8. ‘8. Tenei ano hoki tetahi mea e hiahia nei au kia ata tirohia e koutou kia ho mai hoki o koutou whakaaro mo tona mea. No roto i te takiwa ka mahue ake nei ka timata te mahi a etahi tangata. No etahi Iwi Maori, kei runga atu o Akarana aua tangata. Ko ta ratou mahi he hanga i tetahi tikanga hou. Tona tukunga iho to taea tikanga, me i oti rawa, he kukume i te he ki runga ki te hunga katoa i uru ki roto. E kiai ana, ko nga whakaaro o nga kai hanga o tua tikanga he penei; ko nga Iwi Maori katoa o Niu Tirani kia honoa, ko to ratou piri ki Te Kuini i noho ai ratou i raro i tona maru ka rua te kau nei nga tau, kia mahue; a me whakatu tetahi Kingi Maori, me motuhake atu ratou hei Iwi ke.’

8. There is also a subject to which I desire to invite your special attention, and in reference to which I wish to receive the expression of your views. For some time past certain persons belonging to the tribes dwelling south of Auckland have been endeavouring to mature a project, which, if carried into effect, could only bring evil upon the heads of all concerned in it. The framers of it are said to desire that the Maori tribes in New Zealand should combine together and throw off their allegiance to the Sovereign whose protection they have enjoyed for more than twenty years, and that they should set up a Maori King and declare themselves to be an independent Nation.

153 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:9. ‘Tetahi tikanga hoki a aua tangata he whakatupu Rangatira ki runga ki era atu Iwi Maori o Niu Tirani. E mea ana hoki ko ratou hei runga whai tikanga ai ki aua Iwi ki te Kawanatanga hoki, a ko nga Iwi Maori ekore e pai ki a ratou hei Rangatira me peli maori e ratou.’

‘These men also desire to assume an authority over other New Zealand tribes in their relations with the Government, and contemplate the forcible subjection of those tribes who refuse to recognise then authority.’
that the native people had been treated well, and ‘invited...to become one people under one law.’

New Zealand is the first country to be settled on this new life-saving tikanga. Māori people should consider well to embrace this compassionate tikanga through which they are safe from the evils which have happened to some other peoples not as lucky as them. By the Queen embracing them as her children, the Māori people cannot be unjustly banished from their land, or their property taken without authority. ... From this it can be said that it is a most foolish act when the tribes of New Zealand turn, tempting themselves in engaging in an activity which would stop their bond with the Queen. [They] should not part company, for when the tikanga that they now have linking them with the English people is gone, the result will be that many evils will befall the Māori people, and the destruction through which [they] will disappear.

It was thus clear, as far as the Crown was concerned, that the Kohimarama Conference was only a ratification of the Treaty inasmuch as it ratified Māori loyalty to the Queen and their acceptance of British power in New Zealand. If Māori did not accept the Crown’s interpretation of the Treaty then they would, in effect, be treated as the enemy.

The relative lack of discussion on the Treaty by Māori at Kohimarama indicates that most chiefs either accepted the Crown’s position, or avoided discussion of it. It appears that some chiefs had not come to the Conference with firm opinions on the Treaty. For example, Paora Tūhaere of Ngāti Whātua, entrepreneur and loyalist, was one of the first chiefs to speak. He expressed his friendship to Pakeha and his desire for British law, but dismissed the Treaty of Waitangi. ‘As to the talk about Waitangi

---

154 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:9. ‘...he tutu tera, he whakahihih marire ki te Kuini, a ekore rawa e whakaaetia;’ ‘...i karangatia aia nga tangata whenua kia uru tahi ki te Pakeha hei iwi kotahi, hei noho tahi ki raro i te ture kotahi.

155 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:10. ‘Ko Niu Tirani te whenua tuatahi kua nohoia i runga i tenei tikanga hou, whakaaaro tangata. Ko te whakaaro nui mo te Iwi Maori me awhi mai ki tenei tikanga atawhai, ma kona hoki ora ai ratou i nga he kua tau ki runga ki etahi Iwi kihai i i pera me ratou te waimarie. Na to koutou awhitanga mai e Te Kuini he i tamariki mana, na konei i kore rawa ai e ahei te Iwi Maori te pana he i runga i tona whenua, tona taonga ranei te tango pokanoa. ... No konei i metia ai ko tona tino mahi poaaua tenei kia tahuri nga Iwi o Niu Tirani ki te whakawai mo ratou, kia ananga ki tetahi mahi e mutu ai to ratou piri ki a Te Kuini. Kei wehea hoki, na, kua kore nga tikanga e whakawhiwhia nei ratou inia nei e runga i te hononga ki te Iwi o Ingarani, tona tukunga iho hoki, ko nga tini kino ka tau ki runga ki te Iwi Maori, a, te ngaromanga e ngaro rawa ai.’; ‘New Zealand is the first country colonised on this new and humane system: It will be the wisdom of the Maori people to avail themselves of this generous policy, and thus save their race from evils which have befallen others less favored. It is your adoption by Her Majesty as her subjects which makes it impossible that the Maori people should be unjustly dispossessed of their lands or property. ... It is therefore the height of folly for the New Zealand tribes to allow themselves to be seduced into the commission of any act which, by violating their allegiance to the Queen, would render them liable to forfeit the rights and privileges which their position as British subjects confers upon them, and which must necessarily entail upon them evils ending only in their ruin as a race.’
(treaty), that is Ngapuhi’s affair. Tāmāti Waka Nene of Ngā Puhi demurred, suggesting that he had brought Pākehā to New Zealand for all Māori. McLean agreed, stating that the Treaty was for all Māori, stressing the covenant aspect of the treaty. The next time Tūhāere speaks of the Treaty, he describes it as a kawenata which unified the races. Thus his attitudes towards the government and Pākehā had not changed: rather, he was prepared to accept the Treaty as the mechanism. He was happy with the outcome of the Treaty, suggesting that the Treaty might be correct and appropriate, but still had doubts about the process, that Māori had signed the Treaty in ignorance, or for blankets. This conference, he suggested, was the real treaty. McLean quickly rose to counter this argument lest the government’s claim into legitimacy through the Treaty of Waitangi be called to question. While agreeing that the Conference was making the Treaty more permanent, McLean would not accept that any chiefs, least of all Waka Nene, had been ignorant. However, Tūhāere wanted to make the point that the fault of the Treaty was that most chiefs were ignorant of its consequences. He returned to the subject of the blankets given, saying:

[...]those I call the bait and the hook was within; the fish did not know there was a hook within; he took the bait and was caught. Mr Williams’s bait was a blanket; the hook was the Queen’s Sovereignty [mana]. When he came to a Chief he presented his hook and forthwith drew out a subject for the Queen.

Other chiefs, like McLean, wanted to see the Conference and Treaty linked together. Mete Kingi of Ngā Potama spoke, saying the Conference should be joined together with Treaty, so that its provisions could never be taken away. Tamihana Te Rauparaha decided to build on Tūhāere’s suggestion that the Conference was, in effect, a treaty in itself. Acknowledging that the Treaty of Waitangi was not perfect, he considered it a base for this second treaty they were participating in.

That Treaty [of Waitangi] is like a new road which has just been opened, and which has not been carefully measured off, the brushwood having only just been cut away; and though strife between the Maories and Europeans has been frequent, still the kindly provisions of that Treaty have not been erased. So also in the first purchases, the land

157 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:15.
158 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:38; 31/7/1860:29.
159 Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:35
was not paid for in money, but with blankets, with scissors, with jewsharps; and other goods of inferior value. It was a road of which that was but the beginning. Afterwards the Queen agreed to purchase the land of the Maories. Then first did the Maori see the yellow gold in his hand. Now the purchase of land is clear, as it is paid for in gold. The buying of land with blankets is like the Treaty of Waitangi. This second Treaty, the Kohimarama Treaty, is like the buying of the land with gold. As the rule of paying for land with money is now fixed, so in like manner the provisions of this Treaty are now clear, like the road which has been properly made. 163

Some chiefs, like Tūhaere above, were prepared to accept the Crown’s interpretation of the Treaty as a cession of mana to the Queen. Hemi Mātini Te Awaitaia, brother of the influential Waikato chief Wiremu Nēra, cited the Governor’s speech in which Māori ceded to the Queen ‘all the tikanga and mana kāwanatanga which they collectively had’, 164 adding ‘That was the union of races at Waitangi. I was there at the time, and I listened to the love of the Queen. I then heard about the advantages of the treaty.’ 165 Whatever Paora Tūhaere felt about Māori understanding at the time of the Treaty, he held similar views on its implications, saying ‘unity was started with it, and the relinquishing of the mana of this country under the maru of the Queen’. 166

Other chiefs saw mana as being more than the Queen’s sovereignty, that is, a unitary power deriving from a single source. Perenara of Tūhourangi, proposed that the Treaty of Waitangi meant mana for all people. 167 The chiefs of Ngāiterangi, in their written statement at the conference asserted that they had never lost the mana of the land they conquered. Yet with regard to the Treaty of Waitangi:
Yes—we consent that she, that is, the Queen, shall have the sovereignty [mana], so that she may look to these two races, the Pakeha and Māori.\(^{168}\)

The Kohimarama chiefs thus saw mana as multi-layered, with the Queen and themselves possessing mana simultaneously.

It is apparent that for many chiefs, while they acknowledged that the provisions of the Treaty may be appropriate, they had not been bound by the Treaty. They were now loyal to the Queen, but in effect her government had been a *de facto* exercise with regard to their own tribal areas. Their loyalty was based on the contemporary political situation, rather than the legalities of a Treaty signed by some chiefs twenty years earlier. Eruera Wiremu Kahawai of Ngāti Whakaue, a Te Arawa tribe, in his written statement, said,

> I considered releasing my land to you some time in the future as mana [for you] and to be cared for by you, and when I return to my hapu to organise a big committee for us, to lay down correctly the boundaries of our lands, and then give them to our Queen to care for. ... Furthermore, [we] were reminded of the Committee of Waitangi, where the tikanga and the mana were relinquished to the Queen: My thoughts are like that, of giving over completely the tikanga of this island of New Zealand to our loving Queen.\(^{169}\)

The Te Arawa tribes had not signed the Treaty. They had generally co-operated with the government, and although some were Kingitanga supporters, Te Arawa later assisted the government militarily. However, Kahawai’s statement is clear in saying that his acknowledgement of the Queen’s mana is something new, something that he has yet to fully implement. In fact, most of the expressions of loyalty to the Queen, or positive sentiments towards Pākehā and the government at Kohimarama were made without reference to the Treaty.\(^{170}\) While some chiefs, particularly of Te Tai Tokerau, stressed the longevity of their loyalty, others told of their recent shift to the Queen’s

---

\(^{168}\) *Te Karere Māori*, 30/11/1860:20. ‘Ae, ka whakaae pono matou ki aia te mana, ara, ki a te Kuini, hei tirotiro mo enei iwi eraua, mo te Pakeha, mo te Maori.’

\(^{169}\) *Te Karere Māori*, 30/11/1860:13. ‘...ahau i whakaaro ai kia tukua atu oku oneone ki a koe hei mana, hei tiaki a nga ra e takoto ake nei; ina hoki atu au ki oku hapu, kia whakaritea te tahi komiti nei ma matou mo nga rohe o matou oneone kia takoto tika, hei reira ka hoatu ai ma to tatou Kuini e tiaki. ... Waihoki ko te whakamaharatanga ki te Komiti o Waitangi, tino tukua atu ana nga tikanga me nga mana ki a te Kuini; waihoki me tuku whakaaro e pena tonu ana, e tino hoatu ana i nga tikanga o tenei motu o Niu Tirenī, ki to tatou Kuini atawhai.’; ‘I have thought, therefore, of placing my land under your protection some of these days; and, when I return to my tribe, to appoint a great committee to lay down properly the boundaries of our lands, and when this is completed to hand them over to our Queen to be taken care of. ...You have reminded us also of the meeting at Waitangi where the sovereignty of these islands was ceded to the Queen. My thoughts are similar. I am for yielding up the management of all matters in this island to our kind Queen.\(^{\text{LM}}\)’

side. For Hira Kingi Rātapu of Aotea, conversion to the Queen followed his conversion to Christianity.\(^1\) For Tukihaumene of Ngāti Whakaue, with expressions of loyalty from others of his tribe at the Conference, he could now say that 'Now my people have fully consented to this “tikanga.”'\(^2\) Rirituku Te Puehu of Ngāti Pikiao stated that ‘I have now sided with the Queen; (but) my allegiance has not yet had time to grow’.\(^3\)

Discussions on Taranaki

The chiefs were not called to Kohimarama to discuss the Treaty. As the old Ngā Puhi chief, Waka Nene, succinctly put it,

> What has brought us here to this Assembly? What? what? It is my opinion that it is the King Movement which has brought us hither. The system of this King is that which is pursued by Te Rangitāke. First it was the King; the line of conduct adopted by Te Rangitāke followed it.\(^4\)

Confronted by its ideological battle with the Kingitanga and actual hostilities with Te Rangitāke and Taranaki, the government wanted to gain Māori loyalty and acceptance of its mana. Although Te Rangitāke had called upon the Kingitanga for support, he and other Taranaki chiefs had not previously warmed to the movement. If Governor Browne had not pressed for the sale of land at Waitara, Te Rangitāke may well have remained a loyal subject of the Queen. However, in 1860 some of the Kohimarama chiefs, like Waka Nene, linked the Kingitanga and Taranaki as a single issue.\(^5\) As Te Makarini of Ngāti Awa said. “There is one wrong, these issues standing before us, Taranaki and Waikato’s activities.”\(^6\)

The chiefs had diverse views about Taranaki. On arriving at Kohimarama, they began to discuss the matter. Some considered that the government and Te Rangitāke should sort it out themselves.\(^7\) Epiha Karoro considered that the land sellers were at fault, as was the governor for his haste to fight, but those Māori who had joined in,

\(^1\) *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860:26.

\(^2\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:16. ‘Katahi toku iwi ka tino whakaae ki tenei tikanga.’

\(^3\) *Te Karere Māori*, 14/7/1860:36. ‘Ko tuku tomokanga maiianeke kei roto i te Kuinitanga: ta te mea kaore ano i tupu noa taku Kuinitanga i roto i ahau.’

\(^4\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:52-53. ‘Na te aha tatou i tapoko mai ai ki tenei whare, ki tenei runanga? Na te aha? Na te aha? E mea ana ahau na te kingi tatou i kawe mai ki konei. Ko te tikanga o tenei kingi kei a Te Rangitake. I te tuatahi ko te kingi, i muri iho ko ta Te Rangitake.’

\(^5\) For example, see *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:24, 33-34, 35; 1/9/1860:28-29, 33.

\(^6\) *Te Karere Māori*, 30/11/1860:20-21. ‘Ara, e pa, kotahi te he–ko enei take e tu mai nei, ko Taranaki, ko ta Waikato mahi.’ ‘However, still, O father, there is something wrong. I refer to these two things—the Taranaki affair, and the proceedings of Waikato.’

\(^7\) *Te Karere Māori*, 14/7/1860:21, 37; 31/7/1860:11.
causing an expansion of the war were also in the wrong.\textsuperscript{178} Some thought that the government’s inactivity in crushing the Kingitanga, had allowed the movement and other problems grow.\textsuperscript{179} Some stated that it would be better to leave Māori to sort out Taranaki’s problems, that it would be over if the conference had been called earlier,\textsuperscript{180} or if Māori teachers had been sent to mediate.\textsuperscript{181} Other chiefs suggested that, if asked, they would “go” to Taranaki, some motivated to bring peace, others perhaps to fight for the government. It was these causes perhaps which caused the newly loyal Rirituku Te Puehu to caution lest the branches, newly grafted and yet to bear fruit, should fall off to the government tree.\textsuperscript{182} However, the most scathing criticism of the government came from Parakaia Te Pouepa of Ngāti Raukawa who supposed that Christianity and Queen’s mana should have guaranteed a peaceful solution. Blaming the Governor’s military action, he said ‘the mischief has been contrived by Auckland. This evil is the work of the Council of Auckland.’\textsuperscript{183}

Māori chiefs had been asked to respond in writing to the Governor’s opening speech.\textsuperscript{184} These written replies reflected the more sympathetic views concerning Te Rangitāke, expressed in the early whaikōrero. The chiefs of Te Tai Tokerau tended to condemn Te Rangitāke outright, whereas those from further south wanted the issue to be resolved through mediation, or did not consider it their issue. Certainly the prevailing call was for peace. As Moihe Kupe of Tapuika wrote:

Friend the Governor,—This is my word to you. Make peace with your enemy— Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitāke. If peace is made between you, then will the words of the Governor’s address, at the commencement of this Conference, be fulfilled. I refer to these words, “that the two races of New Zealand may prosper.”\textsuperscript{185}

Worried lest debate on Taranaki get out of control, on 19 July, McLean delivered his speech (detailed above) on the history of the Taranaki purchases,

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{178} \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 14/7/1860:23.
\item \textsuperscript{179} \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 14/7/1860:32, 33; 31/7/1860:24.
\item \textsuperscript{180} \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 14/7/1860:24.
\item \textsuperscript{181} \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 14/7/1860:35-36. This was disputed by McLean who stated that native teachers had attempted to make the peace but had failed.
\item \textsuperscript{182} \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 14/7/1860:47.
\item \textsuperscript{183} \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 31/7/1860:27. ‘Ko tenei na Akarana i wakatupu te he, na te Runanga o Akarana tenei he.’
\item \textsuperscript{184} The debates were concluded in \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 1/9/1860. Despite most of the written responses being handed in during the first week, they did not appear in print for four months, in \textit{Te Karere Māori}, 30/11/1860.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotes}
consuming a full day of business. One chief did not agree. Wiremu Tamihana Te Neke, a Te Āti Awa kinsman of Te Rangitāke, stood to criticise McLean’s version, including the right of Pōtatau to sell land that Waikato had never held. He also disputed Teira’s right to sell, asserting that he, Te Rangitāke and others still retained rights in the land.\textsuperscript{186} He later blamed the war on McLean himself, and excused the murders of settlers by Ngāti Ruanui as “uru maranga” or fair prey.\textsuperscript{187} This last statement was attacked by Tamihana Te Rauparaha as reflecting old uncivilised customs.\textsuperscript{188} Pressure was no doubt applied to Te Neke, because despite objecting to the conference resolution that Te Rangitāke was the guilty party over Waitara, he did move the resolution that condemned the Taranaki murders.\textsuperscript{189}

Directly following McLean’s speech and Te Neke’s attempt to debate the issue, support for Te Rangitāke dried up. Some chiefs condemned Te Rangitāke outright. Ihikiera Te Tinana of Ngāti Whāua, for example, believed that the governor should punish Te Rangitāke for his intransigence.

Should a child cry or be troublesome, the parent’s rod will be applied, and not till he has ceased his naughtiness will the punishment cease.\textsuperscript{190} The prevailing mood, however, saw the chiefs continuing to press for peace. Two weeks into the conference, Hohepa Tamaihengia of Ngāti Toa stood and suggested that he personally go to Waitara to talk to Te Rangitāke.\textsuperscript{191} Several of the following speakers agreed. The following day, McLean opened the meeting with news of more troops arriving from Australia. He maintained that the governor did want peace, and put the blame on the interference of Waikato and especially other Taranaki tribes who had long desired to kill Pākehā.\textsuperscript{192} The chiefs continued to discuss the possibility of going to Taranaki to reason with Te Rangitāke. McLean then told the Conference that he would not stop any attempt by chiefs to go to Taranaki, but Te Rangitāke was unlikely to listen to them.\textsuperscript{193} In this he was supported by Tamihana Te Rauparaha, who considered that now the war had escalated, other Māori would ridicule them for

\textsuperscript{186} Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:8-10.
\textsuperscript{188} Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:32.
\textsuperscript{189} Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1860:8.
\textsuperscript{190} Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:31. ‘Ka tangi ano te tamaiti, ka tutu ranei, ko pa ano te whiu o te matua ki aia; kia mutu ra ano tana tutu, ka mutu ano te whiu.’
\textsuperscript{191} Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:27.
\textsuperscript{192} Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:29-30.
\textsuperscript{193} Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1860:29.
any peace mission and suggest they were in government pay. On the penultimate
day of the conference, McLean again said that the chiefs would be free to see Te
Rangitāke but success was very unlikely. Enthusiasm for visiting Taranaki petered out
that day, with chiefs expressing a desire to discuss the issue at home. On the last
day, the conference passed a resolution that attached blame to Te Rangitāke for the
Waitara dispute, and exonerated Governor Browne.

Discussions on the Kingitanga

Governor Browne, in his opening address on 10 July, attacked the Kingitanga
for disloyalty. He had hoped, he said, that it would disappear of its own accord, but it
had escalated the Waitara dispute, and was now attempting to impose itself upon
unwilling tribes. Therefore,

that thing, the setting up of a Māori King would be insubordination and willful disrespect
towards the Queen, and it cannot be allowed.

Tamati Ngāpora, a leading Kingitanga moderate, sent a letter to the Conference
expressing a desire for peace, and joint mediation at Taranaki. However, the
important Kingitanga leaders avoided the conference, holding their own rūnānga
instead. A few sympathisers of the Māori King did attend Kohimarama and stood
to give their views. Petaera Wharerahi of Ngāti Tūwharetoa identified himself as
coming from among the Kingitanga, but denied being involved in any anti-
government activity. Te Ao-o-te-rangi of Tainui expressed friendship with the
Pākehā, denied any wrong-doing on the part of Waikato, and suggested that the
government let the Kingitanga attend to its own affairs, saying ‘cultivate carefully the
plants in your garden, as I shall cultivate the plants in my garden.’ Hetaraka Te
Tahiwi of Ngāti Pou (Waikato) also stood to give Waikato’s point of view. Right
from the first governor, an agreement had existed,
that the governor should suppress evil amongst the Pakehas and that Pōtatau should suppress our evils at Waikato. The friendship of the Governor and Pōtatau was then cemented. They made their plans agree. The arrangement was sealed by Christianity. 201

This agreement had been followed by successive governors. When Pōtatau had made laws, they were not only those of the government, but from the Gospel too. 202

Such views were rare, with the chiefs assembled at Kohimarama generally holding negative attitudes towards the Kīngitanga. Some objected to the Māori kingship’s lack of precedence, suggesting that the concept had been stolen from the Pākehā. 203 However, there was sympathy for the recently deceased Pōtatau, who prior to his elevation to kingship, had been a trusted ally of the government. 204 As such, some non-Kīngitanga Māori had viewed Pōtatau as a steadying influence. 205

As Waka Nene said,

[according to my notion, now that Potatau is dead, the work of Waikato should be put an end to. He uttered no evil words, nor any words about fighting. His only word was good will and kindness. This was his word, wash me that I may be clean: hence I say let that name be washed out, let each tribe cherish its own pakehas.] 206

Some also noted Pōtatau’s unwillingness to accept the title of king, preferring the term matua (father), even suggesting that he had been duped by younger chiefs into approving the Kīngitanga. 207 This argument allowed those who either respected the mana and wisdom of Pōtatau, or who had earlier sympathised with the Kīngitanga, to now ally themselves with the government. There was thus no contradiction for Te Waka Te Ruki of Ngāti Māhanga to say:

Hold fast the word of our friend, Potatau. Hold fast kindness. ... This also is one of my thoughts. The oyster cleaves to the rock in the midst of the sea: though it be dashed by the waves it does not fall off. By the rock is meant the Queen, and by the oyster the people of Whaingaroa and Aotea. 208

---

201 Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860:63. '...ko te Kawana hei pehi i nga he o te Pakeha, ko Potatau hei pehi i nga he oku, o Waikato. Ka piri i konei te whakahao o Potatau raua ko te Kawana. Ka whakarite i a raua tikanga kia rite tonu. Ka perēhia i e te whakapono.'
203 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:23-24, 28; 30/11/1860:9, 14, 18, 29.
204 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:12-13, 52-53, 55; Te Karere Maori, 3/8/1860 Suppl:17, 33
206 Te Karere Maori, 31/7/1860:53. 'Ki au ia ka mate a Potatau, heoi ano me whakakahore taua mahi a Waikato. Ka hore ana kapu kino, ana kupu whahai ranei: heoi ano tona ko te aroha ko te atawhai. Ko tana kupu hoki tenei, Horoia au kia pai; kora au i mea ai me horoi taua ingoa. Me atawhai tenei iwi ki tona Pakeha, ko tera iwi hei atawhai i tona Pakeha.'
208 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:23. 'He mea atu tenei naku ki a koe kia mau te pupuri i te kupu a to hoa, a Potatau, kia mau ki te atawhai. ... Tenei ano hoki tetahi o kau whakaaro. E rite ana ki te tio e piri ana ki te toka kohatu i waengamoana; ahakoa pakia e te ngaru e kore e taka i taua toka kohatu. Te tikanga o tenei toka, ko te Kuini, te tikanga o te tio, ko nga tangata, e noho ana ki Whaingaroa, ki Aotea.'
Several chiefs had more personal reasons for attacking the Kingitanga, to dispel any notion that they may have been responsible for the movement. Mātene Te Whiwhi complained that ‘it has gone through this Island that [he] Matene was the originator of the Māori King.’\(^{209}\) Te Rauparaha also denied any involvement, restating his rejection of Te Heuheu’s mission in 1857.\(^{210}\) Te Rauparaha instead blamed mischievous Pākehā.

My own opinion is that it was the Pakeha who originated it. I believe it is a scheme of Charles Davis’s. The fault lies with the Pakehas. I think that Pakeha should be tried. He is probably still here. (This should be done) so that the Māori be not charged when it is the fault of the Pakeha.\(^{211}\)

Davis got his revenge in his 1861 annual, *Ko Aotearoa*.

A Pākehā said to a powerful Māori chief from Ōtaki, “We strongly object to what Tamihana [Te] Rauparaha had to say at the Kohimarama Conference.” That Māori chief said, “Why do you worry about a dog? He is our most cowardly. That man is of no account.”[LP]\(^{212}\)

Tamihana Te Rauparaha promised the conference that on his return to Ōtaki he would remove the flag erected by Wī Tako Ngātata and other Kingitanga supporters.\(^{213}\) Others, such as Wiremu Patene of Ngāi terangi, considered the movement to be “child’s play”, and the government was at fault for not dealing with it promptly.\(^{214}\) The intrusion of Kingitanga warriors into the Taranaki war had intensified the chiefs’ antagonism towards the Kingitanga,\(^{215}\) and they could not understand why the government had waited so long to act. However, they did not advocate war, but, in line with the government’s own rhetoric, they wanted trade sanctions.\(^{216}\) As Eruera Wiremu Kahawai asked in his written reply to the government,


\(^{211}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:23. ‘Oīra e mea ana toktū whakaaro na te Pakeha pea: e mea ana ahau na Hare Reweti tenei tikanga - na te Pakeha ano te he. Ki tuku whakaaro, me whakawa taua Pakeha: tenei pea kei konei e noho ana; kei kia na te Maori, na te Pakeha.’

\(^{212}\) *Ko Aotearoa*, 1/1/1861:24. ‘Mea atu anā he Pakeha ki tetahi Rangatira Maori whai mana no Otaki, “Nui atu ta matou whakahei i nga korero a Tamihana Taparaha i roto i te runanga o Kohimarama.” Ka mea ake taua Rangatira Maori, “Hei aha mau te kuri? Heoi ano ta maua haua, hauwarea ko tena tangata.”’; ‘“The speech of Thomson Rauparaha respecting Interpreter Davis in the Kohimarama Conference displeases me very much” said a Pakeha to an influential chieftain of Otaki. “Why should you heed a dog” was the curt reply, “he is the basest man of our tribe.”’[KAJ]

\(^{213}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:23, 57.

\(^{214}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860:32. See also *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860:33; 31/7/1860:26.

\(^{215}\) *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860:37; 1/9/1860:32

\(^{216}\) Discussion of this rhetoric is above. For chiefs advocating sanctions, see *Te Karere Maori*, 31/7/1860:34, 36; 3/8/1860 Suppl:49;
would it meet your approbation to erect a fence, that is, to make a law for all Waikato, to stop their being supplied with blankets, shirts, trousers, coats, sugar, tobacco, and all such things? Let none of these things reach the Maori tribes of Waikato. This, in my opinion, would put an end to the Maori King.217

With regard to the Māori king, Wiremu and Wikiriwhi Matehenoa of Ngāti Porou could only say, ‘If white and black agree, it is right, but if it is left for black alone it will not stand.’218 Therefore, many chiefs thought that, left to its own, the Kingitanga would disappear.219 As Rirituku Te Puehu suggested, ‘As to the King movement, do not suppress it. Let it go on till it comes to nothing.’220 This did not indicate that chiefs cherished any sympathy for the Kingitanga. Moihe Kupe of Tapuika could compare the movement to Satan, and to ‘one dog snarling at another who is in possession of food coveted by both.’ However, he still suggested that the government pay it no heed.221 Despite the resolution ‘[t]hat this Conference is of opinion that the project of setting up a Maori King in New Zealand is a cause of strife and division, and is fraught with trouble to the country’222 passing with a few abstentions, the prevailing desire was for peace. Perhaps because of this, Browne’s closing address did not mention the Kingitanga, while Te Karere Maori’s editor merely compared them to children who ‘have been led away by their fancies; and, in like manner, when they are tired of their toy, we expect to see them cease playing and return to their parent, the Governor, to work with him in promoting the true interests of the Maori people.’223

Discussions on he iwi kotahi.

Kohimarama also proved a venue for a number of other issues. For example, the chiefs discussed land and subdivision, issues which are examined in Chapter Six.

217 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:15. ‘Ekore ranei koe e pai kia hanga he taiepa? ara, ko te taiepa tenei, kia hanga he ture mo Waikato katoa, katoa; ko te ture tenei, kia puritia te paraikete, te hate, te tarautete, te koti, te huka, te tupeka, otira nga mea katoa, me pupuri, kaua rawa e tukua ki nga iwi Maori o Waikato; ko te mea tenei e mutu ai te Kingi, ki tuku whakaaro.’
218 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:50. ‘...ma ma, ma pango ka tika, ma pango anake, e kore e tu.’
220 Te Karere Maori, 14/7/1860:36-37. ‘Tena ko te mahi Kingi, kaua e pehia, waiho kia tupu noa taea noatai te korenga.’
221 Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:17. ‘...ki te kuri e ngangara ana ki tetahi kuri i aia ta raua kai pai.’
222 Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1860:6. ‘E mea ana te whakaaro tenei Runanga ki te mahi whakatuku Kingi Maori, he mahi he, he mahi wehe, he mea whakatupui i te rarurarui ki tenei whenua.’ Some chiefs raised their hands, then lowered them to the ground to show their disapproval of the Kingitanga.
223 Te Karere Maori, 15/8/1860:6. ‘...e reha haere ana i runga i tona whakaaro hanga noa; waihoki, kia hoha i tona whakapataritari, ka mutu te takaro, ka hoki ki to ratou matua ki a Kawana, hei hoa mona ki te rapu i nga tikanga e tupu ai te pai ki te Iwi Maori.’
Less than a week into the conference, McLean read out a draft set of laws drafted by Sir William Martin designed for Māori districts considered not yet assimilated into Pākehā tikanga. Rather than imprisonment, these laws provided fines as punishment and as revenue to maintain the legal infrastructure. The chiefs were reasonably content to take these home for discussion with one exception, the law on adultery. A number of chiefs stood to argue against it, saying that any fine should go to the cuckolded husband, otherwise the husband would resort to killing the offender to gain satisfaction.

Aside from the principal issues of the Kingitanga and Taranaki, many chiefs wanted to discuss how Māori could participate in society as equal citizens with Pākehā, that is, to realise the government’s rhetoric of he iwi kotahi. Several of the earlier speakers raised the issue of legal discrimination Māori suffered, of being prohibited from selling their land to individual Pākehā at higher prices than the government was prepared to pay, and from being able to buy gunpowder. Te Keene of Ngāti Whātua exclaimed,

[The Governor has said that there is the same law for both European and Maori. Now when I asked five shillings per acre for my land, the Governor reduced the price to sixpence. Therefore I have no law. On this account I am grieved. Only the shadow of the law belongs to me. Another instance. I took a gun to a Pakeha to be repaired. The government said, No. Therefore I have no law.]

As Tamati Hapimana of Te Tāwera complained ‘you give us the dark side of your Laws. You make the law void where it concerns us.’ As the conference progressed, several speakers also remonstrated against discriminatory laws, but the chiefs soon turned to positive suggestions on how they could be included.

Mātene Te Whiwhi raised the issue of juries. He saw the issue in terms of “he iwi kotahi”, saying ‘I have been thinking that as the Governor has united the two races, and has said that the Maori and the Pakeha shall be brought close together’ that,
in the case of inter-racial murder, both Māori and Pākehā should form the jury.\textsuperscript{229} The following week, McLean read a memo from the Governor requesting Māori opinion on the issue.\textsuperscript{230} Several chiefs rose to speak, approving mixed juries.\textsuperscript{231} The following day, McLean spoke, saying a law had been drafted in Governor Fitzroy’s time for Māori to sit on juries, but

the mutual jealousies and hatreds of the tribes presented an insuperable barrier to its being brought into operation. This was the difficulty: the tribes carried their prejudices to such an extent, as to make it seem probable that in any case where the prisoner belonged to the same tribe as the Native jurors, they would, even though his guilty were proved, contend for his acquittal; and, on the other hand, should he happen to belong to another tribe, their vindictive feeling might induce them to punish the prisoner, whether right or wrong.\textsuperscript{232}

Māori, he said, must now say whether they were now advanced enough to participate in an English jury.\textsuperscript{233} A few chiefs now expressed caution about juries, but most were still enthusiastic.\textsuperscript{234} Tohi Te Ururangi thought that assessors, such as himself, would make admirable candidates, while Honatana, of Ngā Puehi, suggested that Māori jurors could be brought from other regions so as to avoid any bias.\textsuperscript{235} Mete Kīngi of Whanganui sounded the only sour note. He had yet to be paid for two years work as an assessor: would he be paid if on a jury?\textsuperscript{236}

Other issues relating to \textit{he iwi kotahi} surfaced. Tamihana Te Rauparaha also raised the issue of militia. Māori often viewed these Pākehā units with suspicion. Māori should be included, he said, ‘in order that there may be some truth to the statement that the Pakehas and the Maories are united.’\textsuperscript{237} However, the few who spoke on this issue, either opposed it, or thought it should be discussed at some other time.\textsuperscript{238} A number of times, Pāora Tūhaere of Ngāti Whātua pressed the matter of Māori being included in legislative bodies. He did not accept that a lack of
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  \item \textsuperscript{230} \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 3/8/1860 Suppl:22-23.
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knowledge of the English language was a handicap for Māori, as there were plenty of Pākehā who could interpret for them.\textsuperscript{239} Māori, he considered, should be involved, particularly in matters relating to land legislation.\textsuperscript{240} This cooperation between the races, he believed, would help eliminate the lawlessness in some Māori communities.\textsuperscript{241} Ngārongoamau of Te Uriohau considered that Pākehā had been at fault, as Māori had given over their \textit{mana} to the Queen, but Pākehā had not included them in law-making. If this had happened, he believed, the current unpleasantness would not have arisen.\textsuperscript{242} Tohi Te Ururangi saw the issue in terms of racial unity.

Let me (the Māori) enter the Pakeha Council, that my word may be right, because the opinions of the Pakeha Council are conflicting. Secure an entrance for me that we may all consult together.\textsuperscript{243}

Chiefs saw their attendance at the conference as participating in the machinery of government, within the new \textit{mana kāwanaatanga}.\textsuperscript{244} In the last week, Tamihana Te Rauparaha organised a petition to the Governor, signed by all or most chiefs present, asking ‘that this Conference of the Maori Chiefs of the Island of New Zealand should be established and made permanent by you, as a means of clearing away evils affecting both Europeans and Natives.’\textsuperscript{245} Some chiefs may have held hopes that their conferences would gain some real power. Tāhana Tūroa suggested that this conference have the right to appoint the Pākehā \textit{tumuaki} (commissioners) for the remoter areas,\textsuperscript{246} but his suggestion was not followed up, with chiefs being content with the consultative nature of the meeting. The conference lasted a full month. Although some chiefs came and went, many had been away from their homes for a long period. As the conference was drawing to a close, Mātene Te Whiwhi made the following request, ‘[l]et the warmth rest upon the Māori as it does upon the
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Pakeha. 247 This metaphor expressed a desire that the Conference members should receive pay, or some recompense for their time. While Wi Pohe of Parawhau (Ngā Puhi) thought that demanding money ‘would be plundering the Queen’, other speakers warmed to the idea. 248

Although Governor Browne made no mention of paying the chiefs in his closing address, he did promise another conference would be held the following year, and Te Manuhiri Tuarangi discussed the possibility as late as July, 1861. 249 However, the conference had been held primarily to contain Māori support and sympathy for Te Rangitāke in Taranaki, and for the Kingitanga. Once the war crisis was over, the government’s need for a second Kohimarama receded, although Browne was still prepared to hold it. Once he learnt that he was to be replaced by Grey, he put these plans on hold. 250 When Grey returned as governor in September 1861, he decided not to bring Māori chiefs together again, considering ‘it would not be wise to call a number of semi-barbarous Natives together to frame a Constitution for themselves’. He also thought a second conference would prove divisive: to the Waikato chiefs who were still unlikely to attend, and to the settler parliament. 251 Instead Grey took mana kāwanatanga out to individual Māori districts with a plan for resident magistrates and a devolved Māori self-government, the so-called Tikanga Hou. These issues, and their portrayal in the Māori language newspapers, are discussed in the following chapter.

Conclusion

The Treaty of Waitangi had enabled the establishment of a colonial government in New Zealand, but that government was not yet actually governing Māori. In order to achieve successful colonisation, the government needed to persuade Māori to accept the mana kāwanatanga created by the Treaty. The government used its newspaper, Te Karere Maori, in this propaganda effort, and was assisted by both Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1860:16. ‘Kia tukua te mahanatanga ki runga ki te Maori, kia rite ki to te Pakeha.’

Te Karere Maori, 1/9/1860:16, 17-18, 19. ‘...he muru tena i a te Kuini.’ According to Rēnata Kawepō, this desire for payment was evidence of the unreliability of the chiefs at Kohimarama, that they had agreed with the Browne over Taranaki in hope of recompense. He suggested that one chief had thought that the £3000, voted by Parliament to fund the event, would be divided between the chiefs present. See Kawepō, pp 5L, 16L.

Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/6/1861:6; 1/7/1861:3.

Dalton, p 135.
Karere o Poneke and Te Haeata in this general aim. With hindsight, it appears that this mana could only be enlarged at the expense of the mana Māori. Similarly, Pākehā could only colonise successfully by acquiring Māori land, the very taonga which represented tribal mana. Certainly, some Māori recognised this and established the Kingitanga as a barrier to the loss of land and mana. However, other Māori saw no contradiction between their own mana whenua and the mana of the government. With the political context still fluid, they considered that by cooperating with the government and accepting its right to govern, possibilities existed, not only of sharing mana kāwanatanga but also maintaining their own mana whenua.

The government’s aims were blighted by two events: the Kingitanga and the Taranaki War. The former represented an ideological challenge to mana kāwanatanga. Te Rangitāke was not challenging the government’s right to govern New Zealand but its attempt to purchase land that neither he, nor his tribe, had assented to sell. Had Teira not offered Waitara for sale, Te Rangitāke might have remained a loyal subject. However, because the government was unwilling to recognise Te Rangitāke’s chiefly veto of the sale, they interpreted his actions as a challenge to mana kāwanatanga, thus throwing him into the arms of the Kingitanga. Te Karere Maori, and its two newspaper allies, thus extended their propaganda campaign to discredit both Te Rangitāke and the Kingitanga.

With the government waging war against Te Rangitāke’s Te Āti Awa and their Taranaki and Kingitanga allies, it felt compelled to call together those chiefs considered loyal, or potentially loyal, to bolster its support base among Māori. Te Karere Maori aided this exercise by providing extensive coverage of the Kohimarama Conference. Many of these chiefs were unfriendly towards the Kingitanga because they were not prepared to divest their mana whenua to another chief, but had reservations about the government’s actions in Taranaki. These chiefs also wanted to play a part in the evolving political life of the country, to help wield mana kāwanatanga. Kohimarama was successful for the government because Te Karere Maori’s accounts portray the chiefs as progressively supporting the government, in opposing Kingitanga and Te Rangitāke, and in voicing their loyalty and desire for law and order.

251 AJHR (1862) E1 Sec II, p 33.
Chapter 8: political issues, Kohimarama to September, 1863.

Introduction

This chapter explores the political developments, and their portrayal in the Māori language newspapers after the Kohimarama conference, which were based on the concept of mana. The first section details the events transpiring in the last year of Browne’s governorship, and his vision for the future; the second how his replacement, Governor Grey, sought to expand mana kāwanatanga over Māori by providing his Tikanga Hou (New Institutions), a limited system of law and self-government to Māori. For both governors the major obstructions to their aims were the events that were carried over from the pre-Kohimarama era: the unsettled nature of Taranaki, and the continued existence of the Kingitanga. The chapter continues to focus on the government’s newspapers output, and the voices of its supporters. Voices of dissent follow: firstly, the opposition of the Ngāti Kahungunu chief, Rēnata Kawepō, and the editor, Charles Davis, to Browne’s handling of the Waitara purchase and the Taranaki War; secondly, the emergence of the Kingitanga’s Te Hokioi as a challenge to mana kāwanatanga. Te Hokioi’s success was sufficient for Grey to establish Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, a rival newspaper, to counter-act its propaganda. The chapter covers in depth the brief “newspaper war” between these papers, in which contrasting views of mana were contested. Finally, the chapter concludes with the advent of the Waikato War in 1863, and the final issues of Te Karere Maori, a newspaper, which, in a number of incarnations, had survived for over two decades.

Historical Summary

The Taranaki war over the disputed Pekapeka Block at Waitara continued into the first half of 1861. Seeing their position weaken, Māori forces took Tatarimaka, 4000 acres of previously sold land south of New Plymouth. They claimed the land through right of conquest, although their aim was to strengthen their position should they have to negotiate terms.1 Wiremu Tamihana Tarapipipi, the moderate Kingitanga leader, visited Taranaki in the dying stages of the war. He arranged a three day truce but unfortunately was unable to bring about peace.2 The Māori

---

2 Dalton, p 123.
position became untenable: Te Rangitāke left to live with Ngāti Maniapoto within the Kingitanga, while the Te Āti Awa chief, Hapurona, and the government made peace. However the peace agreement did not resolve the major issues. The Crown continued to hold Waitara, and Māori forces Tātaraimaka.

Governor Browne, as hostilities ceased at Taranaki, prepared for war against the Kingitanga in Waikato, but was forestalled by Grey’s arrival for his second governorship in September, 1861. Grey sought to attack the Kingitanga more subtly, by marginalising the movement. In areas where he could get enough local Māori support, Grey set up his Tikanga Hou, continuing to use Te Karere Maori as a propaganda weapon to promote the government’s plans, and to malign the Māori king. Grey also sent John Gorst as Resident Magistrate to Te Awamutu, in the Upper Waikato. Although Gorst was largely ineffective as magistrate, he was able to irritate the Ngāti Maniapoto amongst whom he lived, by establishing an industrial school under government auspices, and by publishing for a short time the anti-Kingitanga newspaper, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke. In March 1863, Kingitanga supporters confronted Wiremu Te Wheoro, a Waikato kūpapa chief who was protecting the construction of a suspicious looking “school house” within the Kingitanga realm. The Kingitanga supporters, after much argument with Te Wheoro, floated the timbers downstream onto government owned land. Soon after, Rewi Maniapoto expelled Gorst and his printing press back to Auckland.

Grey decided to retake Tātaraimaka in April 1863. He also established an enquiry to determine the validity of the Waitara purchase which found that the purchase was flawed, and that Te Rangitāke and others indeed had a claim to the land. However, the government’s proclamation of restoring the land was very slow in coming. Dalton suggests that Grey spent too long attempting to obtain backing from the settler government to return Waitara. Had the government given up Waitara up quickly, or had not retaken Tātaraimaka before returning Waitara, events may well have been different. Soon after, Māori ambushed and killed a party of
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3 Dalton, pp 127, 134.
7 Dalton, pp 168-170. Atkinson believed that ‘Grey ... only wants a show of reason to give up the land.’ Richmond-Atkinson Papers, Vol 2, p 34.
8 Dalton, p 170.
soldiers at Oākura, near Tātaraimaka. Taranaki was at war again. However the
government chose not to engage heavily in Taranaki. After shelling a Māori position
with a gunboat as *utu* for the slain soldiers, Grey turned his attentions on Waikato
instead. In May, an ultimatum was issued to Māori living in South Auckland to swear
allegiance to the Queen or depart for the Waikato. Most chose the latter. 9 Within
days, the British army crossed the Mangatāwhiri Stream, thus initiating the Waikato
War.

**Browne’s governorship**

**Taranaki**

The two Māori language newspapers which appeared during the first Taranaki
War, *Te Karere Māori* and *Te Haeata*, spoke in one voice with regard to Taranaki.
Naturally, the religious *Te Haeata* saw the conflict in spiritual terms of evil spirits
infecting the world, and Māori who succumbed would have to face God’s
judgement. 10 Both provided “war news”, especially when Māori suffered defeats.
For example, inserted among *Te Karere Maori*’s issues detailing Kohimarama was a
four page “extra” dated 8th November 1860, with details of the Battle of Māhōetahi. 11
This battle, fought the previous week, was a British victory over Ngāti Haua warriors.
The account was taken from the government’s *Gazette*, and included reports from
General Pratt, and Robert Parris, as well as the ‘insulting letter sent by the Waikato
chiefs’ inviting the British to fight. 12 *Te Haeata* published its own account, written by
Rev. John Whiteley. He attempted to display how Pākehā attitudes to war differed
from those of Māori, and to show that Waikato forces had intruded into the war.
Despite their severe defeat at the hands of Waikato at Puketakauere (which the
newspapers had failed to report), with much plunder lost, Whitely recounted that
Pākehā had not gone to Waikato to seek *utu*. However, when Wetini Taiporutu led
his force of Ngāti Haua to Taranaki, the British ‘then sought revenge for their dead
killed at Puketakauere, for the plunder taken by Waikato and the Pākehā whom
Waitako stealthily attacked.’ 13 The Pākehā action was ‘mahī awatea’ (done in the
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10 Te Haeata, 1/11/1860:1; 1/12/1860:2.
12 Te Karere Maori, 8/11/1860:2. ‘...tetahi pukapuka whakatara i tonoa mai e o Waikato rangatira...’
13 Te Haeata, 1/12/1860:2. ‘...katahi ka rapu utu mo o ratou tupapaku i mate ki Puketakauere i a
Waikato, mo o ratou taonga i riro i a Waikato, mo  nga Pakeha i konihitia e Waikato.’
open). The Pākehā, he said, lost four dead, and fourteen wounded. ‘Thirty or more Māori were killed, and an unknown number wounded.’

14 The Maori would not enjoy a glorious death: ‘[i]his death will be laughed at by the peoples of the world, and they will say, “What a foolish people the Māori tribes are to fight against the Pākehā”’.

15 In January, Māori attacked the redoubts threatening the Māori position at Te Ārei. Te Karere Maori stressed the disparity between the Māori and Pākehā dead, as did Te Haeata, both detailing the names and tribes of the known Māori dead.

16 Both papers also continued to press themes that had preceded the Kohimarama Conference: that it was futile to fight against the British; that the conflict was a hindrance of the progress of both races; and that Māori were not to listen to any false rumours about the government wanting to take their land unjustly.

The Taranaki War was also an opportunity for Te Karere Maori (and its alter-ego Te Manuhiri Tuarangi) to malign the Kingitanga. For example, in December, 1860, King Tawhiao, Tamihana and the moderate Kingitanga chiefs sent out a letter to its people calling on Waikato Māori to respect Pākehā living amongst them, and to adhere to the principles of the law. The letter, no doubt designed to keep its more turbulent followers in line specifically forbade any fighting in Waikato and South Auckland. However, realising the fait accompli of Taranaki, it conceded:

The tikanga for Taranaki is that while we are going there to fight, there is nothing wrong with our fighting there, because that place is clear, in these times, as a fighting place for Māori and Pākehā.

16 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1861:1-2; Te Haeata, 1/2/1861:1. Although similar in format, these are two different texts.

17 Te Haeata, 1/12/1860:1; Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:1; Te Karere Maori, 30/11/1860:5; Te Haeata, 1/12/1860:1.

18 Te Haeata, 1/12/1860:2; Te Karere Maori, 28/2/1861:9; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/3/1861:4-6.

19 Te Karere Maori, 31/12/1860:5-6. ‘Ko te tikanga ki Taranaki, i a matou e haere nei ki reira whawhai ai, kahore he he ki reira o ta matou whawhai, no te mea hoki kua marama a reira i enei takiwa hei whawhai nga ma te Maori ma te Pakeha.’; ‘The arrangement about Taranaki, where we are going for the purpose of fighting, is, that there is nothing wrong in our doing so, inasmuch as that place has been opened, in these times, as a battle ground for Maories and Pakehas.'
suppressed. All those who enter into that scornful activity will also receive his punishment.[LP]

As the Taranaki War drew to a close, Wiremu Tamihana travelled to Taranaki to get Māori combattants to cease fighting, and was granted a three day truce. *Te Haeata* was positive about his efforts, saying ‘There is one main point we can hear, that of Wiremu Tamihana, to leave the war for the head of the Queen’s council to determine.’

Although Tamihana convinced the Maori side to agree to cease fighting, he was unable to negotiate a withdrawal of the troops from Waitara. Neither would he go to Auckland to meet Grey. Neither side trusted each other.

The government did little to commend Tamihana’s peace making efforts. *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi* could only say ‘The armistice was granted, but, as nothing satisfactory transpired, the fighting was resumed on the fourth day’, giving all credit for the eventual peace to the government’s negotiator, McLean.

As the war ended, Te Rangitāke departed, perhaps unwillingly with Rewi Maniapoto to the Kingitanga, and the government made peace with Hapurona, the leading Te Āti Awa general. The deal gave Hapurona a pension and one of the British redoubts while the Governor could dispose of the Māori combattants’ land as he saw fit.

The English version of the agreement suggests capitulation by Te Āti Awa, so that ‘your sins would be erased.’ Crucially, where it states that Te Āti Awa must ‘submit’ to the Queen, the Maori text asked them to *whakaae* (agree).

The Taranaki and Ngāti Ruanui tribes had not made peace, and, because they had no direct association with the disputed land at Waitara, the government considered them to be more at fault than Te Āti Awa. Browne suggested terms for

21 *Te Karere Maori*, 31/12/1860:4. ‘E hoa ma, he rawa tenei whakaaro. Kahore ano i marama a Taranaki hei whawahitanga. Ko ta Wiremu Kingi ratou ko ona hoa whakauru, he whakahīhi ki te mana o te Kuini, a, ka tika kia pehia iho. Ko ratou katoa e uru atu ana ki taua māhi whakahīhi, mo ratou hoki tona whiu.’; ‘Friends, this is a fatal mistake. Taranaki is not a lawful fighting ground for the Waikato people. William King and his supporters are rebelling against the Queen’s authority and must be brought to submission. All who join in this rebellion will bring upon themselves its punishment.’

22 *Te Haeata*, 1/4/1861:1. ‘...kotahi te kupu nui i rongo ai matou, ko ta Wiremu Tamihana, kia waiho te pakanga ma te tino pane o te Kuini Runanga e whakarite...’

23 Stokes, pp 195-203.

24 *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 15/5/1861:2. ‘Na, whakaaetia ana taua takiwa e te Rangatira Hoia: otira, kahore ona ahatanga, kahore he tikanga kupu i puta ake i nga tangata, na reira ka timata ano te whahai i te wha o nga ra.’

25 Gorst (1908), p 143. Gorst describes Te Rangitāke’s situation as ‘a sort of honourable captivity at Kihikihi.’

26 Maxwell, p 59; Gorst (2001), pp 73-74.

27 *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi*, 15/5/1861:2. ‘...kia murua o koutou hara.’

28 The government considered the Waitara issue to be an issue between the Crown and Te Āti Awa. Ngāti Ruanui in particular received very little positive press in the Pākehā-run papers being seen as
these tribes ‘bearing in mind the evil acts that you have committed.’ However, the Māori translation mitigated the severity of the English version. Their unwarranted intrusion into the quarrel was, in English, ‘set[ting] the authority of the Queen and the Law at defiance’ but, in Māori, ‘making noa [profane] the Queen and the Law[LP].’

That they give ‘[e]ntire submission to the Queen and the Law’ became a requirement to ‘truly agree to the mana of the Queen and the Law[LP].’ However, these tribes remained defiant, becoming strong Kingitanga supporters. As Gorst makes plain, Te Ati Awa did not let the government survey their land, and their allies, Ngāti Ruanui, continued to hold Tātārāimaka. Relations remained strained. In 1862, Te Karere Maori felt the need to publicly castigate Hapurona for his continued hostility, which it blamed on alcohol.

Brownes’s post-war vision

As the Taranaki War was concluding, however unsatisfactorily, Brown turned his attentions on the Kingitanga. On 21st May 1861, he issued an ultimatum to Waikato, which was published in Te Manuhiri Tuarangi the following month. On 25th May he sent a letter to his Council explaining his vision for Māori governance which the paper published in August. The two documents are linked, the latter saying:

the Māori people seeking a tikanga of government for themselves will not turn to us in cooperation, because this thing causing anxiety, the tikanga of the Māori King, is still operating. But when that is dead, and when the Queen’s mana is truly constituted, then [we] can begin among the people a tikanga of law which they will cherish and agree to.[LP]

being uncivilised, superstitious, irreligious, obstructive and murderous. See Te Karete o Poneke, 5/11/1857:3; 7/6/1858:2; Te Karere Maori, 31/3/1860:1-5; 30/4/1860:5-6; 31/5/1860:5; 20/7/1862:7-10. Such did Bishop Selwyn feel about the condition of Ngāti Ruanui, that he visited them in 1862, with the express desire ‘to take out the grub from the hearts of the people’ [ki te tango i te mokoroa i roto i te ngakau o te tangata].

29 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:5. ‘tenei ano ahau te mahara nei ki nga mahi kino kua mahia e koutou.’ ‘In dictating these terms, I cannot overlook the outrages you have committed.’

30 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:5. ‘...kua whakanoa te mana o te Kuini, o te Ture ano hoki...’

31 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:6. ‘Me tino whakaae pono koutou ki te mana o te Kuini, o te Ture ano hoki.’

32 See Te Karete o Poneke, 20/7/1862:9-10.

33 Gorst (2001), p 74.

34 Te Karete o Poneke, 13/3/1862:11-12

35 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/8/1861:2. ‘Ko nga tangata Maori e rapu ana i tetahi tikanga-kawanatanga mo ratou, ekore rawa e tahuri mai ki a tatou hei hoa-mahi, i te mea e tu tonu nei tenei mea-whakatupato, te tikanga Kingi Maori. Otira, ko tena kia mate, kia tino whakauria hoki te mana o te Kuini, i reira, ka timata rawa te mahi i roto i nga tangata, i tetahi tikanga ture, e whakapaingia ana, e whakaaetia ata e ratou.; ’So long as the dangerous element; contained in the King movement remains
In his Declaration to Waikato, Browne asserted that he was pointing out 'the course necessary to be taken in order to avert the calamities that threaten the country.' He had watched the Kingitanga form, and had hoped for the best, that Māori would see the errors of a separate mana. This new mana, he considered, violated the Treaty of Waitangi. They had without due cause entered into the Taranaki dispute, had interfered with the carriage of justice, stopped mail services, and engaged in other activities against the Queen’s mana. The Queen, he said, had instructed him to suppress such ‘unlawful combinations’. The demands within this document resembled the terms demanded of the Taranaki and Ngāti Ruanui tribes, that they submit to the Queen’s mana and law. However, it also included an exposition on the protective nature of the Queen’s maru, together with the Māori translation of the English version of the Treaty. The governor hoped the Kingitanga would abandon its ‘perilous position’. If they agreed to his demands, all would be forgiven.

In his letter to his Council, Browne laid down his plans for kāwanatanga.

I certainly agree with what the Assembly said, “that good arrangements be laid down for the Māori, based on their own agreement, and that those arrangements be given to them, for them to support, and put into practice.” Moreover, that boundaries be set for the large tribal districts, and to appoint one or more Māori chiefs in those districts as writers and talkers to the government. In addition, to establish Māori rūmanga properly to have mana to lay out tikanga for the minor matters of their district, and to set up a court to make known the tikanga of Māori tribes, and to write them down.

unsubdued, so long will any assistance offered to the Natives in their search for better Government, be received with indifference, and attended with little or no result; but when the supremacy of the Queen is fully established, the first step to be taken should be the initiation of a system by which the Natives may be governed through themselves. [TMT]

36 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/6/1861:1. ‘...i te ara e tika ai e ora ai tatou i nga aitua e tu mai nei i to tatou aroaro.’
37 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/6/1861:3. ‘...ngā hono e tika kē ana i te Ture.’
38 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/6/1861:6. ‘...tunga whakamataku...’
39 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 1/6/1861:7. The Kingitanga responded to this ultimatum. For example, see Tamihana’s letter in Chapter 7 in which he justifies the existence of the Kingitanga.
40 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/8/1861:2. ‘E whakaae tonu ana au ki te kupu a te Runanga, e ki ana, “kia whakatakotoria nga ritenga pai mo nga Maori, i runga ano i to tikanga-whakae; a kia tukua iho ena ritenga ki a ratou, ma ratou hoki e takih, e whakamana.” Tetahi, kia takoto nga rohe mo nga whenua nui o nga iwi Maori; a kia whakaturia tetahi Rangatira Maori, e hia ranei, ki roto ano ki aua rohe, hei kai-tuhituhi, hei kai-korero ki te Kawanatanga. Tetahi, kia whakaritea tikatia nga Runanga Maori, kia whai mana ai te whakatakoto tikanga mo nga mea ririki o tona Tiriwa: a kia whakaturia tetahi Kooti hei whakamohio mai i nga tikanga o nga iwi Maori, kia tuhituhia hoki ki te pukapuka.’ ‘I entirely agree with the House of Representatives in thinking “that Institutions for the Native people ought to be based on their free assent, and committed to their guardianship;” that Native territory ought to be divided into districts, and, if possible, one or more Chiefs in each, appointed to act as organs of communication with the Government; that the Runanga lawfully constituted should have power to recommend regulations for the local affairs of the district; that measures ought to be taken for the ascertainment and registration of tribal rights.”
He intended to canvass these issues at the next Kohimarama, to see whether his plans were feasible, in particular whether Māori chiefs would cooperate as government agents.41

Browne also planned a census, both of individuals and land, and develop methods whereby local courts could easily rule on land ownership, allowing easier subdivision. Chiefs would become trustees of tribal land, with the authority to alienate it. Land purchasing would stop for the time being, except in peaceful areas. He also wanted better trained, and bilingual officers within the Native Department, and resident Pākehā officials in the field who would assist in the civilisation of Māori. He also saw a need for a more comprehensive, local education system under government administration, and roads into the restive Māori districts.42 It was a comprehensive vision, designed to incorporate Māori into the government at the lowest level, and much of it was instituted in years to come. However, he considered that the Kingitanga had to end before he could institute his plans, and since they were unlikely to do this voluntarily, Browne would face another divisive and expensive war.43 However, his replacement, Grey, had other plans.

Voices of dissent
Renata Kawepō

Some Māori chiefs were critical of the government’s handling of the Taranaki dispute, as they considered that, by supporting Teira over Te Rangitāke, the government was setting a new precedent in its land purchasing policy by ignoring chiefly mana. In November 1860, one Māori chief, Rēnata Kawepō of Ngāti Kahungunu, publicly debated the issue with Thomas Fitzgerald, then Hawkes Bay superintendent. Kawepō, a progressive chief and devout Anglican, who had earlier supported Moananui against Hāpuku’s land selling in the Wairarapa in the late 1850s, wanted any land sales to be unanimous tribal decisions.44 Kawepō was therefore sympathetic to the Kingitanga’s opposition to land-sales, but, in his speech attacked the government for inconsistency – it argued that Māori should follow the rule of law, but then attacked Te Rangitāke over Waitara rather than hold an enquiry. Rēnata and

41 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/8/1861:3.
42 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/8/1861:3-9.
43 The commander of the British troops, General Cameron estimated that a war to subdue the Waikato would cost at least £1,000,000. See AJHR (1862) El, Sec II, No 4.
Fitzgerald’s speeches were published, but Rēnata, unhappy with how Fitzgerald had attacked his speech point by point, replied in a letter, in which he answered Fitzgerald. The two original speeches were again printed with Kawepō’s reply in both Māori and English. As the publication is foreworded with a note from Kawepō verifying the authenticity, it is possible he himself was responsible for the publication.

Kawepō fulminated on many of the issues that ranked with him and other Māori: the previous Wairarapa purchases which had caused the feuding within Ngāti Kahungunu; the government’s recourse to war in Taranaki instead of submitting the issue to enquiry, and of supporting the tūtū Teira instead of the chief Te Rangitāke; the craven behaviour of the chiefs, “Lick-Plates”, at Kohimarama; and Pākehā racism. Kawepō also defended the establishment of the Kingitanga due to the lack of government interest in Waikato. Blame, he considered, should not be placed on the Kingitanga for events in Taranaki: such a suggestion was merely an attempt by the government to hide its own guilt. The government’s actions, he believed, had abrogated the Treaty of Waitangi.

Moreover, the Treaty of Waitangi has failed. That Treaty is said to be a Covenant lest we be taken by some foreign peoples. Those bad people did not come to attack us. The attack on us came from among you, the people who made that Covenant.

The Māori language press chose not to discuss Rēnata’s letters directly, although they were covered by the English language papers. The government no doubt would have preferred to ignore such comprehensive criticism. However, three months after the release of the second letter, Te Manuhiri Tuarangi printed an article as a rebuttal, indicating that Kawepō had been successful in distributing his message. No doubt mindful of Kawepō’s standing in the Wairarapa, at a time when

---

44 See the letter from Moananui, Kawepō and others in Te Karere o Poneke, 24/12/1857:3-4.
45 He Niupepa Tenei hei Whakaatu i nga Korero i Korerotia ki te Hui ki te Pa whakairo i te 7 o nga ra o Nowema, 1860, na Renata, na Pitihera i tuhi. (n.l.: n.d.)
47 Renata Kawepō’s Letter Answering the Letter of Thomas Fitzgerald, The Superintendent of Napier, H.B. På Whakairo, February 1861. Folios 30 & 31, McDonnell Papers, MS-Papers-0150 [MS-Copy-Micro-0651-4], Alexander Turnbull Library. ‘Inahokī kua he ano te Tiriti o Waitangi, i kia ra hokī ko taua tirīti he Kavenata kei tikina mai e etahi iwi ke, te tae mai aua iwi kino ki te patu i a matou. Ka puta tonu mai i roto i a koutou i te iwi naana taua Kavenata nei te patu i a matou.’; ‘For behold, the Treaty of Waitangi has been broken. It is said that that Treaty was to protect the Maoris from foreign invasion. But those bad scoundrels never came here to attack us: the blow fell from amongst you yourselves, the nation that made that same Treaty’. These folios contain hand-written copies, and translations, of Kawepō’s letters.
48 Ko Aotearoa, 1861:24.
49 Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/5/1861:6-8.
Governor Browne was planning a military campaign against Waikato, the paper chose to gently chide Kawepō, suggesting

\[\text{[h]e is a thoughtful man, and of a good disposition towards his race: but his thoughts have now become one-sided, and he has given way to murmuring at everything which is done by the Government.}\]

He was, the paper said, forgetting all the benefits that Pākehā had brought to the Māori. Without quoting a single word from Kawepō's letters, the article assured the readers that 'no new system of land purchase has been adopted at Taranaki' and it was slander to suggest otherwise. Most of Kawepō's concerns were either ignored, or barely touched on, as the paper sought to limit the effects of Kawepō's fulminations.

Charles Davis

The only Pākehā editor who displayed sympathy for the Kingitanga or Te Rangitāke was Charles Davis, but his comments were circumspect in his first two newspapers, *Te Waka o te Iwi* and *Te Whetu of te Tau*. However, he became more forthright in projecting his viewpoints in his annual, *Ko Aotearoa*, which appeared in January of 1861 and 1862. Davis, like other Pākehā editors, called for peace, but on religious grounds which could be applied to both Crown and Māori, that war was against God’s will and an impediment to God’s millenium, rather than because Māori needed to submit themselves to the Queen’s mana. In the 1861 journal, while the war was still in progress, Davis was brief in his political comments, but they betray a sympathy for the Kingitanga and Te Rangitāke, especially in the Māori text. He commended Sir William Martin for his 'very fine book' on the Taranaki War. He mentioned 'Numerous tribes desiring goodness' writing to the Queen for the removal of Browne as governor, and Kawepō’s speech on 'the matters distressing the Māori tribes'. Finally he asked, 'in March 1859, the question came up “Has the land being quarreled over in Taranaki been throughly investigated yet?” The question has not been answered right up to the present time.'
Davis also published a biographical article on “Matutaera Potatau” (King Tawhiao) extolling his whakapapa, but without once mentioning his position of king, or the involvement of the Kingitanga at Taranaki. Davis optimistically portrayed a beneficent and peaceful chieftain.

Matutaera is...strictly adhering to Potatau’s motto, “Religion, love, and law;” and earnestly endeavouring to carry out the dying injunction of the most influential personage, perhaps, of his generation. And this injunction was none other than to maintain by every possible means, friendly relations with the Government of the country, and the European settlers spread over the land.\(^4\)

In 1862, with the war over, and Governor Browne replaced by Grey, Davis was much more forthright concerning Taranaki. He printed an account of Teira’s confession that Te Rangitāke had been responsible for the shares of many absentee tribespeople, and that he (Teira) had no right to sell.\(^5\) Davis also savagely attacked former Governor Browne, of whom ‘not a single good thing could be discerned’.\(^6\)

He favoured ignorant and evil-hearted Pākehā; they perverted his judgement; and the end result of his deranged behaviour was the flowing of Pākehā and Māori blood upon Taranaki.\(^7\)

Davis was a lone voice among the Pākehā editors of Māori newspapers. However, as indicated in Chapter One, his support for Grey earned him the editorship of *Te Karere Maori*, a position that curtailed his independent political stance.

**Governor Grey**

Grey eschewed war, but his goals were the same as Browne’s, to gain Māori compliance to the government, by encouraging those who already expressed their loyalty to the Queen’s mana, and by converting, or isolating those who had not. His policy was thus two-fold: to simultaneously undermine the Kingitanga as the mouthpiece of Māori opposition, and to institute a new system of supposed Māori self-

---

\(^4\) Ko Aotearoa, 1861:8-9. ‘E tapapa ana a Matutaera ki runga kite kupu pepeha a Potatau i mea nei “Ki ahau te Whakapono, te Aroha, me te Ture.” A, e uekaha ana ia ki te whakarite i te kupu whakamutunga a Potatau, te tangata i nui rawa ake tona mea pea i nga tangata katoa o tona whakatupuranga. Na, ko taua kupu tenei a Po, kia whakaaro nui te iwi ki te whakatakoto tikanga e tupu ai te rangimarie ki te Kawanatanga, ki nga Pakeha katoa hoki, e noho haere ana i runga i te mata o te whenua.’

\(^5\) Ko Aotearoa, 1862:2, 31. Teira denied this accusation. See Chapter 1.

\(^6\) Ko Aotearoa, 1862:17-18. ‘...kia whakaaro tētahi pai nui ana...’

\(^7\) Ko Aotearoa, 1862:17-18. ‘Ko nga pakeha kuare me nga pakeha ngakau kino i paingia e ia; na ratou i whakariroiate tona whakaaro; a te mutunga o tana mahi poaau, ko te rewanga o te toto Pakeha, Maori, ki runga o Taranaki.’
government, the *Tikanga Hou*, which would bring further chiefs onto its payrolls and into its influence.

**The Kingitanga and Taranaki**

Grey used *Te Karere Maori* to further both his political goals of undermining the Kingitanga, and promoting his *Tikanga Hou*. Surprisingly, once Grey returned, the Wesleyan *Te Haeata*, which had supported Browne wholeheartedly, largely removed itself from the political debates, concentrating on its social and religious messages in its last six months. In December, 1861, Grey paid a visit to Kōhanga and Taupari, Māori settlements near the mouth of the Waikato River, on the frontier between “Kuininitanga” and Kingitanga domains. There he discussed the *Tikanga Hou* with the loyal chiefs and, as described in Chapter 7, received their *mana tipuna*. He also used his time there to engage several Kingitanga chiefs in debates which *Te Karere Maori* subsequently printed in early February, 1862. These debates were reported extensively and as if verbatim, giving the impression of disinterested reporting. However, it was the governor who framed questions for the chiefs, in the manner of an aggressive and hostile interviewer. Grey sought to elicit statements from the Kingitanga chiefs which could be portrayed as either inconsistent, or bellicose. The reader also had no way of knowing how much of the discussion was changed or omitted.

On 12th December at Kōhanga, Grey debated with the Kingitanga orator, Herewini, trying to draw from him definitive statements concerning who the Kingitanga was purporting to represent. Herewini was attempting to project peaceful intentions but the questioning forced him to claim repeatedly that Māori tribes, in general, were not against the Kingitanga. This gave Grey room to enquire whether

---

58 The original name, *Te Karere Maori*, was reinstated in December 1861. 59 Despite the Wesleyans generally supporting the government’s actions after Browne’s departure, Buddie was certainly not as close to Grey as he was to Browne. Once the war erupted in 1863, he was less than helpful. He wrote to Grey in May 1863 objecting to the conscription of lay readers and the sons of missionaries lest Māori misconstrue the relationship of the Church to the government. Thomas Buddie to Governor Grey, 15/5/1863. Thomas Buddie Letterbooks, Micro-MS-0778 [Alexander Turnbull Library]. Similarly, he objected to the placement of a military canteen on Wesleyan land at Papakura in August, 1863. Thomas Buddie to the Minister of War, 5/8/1863. Thomas Buddie Letterbooks, Micro-MS-0778 [Alexander Turnbull Library].

60 See Chapter 7.

61 According to Atkinson, Bell claimed that the published accounts of Grey’s speeches concerning Ngāti Ruanui were different from the first reports. *The Richmond-Atkinson Papers*, Vol 1, p 741.

62 This meeting is reported in *Te Karere Maori*, 5/2/1862:1-7.
Ngā Pūhi, or even Ngāti Tīpā of Waikato, had accepted the King, and what the King’s intentions were towards the unwilling. Herewini was unable to answer to the governor’s satisfaction, so he called on another Waikato chief to respond. Te Whī Panawaka took up the challenge, and after some prevarication, stated that the Kingitanga would not threaten those tribes who stood opposed. Grey then claimed he was satisfied.

I felt some anxiety to know whether you intended to force your king on tribes who did not want him, because I should have been obliged to protect them from such a course of things; but now my mind is at ease. I don’t care what you call him; king or chief, I do not mind him. What I shall now do is to set to work with all the Chiefs who will help me, and do all the good I can; and those who will not aid me, I shall not care for. I shall look upon each Chief as the king of his own tribe; and if two or more tribes come and say, “This is our king,” like the king of the Ngapuhi and other tribes, I shall say, “Well, if you like to give up your Chieftainship to another man, well and good, I shall not care.” I shall have twenty kings in New Zealand before long; and those kings who work with me shall be wealthy kings, and kings of wealthy peoples.

To Karere Māori also reported on Grey’s address, four days later, to Māori who had assembled at nearby Taupari. It was a wide-ranging speech on both the Kingitanga and the Tikanga Hou, and he was at pains to emphasise that he had returned for the benefit of all, Māori and Pākehā, answering only to God. Neither would he attack the Waikato: they could rest in goodness and peace. However, his attitude to the Kingitanga was harder than at the earlier meeting. He stressed his ‘mana kawana’ which precluded any Māori, including the King, from standing above the law. Grey also accused the King of being mixed up with law-breakers, and as governor, he could not cooperate with Māori chiefs until they abandoned the Kingitanga. Grey then stressed his Tikanga Hou, including the salaries that cooperating chiefs might receive.

Several chiefs spoke words of welcome, but one, Tipene, stood to defend the Kingitanga, with his debate with Grey comprising seven pages of the To Karere

---

63 Te Karere Māori, 5/2/1862:5-6. ‘I awangawanga au. I hua au, tera pea e rere koutou ki runga ki nga iwi e whakahawe ana i to koutou kingi, ki te pehi i a ratou kia tangohia ai to kingi hei kingi mo ratou. Mei pera hoki, kua whakaaro au, maku ratou e tiki i runga i tena tikanga. Ko tenei, kua ora taku ngakau. He mea noa ki au te inoan mono; ki te huaina e koe hei kingi, hei rangatira ranei, hei aha maku? Kahore aku whakaaro ki a ia. Ko taku tenei e mea ai inaianei, ka tahuri au ki nga rangatira e awhi ana i ahu, a ka mahi au i te pai. Ko te hunga kahore e tahuri mai ki te awhi i ahu, kahore whakaarohia e ahu. Akuanei, ki taku titiro, ko ia rangatira ko ia rangatira te kingi mo tona hapu ake. A ko ki te haere mai etahi o enei hapu ki ahu, e rua e toru ranei, a ka mea “Ko to matou kingi tēnei” kia pera me te kingi o Ngapuhi, o era atu iwi, ka mea atu ahau ki a ratou, “Ki te pai koutou ki te tuku i to koutou rangatiratanga, e pai ana, he ei aha maku?” Ekore e roa ka rua tekau (20) aku kingi i roto i Niu Tirani. Engari hoki nga kingi e mahi tahi ana ki ahu, ka whai rawa, ka whai rawa ano hoki o ratou iwi.’
64 Te Karere Māori 5/2/1862:8.
65 Te Karere Māori, 5/2/1863:8-13.
Maori. As at Kohanga, Grey attempted to trap the chief into making an inappropriate statement, raising the issue of whom the Kingitanga represented, and how they felt about land sales. Grey’s questioning elicited a response from Tipene that should a group of Māori place their land under the King’s mana, then subsequently decide to sell the land to the government, the Kingitanga would fight for that land. The two men argued over the Taranaki war, and then the benefits of the Kingitanga. Tipene stressed the positive outcomes of the King’s rule, and the wide ranging support the movement enjoyed. Gorst considered that the Waikato chiefs had indeed wanted a straight answer from Grey concerning his intentions towards the Kingitanga, which he refused to give. Gorst also stated that Grey announced his intention to resume the construction of the road towards Waikato. Although some Māori expressed their fear that the government would use the road for military purposes, Grey’s announcement was not explicitly stated in the newspaper.

The publishing of these discussions proved an effective propaganda exercise because Grey had managed to elicit statements from the Kingitanga which could be used against them, but gave little away himself. In May, the newspaper returned to the issue,

[We] beg to call the attention of our readers also, to the letters from Puketawa, Te Umuroa, and other places, relative to the speeches of Tipene Tahatika and Te Herewini, of Waikato, on the occasion of the Governor’s visit to Kohanga, Waikato Heads, in December, 1861.

The initial publications had prompted several Māori hui in Taranaki and Waipau, resulting in six letters to the newspaper disputing the Kingitanga claims. The paper published another letter in the same vein from the same Taranaki rūnanga several months later. While it is likely these letters derived from as few as two kāinga, the impression was of a more widespread disapproval of the Kingitanga’s message.

Te Karere Maori was happy to print letters, or report speeches by Māori rejecting or disparaging the Kingitanga. These supported its position that the Kingitanga was a movement with little support outside the Upper Waikato. For

66 Te Karere Maori, 5/2/1862:13-20.
68 Te Karere Maori, 5/2/1862:15, 22.
69 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:2. ‘Me anga te titiro o nga kai korero ki nga pukapuka o Puketawa, o Te Umuroa, me era atu wahi, kei tetahi atu wharangi o tenei nupepa. E ahu ana aua kupu ki nga whai Korero a Tipene raua ko Te Herewini, i te huia ai ki te Kawana ki Kohanga, i te wahapu o Waikato, i Tihema 1861.’
70 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:10-16.
example, the rūnanga of Pōpokorua in Taranaki wrote in, no doubt in response to the Kōhanga discussions, to say that they had never belonged to the Kingitanga. The motivations for writing in these letters were probably diverse. Some, such as the chiefs of Pōpokorua, lived near hapū that had joined the King, and no doubt wanted to ensure that their non-adherence was noted. They had also recently supported Te Rangitāke because of whakapapa ties, and they wanted the government to know that they were now no longer in arms. The newspaper was prepared to accept the testimony of those returning to the fold. Wiremu Parāone of Masterton wrote about ‘our unauthorized acceptance of the king system which we now see as wrong.’ However, for those rangatira who were distant from Waikato, and from Taranaki, such as of Ngāti Porou, their letters against the movement would have been less driven by fear, but through a desire for good relations with the government. Ngā Puhi antipathy towards the King stemmed from long established support for the government. Whatever the motivation of these Māori, Te Karere Maori added their comments to its own anti-Kingitanga propaganda.

Soon after the Taupari meeting, the Premier, William Fox, travelled further south and attempted to meet Tamihana in order to arrange an enquiry into Waitara. The meeting did not eventuate, leading Fox to believe that Tamihana had deliberately evaded him. Tamihana subsequently wrote a letter in which he refused his consent for an enquiry because he had no inkling of the Governor’s motives.

This is the only thing that stops it. I do not know the thoughts of the Governor. We might waste time investigating, and afterwards there would be fighting at some other part.

During the Taranaki war, it had been Māori who had been most insistent that an enquiry be held. Fox therefore believed that Tamihana’s refusal was a deliberate attempt to retain a source of discord between the races. Tamihana may have genuinely felt aggrieved at the sly manner of the new governor. He may also have known that he could not get Te Rangitāke to agree to an enquiry while under the

71 Te Karere Maori, 1/7/1862:11-12.
72 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:12-13.
73 Te Mamihiri Tuarangi, 29/11/1861:20-22, 24; Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:16.
74 Te Mamihiri Tuarangi, 15/1/1862:10-19.
75 For example, see Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:10-19.
77 Stokes, p 268.
control of the more militant Rewi Maniapoto. Indeed, Fox was unable to make any way with his proposal when face to face with Te Rangitāke and Rewi at Hangatiki.  

Surprisingly, given that Te Karere Maori at times printed Māori letters to which they could add a damaging interpretation, it did not publish Tamihana’s letter. It did make some capital out of it nevertheless. Soon after, Fox, promoting the Tikanga Hou at Napier, was confronted by Rēnata Kawepō, who stated that Hawkes Bay Māori had been sympathetic towards the Kingitanga because they had similar land disputes to that which sparked the Taranaki War, and were fearful the governor would turn on them next. Kawepō stated that he was happier now that Grey had returned, but asked when Waitara, ‘the root of all the evil’ would be investigated. Fox told of Tamihana’s letter, saying ‘Let all the Maoris see who it is that stops the road of peace: that it is William Thompson and the Waikato Maoris, and not the Governor and the Pakehas.’ Kawepō and others ‘were very much surprised’ and resolved to write to Tamihana to find out if this was indeed true. The paper continued,

[...]the Ahuriri Maories think that Thompson has made a fool of them, and of their loving friends the Pakehas, who assisted them in fighting the battle of words with Governor Browne. In December, Teira and his friends at Waitara, utilised Tamihana’s refusal to their advantage, sending letters to both Fox and the official, Henry Halse, subsequently printed in Te Karere Maori, calling on the government to conduct the enquiry anyway.

Te Karere Maori’s vituperation of the Kingitanga continued, but not in a consistent fashion, probably to avoid giving the movement undue attention. For example, the August 1862 issue of 24 pages, dominated by Tikanga Hou, contained only two pages specifically attacking the Kingitanga’s activities. However, one less overt article also appeared in that August issue which Māori might have interpreted as relevant to the government’s relationship with the Kingitanga. The article detailed the
size and expenditure of European armies. While the article was ostensibly general knowledge, the information was most likely an attempt to intimidate potential Māori enemies. ⁸⁵

*Te Karere Maori*’s next attack on the Kīngitanga did not occur until March, 1863, with articles reprinted from *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke*. ⁸⁶ This March issue contained a number of letters between Grey and Kīngitanga leaders. One, from Taati Te Waru dated 22nd January, asked Grey not to send troops into Tātaraimaka, as he and Tamihana had written to Ngāti Ruanui asking them to vacate the land. ⁸⁷ These Kīngitanga moderates may well have expected the return of Waitara to Māori to precede the governor’s re-possession of the Crown land at Tātaraimaka, or may have felt a resolution in Taranaki was more likely if the land was vacant. Grey’s reply (14th March) followed, in which he praised their efforts, saying,

> but I shall go upon Tataraimaka, and therefore I say, let your works be performed first, and the works of Tamehana, and good men, so that it may dwell with this land, so that the people may dwell in peace. ⁸⁸

Within a week of this newspaper’s publication, troops had taken Tātaraimaka, while still occupying the Pekapeka block at Waitara. Grey may have considered that he had negotiated sufficiently with Maori. He may have imagined that Māori would consider his actions as decisive, but Taranaki Māori saw them as provocative. ⁸⁹ Nevertheless, *Te Karere Maori* had been able to imply that Grey had reoccupied Tātaraimaka with the approval of the moderate Kīngitanga leaders.

Taranaki Māori, perhaps waiting for Waitara to be returned, did not react immediately to the seizure of Tātaraimaka. No doubt, Grey had thought he had achieved his aims successfully. *Te Karere Maori* of 20th April trumpeted his success, that contrary to the fears of some, ‘[t]he Ngatiruanuis and Taranakis have in this matter acted simply as all right minded men should do’. ‘[M]ay it not be reasonably expected’ asked the paper ‘that the same law of mutual kindness, brotherly feeling,
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⁸⁸ *Te Karere Maori*, 30/3/1863:20. ‘...otia, ka haere a au ki runga o Tataraimaka, no reira ka mea a au kia hohoro to mahi, i mua, me nga mahi o Tamehana, o nga tangata pai, kia noho pai te whenua nei, kia noho marire.’
⁸⁹ Jane Maria Atkinson, for example, states that Grey and his agents had been ‘endeavouring to obtain the permission of the Natives for the reoccupation of our own land, Tataraimakah]. Whether the private coaxing or our appearance of strength has been most effectual I cannot say but on the 4th the troops boldly took possession of our own land unopposed.’ Richmond-Atkinson Papers, Vol 2, p 35.
and healing influences, will soon prevail throughout New Zealand[?]. However, after waiting a month, Ngāti Ruanui attacked and killed a group of soldiers at Ōakura. Gorst writes that ‘the deed, though brutal, was not treacherous.’ The government had been warned, but had paid no heed.

Although the May issue of Te Karere Maori was published eleven days after the killing at Ōakura, surprisingly, it ignored that incident completely. The paper only mentioned the Kingitanga obliquely when Wiremu Nēra was commended for his work on the Whāingaroa to Waipā road despite the opposition of ‘Māori who are not friendly to the iwi working on this road’. This assessment may have been premature, as according to Arthur Atkinson, the building of the road stopped after the Kingitanga threatened to fight. The remaining content of that issue gave no indication that interactions between Māori and Pākehā were anything but normal. The final article, a short piece on the population of British India, was perhaps designed to show Māori the futility of resisting the British.

In June, Te Karere Maori finally turned to these issues. The paper blamed the Kingitanga for the resumption of war in Taranaki, publishing an open letter sent to King Tāwhiao and the moderate Waikato chiefs in early May. The murderers, the letter asserted, had been acting in the King’s name, and so it was time for the Kingitanga to renounce them completely. This article was followed by a proclamation from Governor Grey, dated 11th May, stating that the government was no longer buying Waitara because of new (unstated) information. The new information was that Teira had admitted Te Rangitāke’s right in Waitara. Gorst states that this information emerged soon after Grey’s seizure of Tātāraimāka in April 1863, although Davis discussed a supposed “confession” by Teira in Ko Aotearoa as early as January, 1862. The tardiness in restoring Waitara precipitated the resumption of war in Taranaki, and according to Gorst, in the light of the Ōakura
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90 Te Karere Maori, 20/4/1863:1-3. ‘I penei te mahi o Ngatiruanui o Taranaki i runga i tenei mea, me ta nga tangata whakaaro tika katoa.’ ‘...ekore ianei te ngakau e manakonako ki te putanga o te ture atawhai, whakateina, whakamahu, ki nga takiwa katoa o Niu Tiren!’
92 Te Karere Maori, 15/5/1863:3. ‘...nga Maori kaore nei i whakahoa mai ki te iwi mahi i tua ara.’; ‘...in the face of much opposition from unfriendly Natives, [TRM]’
93 Richmond-Atkinson Papers, Vol 1, p 761.
94 Te Karere Maori, 15/5/1863:16.
96 Te Karere Maori, 1/6/1863:5.
killings, Māori now saw the restoration as a sign of weakness.\textsuperscript{99} The June issue of \textit{Te Karere Maori} would have done nothing to change this perception.

\textit{Ngā Tikanga Hou}

In 1858, the New Zealand Parliament passed the Native Districts Regulations Act and the Native District Circuit Courts Act. As \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} explained, these were ‘laws empowering the Māori tribes of the interior living separately from the Pākehā system’,\textsuperscript{100} that is, those tribes whose lands were still held under native title. The governor would not impose these laws on a district, said \textit{Te Karere Maori}, ‘except where he has good reason to believe that the inhabitants are sincere and unanimous in desiring it.’\textsuperscript{101} Both \textit{Te Karere Maori} and \textit{Te Karere o Poneke} published these laws in instalments, translated into an unnatural Māori legalese.\textsuperscript{102} Under the first law, Māori rūnanga could make by-laws, and impose fines, on a variety of social and property related offences.\textsuperscript{103} The second Act enabled the establishment of Native Circuit Courts under Resident Magistrates, assisted by Māori assessors. Once native title was extinguished, either through granting a Crown title, or through sale, this half-way system was removed, and Māori fell under the full weight of the Queen’s \textit{mana kāwanatanga}. Ward suggests that the magistrates appointed had variable success in hearing cases, but the system faltered because officials were also expected to promote land sales.\textsuperscript{104}

Grey’s \textit{Tikanga Hou}, or “New Institutions”, were in fact a more complex form of this existing system, and used the 1858 Acts as the basis to work from. \textit{Te Karere Maori} released the details in December 1861, portraying the system as a semi-autonomous local government. Districts would be established along tribal boundaries, each district possessing a rūnanga of chiefs making decisions on local matters, including land disputes and schools, subject to the governor’s approval. The governor would appoint a Pākehā \textit{Tumuaki Whakahaere} (Civil Commissioner) to instruct local

\textsuperscript{98} Ko Aotearoa, 1862:2, 31.
\textsuperscript{99} Gorst (2001), p 151.
\textsuperscript{100} Te Karere o Poneke, 22/11/1858:2. ‘...he ture whakamana mo nga iwi maori o te tuawhenua e noho motuhake nei i te hanga pakeha.’
\textsuperscript{101} Te Karere Maori, 15/9/1858:1. ‘...kia tino kitea e ia te pono o te hiahia o te hunga e noho ana i tua wahi kia peratia, me te kotuitanga o te whakaaro.’
\textsuperscript{102} Te Karere Maori, 15/9/1858:2-5; 30/9/1858:1-5; 15/10/1858:1-5; 30/10/1858:1-4; 16/11/1858:1-3; Te Karere o Poneke, 22/11/1858:2-3; 29/11/1858:3-4; 20/12/1858:2-3; 27/12/1858:3.
\textsuperscript{103} For example, see Te Karere Maori, 15/9/1858:2-4.
Māori, and to head the rūnanga. The district would also be divided into “hundreds” each under a Māori assessor who could decide small cases, and enforce his decisions with a small police force. The December issue also published the boundaries of Upper Waikato, the very heart of the Kingitanga, under the two 1858 Acts, thus indicating that the government expected the Tikanga Hou to cover to all Māori districts, not just those which were willing. For the next 14 months, flurries of ‘Orders in Council’ laid out the boundaries of most of the North Island, and in some cases, the establishment of hundreds.

In early November, 1861, Grey toured Northland to present his plans to Ngā Puhi, a ten day event reported in the 15th January issue of Te Karere Maori. The tour was meant to impress: Grey arrived in a warship, accompanied not only by Premier Fox, but also General Cameron. On his arrival at Kororareka, ‘a multitude had assembled there, Māori and Pākehā, to honour him.’ The newspaper stressed the esteem Māori held for Grey. On the journey from Kerikeri to Waimate, ‘[t]hey were escorted by about 200 Native horsemen, and when near that place they were met by 200 more riding in military order and with the Union Jack flying, and great were the cheers which resounded on every side.’ At the Hokianga, his arrival was announced with cannons and small arms. Northland, an area of early European settlement, was considered not only knowledgeable in tikanga Pākehā but also more loyal than some more southern tribes. Te Karere Maori extensively published the Māori speeches to Grey from chiefs at Kororareka and Kerikeri. At times, the chiefs employed religious metaphors of Grey bringing salvation, and wiping their sins clean. Māori readers were left in little doubt that Ngā Puhi would support the Tikanga Hou. Grey had expended much effort in the North to ensure success,
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105 Te Karere Maori, 16/12/1861:5-8.
106 Te Karere Maori, 16/12/1861:1-3.
108 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:1-3
109 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:1. ‘...kua mine mai hoki ki reira te tini o te tangata, te Maori me te Pakeha, hei whakahonore ia ia ia; ’he was received by the whole population, the Natives and Europeans [who were] vying with each other to do him honour."
110 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:2. ‘E rua rau pea o te Maori eke hoioi hei arakata i a ratou ; a ka mea ano, ka tata ki te kainga, e rua hoki nga rau ka tutaki i a ratou, he mea haere rarangi i runga i te kuri, me te Kara nui o te Kuini e rerere ana i waenga, a nui rawa atu te turituri a te umere i puta ake i nga tangata katoa.’
111 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:10-19.
knowing that if his new tikanga was not accepted there, they would not work anywhere.

Grey was active in promoting his tikanga elsewhere. At Kōhanga, discussed above, he explained the new system to the chiefs of Lower Waikato. At a Christmas party at Waiuku, the governor again expounded his plans, and selected assessors and wardens (police chiefs) from the Māori present. He and Fox also undertook tours of other parts of the North Island, promoting the new system. Grey also used Te Karere Māori to promote the new system, with some success. A tribal rūnanga at Aotea, for example, wrote expressing their support for the Tikanga Hou after they had read Te Karere Maori out loud to the meeting. When Fox spoke to Māori at Napier, he said that those who read the newspaper would know that a tumuaki would soon be sent. Once established, the newly established district Rūnanga also wanted their deliberations printed. Te Karere Maori strived to show that Māori approved and accepted Grey’s schemes, and included reports on rūnanga elections and meetings, and letters from Māori publicly accepting the new tikanga.

The newspaper also wanted to portray the new rūnanga as being successful in their activities, that is in dealing with the lawlessness plaguing Māori society. For example, a report from Walter Buller, now the magistrate for Manawatū, that a Māori warden had successfully executed four warrants on his behalf, was given as proof of the scheme’s success. When a rūnanga in Whangarei stopped Māori from another tribe stealing a Pākehā’s cattle, it was portrayed in a similar manner. That local Māori may have considered outside Māori interfering with their Pākehā as trampling on their tribal mana was not contemplated. The newspaper marginalised tribal politics in favour of Grey’s Tikanga. Te Karere Maori also showed the enthusiastic activity of the tumuaki for the Bay of Plenty, T.H. Smith. According to the paper

112 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:8.
113 Te Karere Maori, 15/1/1862:9-10.
116 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:19; 1/7/1862:8-9
118 Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:19; 1/7/1862:8-9
119 Te Karere Maori, 25/2/1862:7.
‘[t]here have been several Councils held in the District, and the system of Governor George Grey, is we understand, highly appreciated in this locality, and works admirably.’

It was the tribes of Northland who entered into the spirit of law-making most fully, so naturally Te Karere Maori reported their activities extensively, such as the extensive accounts of the Mangonui Rūnanga under the tumuaki, John White.

Did the newspaper propaganda actually reflect reality? Success depended on Māori support, and according to Ward, the system was only really effective in Northland. The whole of the 23rd May 1862 issue was given over to one of the scheme’s successes, the Bay of Islands Rūnanga. However, the report of the tumuaki, George Clarke, which Te Karere Maori printed in English only, shows that he had misgivings. Clarke had schooled the chiefs in the correct protocols before the rūnanga meeting, and E.M. Williams, the Resident Magistrate, assisted in writing out motions. The chiefs complained that there were not enough positions for everyone, so two more were created. Despite this, thought Clarke, one unsuitable man was selected. As seen in Bell’s instructions to Shortland on his appointment as Civil Commissioner to Waihou (Thames), the government did not expect the task to be achieved easily, particularly south of Auckland.

Sir George Grey’s aim is to restore the confidence of the Native population in the British Government ... But confidence is a plant of slow growth, and it may take the patient labour of many years to remove the secret causes of dissatisfaction and distrust, which estranged so large a proportion of the Native people from us, and led them to set up the Maori king.

Shortland was then asked to ‘take His Excellency’s plan and do your best to induce the Natives to accept it.’

As shown in the following chart published by Te Karere Maori, areas such as the Bay of Islands were well serviced with Pākehā and Māori officials.
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122 Te Karere Maori, 20/7/1862:3. ‘Kua noho etahi Runanga, kua mahi, a ko te tikanga a Ta Hori Kerei Kawana, e meinga ana e tino, e manaakitia ana e nga iwi i roto i tenei takiwa.’
125 Te Karere Maori, 23/5/1862:1-16.
127 F.D.Bell to Edward Shortland, 30/12/1862. MS-385, Hocken Library.
The number of appointees in each district varied, with a good showing in the Bay of Plenty. The District least supported by Māori was Upper Waikato, where the resident magistrate, John Gorst, attracted none of his Kingitanga neighbours to join the system.

Ultimately, the Tikanga Hou failed. As Ward points out, Māori were generally cool towards the scheme for a variety of reasons: concern about land and debt keeping them from co-operating; stronger tribes preferring to keep their own mana through their own tribal rūnanga; the greediness of some chiefs for salaries; insufficient
The scheme also faltered because the Native Ministry came under the sway of the unsympathetic Dillon Bell, and when Fox's ministry fell in April 1862, Grey gained little support from the new settler government.\textsuperscript{129}

Grey also chose to marginalise the K\textingitanga\text{ from participating, not agreeing to Ng\text{\text{"a}t\text{\text{"i}} Haua's proposal that they would participate if Grey allowed their r\text{\text{"u}nang}\text{a decisions to be approved by the M\text{\text{"o}}ri king}.\textsuperscript{130} Grey had established the Tikanga Hou as a replacement for the nascent Kingitanga institutions, not as an addition. This was obvious to M\text{\text{"o}}ri at the time. As one old M\text{\text{"o}}ri man told the magistrate, Law, in Taup\text{o}, if the government had established the District R\text{\text{"u}nang}\text{a earlier, there would have be no support for the Kingitanga there.}\textsuperscript{131}

Ultimately, the success of the Tikanga Hou depended on how favourably tribes already viewed the government. That the government felt the need to invade the Waikato is proof enough that the Grey's scheme was not achieving its object of constricting the Kingitanga. However, while the scheme was unfolding, \textit{Te Karere Maori} attempted to portray it as successful and efficacious, rather than provide honest reporting on its workings. As war became inevitable, this propaganda effort by the paper dwindled to nothing.

\textit{Te Hokioi}

\textit{Te Hokioi, Mana and the Treaty of Waitangi}

For most of this research period, P\text{\text{"a}keh\text{"a}-run} newspapers monopolised the M\text{\text{"o}}ri language press, with \textit{Te Karere M\text{\text{"o}}ri} dominating in terms of longevity and output. Most of the M\text{\text{"o}}ri voices appearing in these newspapers belonged to loyalists, who were happy to pay lip service to the Crown's \textit{mana k\text{\text{"o}wanatanga}, so long as their own mana whenua} was intact. The Kingitanga contested this view, and, obtaining their own press in 1861, from mid 1862 were publishing their anti-government propaganda in their own journal, \textit{Te Hokioi e Rere atu na}. M\text{\text{"o}}ri who supported the Kingitanga saw the King as possessing his own mana. When a Ng\text{\text{"a}iterangi chief wrote 'I, R\text{\text{"e}wet\text{"i} Manotini, place my lands under the mana of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Te Karere Maori}, 15/4/1862:11.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
King, for protection’, or when Te Āti Awa chiefs talked of Pōtatau ‘as mana for the land and the people’; they were acknowledging mana kingi, even if only symbolically. Mana Kingi resided in Māori land unsold to the Crown which its owners pledged to the King. As Te Hokioi stated, ‘let the mana of King Pōtatau stand on the parts of New Zealand we still hold, and the mana of [the] Queen on the parts that she has obtained.’

That the Crown could claim mana kōwanatanga over the whole of New Zealand, on the basis of the Treaty was thus unacceptable to the Kingitanga. The newspaper therefore mounted several attacks upon the legitimacy of the Treaty employing two main arguments. The first was that ‘it is not good for [the allegiance of] many chiefs to be obtained on the acceptance of one chief’, meaning that many chiefs, including King Pōtatau and most other chiefs of Waikato, had not signed the Treaty and should therefore not be bound by it. Te Hokioi also used this argument, that the Treaty could only apply to those who signed it, to criticise the Crown intention to send gunboats up the Waikato.

The Waikato River does not belong to the Queen but to the Māori only....The word of our mother, the Queen, to those chiefs is clear indeed, that is: if the people of New Zealand don’t wish to cede the mana of their lands, their rivers and their fisheries to me, that is fine; let them keep the mana: so this is one of our rivers we are keeping to ourselves.

Because many of their potential supporters came from iwi which had signed the Treaty, the newspaper also attempted to belittle any validity the Treaty may have had, by suggesting that Māori had been tricked into signing it. This, the paper said, had been the case at the mouth of the Waikato where chiefs had been beguiled into signing with a bribe of a blanket. Using Tūhaere’s metaphor, it suggested ‘they did not know there was a hook inside’: the hook of the Queen’s mana. The paper also suggested that Māori were not sufficiently informed in 1840 to fully understand what the Treaty meant, or would come to mean. The newspaper labelled the Treaty

132 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:2. ‘ko a hau ko te Reweti-manotini ka tuku nei i oku whenua, ki raro i te mana o te kingi, hei tiaki[.]’; ‘...hei mana mo te whenua, mo nga tangata...’
133 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:2. ‘...koia ra me tu te mana o kingi potatau ki runga i nga wahi o Nui tireni e mau nei ki a tatou, me tu te mana o kuini ki runga i nga wahi kua riro atu ki a ia...’
134 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:3. ‘...e kore e pai ki a riro nga rangatira tokomaha i te whakaetanga o te rangatira kotahi...’
135 Te Hokioi, 15/2/1862:1. ‘Ehara a Waikato awa i a te Kuini, e rangi no nga Maori anake. ... he kupu marama ano te kupu a to tatou whaea a te Kuini, i kii mai ai ki su rangatira, i mea: Ki te kore nga tangata o Nui-Tireni e pai ki te tuku mai i te mana [o] o ratou whenua, o a ratou awa, o a ratou hianga ika ki au, e pai ana; waiho kia ratou ano te mana; na ko tetehi tenei o a matou awa e kaiponuhia nei e matou.’
the covenant of blindness: I say it is the covenant of the blind, because the people of that time lived as animals, without human thoughts, like a dog shown some nice looking food. When it sees it, it rushes to eat, thinking that food to be very fine. When it eats it, it sticks in its throat, then it knows that it is stricken. Then his owner arrives, and sees a bone stuck in its throat. Then he removes it, and health returns to it [the dog]. ...so in your opinion, is it the dog that did wrong? No, the person that erred is the one that knew what it was doing.137

At Kohimarama, the Crown rested its claim to mana kāwanatanga on Māori understanding of the Treaty. Not all the chiefs present agreed to this notion, although they accepted the Treaty as a public good. In contrast, Te Hokioi accentuated the notion of Māori ignorance in order to undermine any validity the Treaty might have. Therefore in the Kīngitanga’s opinion, Māori were not morally bound by the Treaty once they realised its repercussions; and the Crown had no right to assert its mana upon unwilling Māori.

As seen, both by Te Hokioi’s arguments and comments made by chiefs at Kohimarama, Māori had gained an appreciation of what kāwanatanga entailed, and its accompanying mana. As discussed in Chapter 6, Māori considered that their mana whenua was lost when the Crown bought their land. By joining the Kīngitanga, some chiefs considered that their land, and thus their mana, would be protected. As indicated in Chapter 4, the Kīngitanga sought to establish its credentials through association with chiefs and tribal mountains. Thus Te Hokioi discussed the formation of the Kīngitanga, projecting a sober, orderly progression to statehood, with a wide backing of tribes.138 It also printed letters, written three years earlier, from Māori chiefs giving allegiance to the Māori king.139 Mana kingi therefore rested on the mana whenua of its followers. For the Kīngitanga to meet its followers’ wishes, it needed to function as an alternative to the Kuinitanga, that is, to show itself as an independent nation, where the Queen’s mana could not stand.
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136 Te Hokioi, 15/2/1862:2. ‘...kaore i mohio he matika kei roto...’
137 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:3. ‘...ko te kawenata o te mata po tanga, i kiai ai e au ko te kawenata o te matapo, te mea e noho kuri ana nga tangata o taa takiwa, ka ore he whakaaro tangata, e penei ana me te kuri e whaka aria atu nei ki te kai pai te kitenga mai rere tonu mai ki te kai, ka hua he tino pai taa kai; no tana kainga ka mau i tona kaki katahi ka mohio e hemate tenei, ka tae atu tona ariki, ka kitea, he wheua e mau ana i tona kaki ka tahi ka tangohia ka riro na ka hoki mai te wai ora ki a ia. ...tena ki ta koutou whakaaro koia ko te kuri ihe, kao ko te tangata ano ihe ko te mea whai mahara.’
138 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:2-3.
139 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:4.
Mana and ‘nationalism’

Nationalism can be seen as the pursuit, or holding, of a collective mana on behalf of a group that imagines itself as a “nation”.140 The Kingitanga can be considered a pan-Māori nationalist movement, in that it sought to create a nation encompassing all Māori, regardless of their tribal affiliations. Māori had imagined themselves in terms of whānau, hapū, iwi and waka, in effect mini-nations, but until the arrival of the Pākehā, had not been aware of themselves as a ‘people’. As seen in Chapter 3, the nature of colonialism encouraged Māori to think of themselves as a group, within a society dichotomised between “black” and “white”, native and European, civilised and savage.

Theorists, such as Gellner and Anderson, see literacy as a pre-requisite to nationalist sentiments.141 As large amounts of reading material are disseminated to ordinary people, they begin to reevaluate themselves and their position in society.142 As seen in Chapter 2, Māori, in comparison with other societies, were relatively “literate” by 1860. However, unlike modern Europe, it was not capitalists who created and sustained a Māori print culture, but missionaries and the government. They addressed their material to Māori as a group, not to individual hapū or iwi. Therefore, literacy, and printed matter, such as newspapers, did allow Māori to see themselves as one people sharing one print-language.

The Kingitanga imagined itself ethnically, as a Māori kingdom, using a biblical exemplar, of Jewish tribes amalgamating under a single Jewish king, and the example of Haiti in which the “blacks” fought and defeated the “whites”.143 The Kingitanga was thus open to all Māori, which explains not only the antipathy of both Browne and Grey to the movement, but why Herewini, when debating with Grey at Kōhanga, would not admit that the Kingitanga did not represent all Māori.

140 I am indebted to Benedict Anderson for the concept of ‘imagined communities’. See Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition (London: Verso, 1991) pp 4, 6. Given the vast amount of literature on nationalism, and the complexity of the subject, this thesis does not have the space to weigh the various models of nationalism, and apply their validity to the Kingitanga. However, it is worth noting that the Kingitanga resembles a modern nationalist model in many ways, despite Māori society not being industrialised, a pre-requisite, suggested by Gellner. See Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism (Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1983) pp 11, 12, 25, 63. Neither does it follow a European, US or South American exemplar, as demanded by Anderson, p 67, 81.

141 Gellner, pp 28, 50; Anderson, p 36.

142 Anderson, p 36

143 See Chapter 4.
The concept of “nationalism” can be applied to the Kingitanga through their use and understanding of mana. When an early Kingitanga rūnanga stated ‘let the King Pōtatau’s mana stand upon the places of New Zealand that we still hold, and let the Queen’s mana stand in the places she has obtained’ they were portraying a vision of a Māori nation. Its flag denoted its mana over an area; it attempted to establish a working legal system; it rejected any government attempt to assert mana kāwanatanga within its boundaries. The Kingitanga thus had an awareness of itself that can be equated with a nationalist movement. However, as Gellner acknowledges, many potential nationalist movements fail or never get going. The Kingitanga must therefore fall into the category of thwarted nationalism, because the colonial government was able to cripple its power through military force. The Māori state continued as a politically independent entity on Ngāti Maniapoto lands until 1881. However, it had lost much of its territory, and was effectively cut off from potential supporters. It eventually ceased to identify itself as a movement for all Māori, content to represent the tribes of Tainui.

The Newspaper War

Waikato, as the centre of Kingitanga, was the district most openly resistant to governmental authority. The government persisted by appointing several magistrates who tried to apply the Queen’s law among a rather unwilling populace. When the Kingitanga established its anti-government newspaper, Te Hokioi, the government responded with a countering journal, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke. The interaction between Te Pihoihoi and Te Hokioi was a brief cold war interlude before actual hostilities began. The two papers clashed over a number of issues. The administration of justice was one. There were also the military threats to the Kingitanga: the road being built to their border; the redoubt at Te Ia on the border of the two realms, and the prospect of government gunboats marauding up the Waikato river. By 1861, the Taranaki War had ground to a standstill, but was still unresolved, providing a fertile opportunity for both sides to engage in propaganda. When the government started to construct a suspicious building at Te Kohekohe beyond its boundary, a Kingitanga force intervened, and floated the timber back onto the

---

144 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:2. ‘...me tu te mana o kingi potatau ki runga i nga wahi o Nui tiri nei ki a tatou, me tu te mana o kuini ki runga i nga wahi kua riro atu ki a ia.’
Queen’s land. These issues, reported by both newspapers, revolved around mana: whose mana would prevail within the Kingitanga.

In 1857, Governor Browne appointed Francis Dart Fenton as a Resident Magistrate to the Waipā and Waikato districts, where he enjoyed moderate success in administering the law. He also attempted to establish rūnanga under mana kāwanatanga to rival the institutions being set up by the Kingitanga. His support came mainly from younger chiefs of the Lower Waikato: chiefs, according to Gorst, whose first loyalty was to money. Fenton’s deliberate disregard for the Kingitanga caused resentment. Pōtatau, in particular, was incensed that Fenton took no account of his chiefly mana. McLean, who regarded Fenton’s work as a challenge to his own position as Secretary of the Native Department, persuaded Browne to remove Fenton from his position on the basis of these complaints.

The Waikato was effectively left to the Kingitanga until 1861, when Fenton was appointed briefly as Civil Commissioner to Waikato. John Gorst was appointed as Resident Magistrate to the Upper Waikato in January, 1862, and was later promoted to Civil Commissioner, with the Lower Waikato also added to his responsibilities. Gorst had a variety of roles. He was responsible for the administration of justice, tribal rūnanga, and an industrial school at Ōtawhao. Gorst was largely ineffective in his political endeavours. While the school was moderately successful, it was, he suggested,

impossible...to force upon the Waikato District institutions to which the whole mass of the people were opposed. The only result was to draw a small minority of greedy and mercenary men into our employment, who would render us no other service than to make us contemptible in the eyes of the disaffected but more honourable chiefs.

Such was the displeasure of Ngāti Maniapoto whose district Gorst had based himself in, that soon after his arrival Pātene Poutama, a local chief, marched a group of 30 Kingitanga soldiers to Ōtawhao to eject him. Pātene stated that he had read in Te Karere Maori that Gorst was to be a magistrate. Gorst, and his interpreter were, according to Pātene, ‘worms, baits that Sir George Grey was fishing with, and if they were suffered to remain some of the tribes of Waikato would inevitably be caught.'

---

145 Gellner, pp 45, 47.
146 Ward, p 105.
147 Gorst, p 45, Ward p 104.
149 Gorst, p 105.
150 Te Karere Maori, 25/2/1862:4. 'He toke raua; he parangia hi ika na te Kawana; a, ki te waiho kia noho raua, e mau i te maunu etahi o nga iwi i roto o Waikato.'
Gorst argued that he was living on a piece of land already sold to the Queen, but managed to evade ejection due to the desire of more senior chiefs to avoid direct confrontation. Māori decided instead to ignore the presence of the magistrate. They would not co-operate: as Taati Te Waru told Gorst, his runanga forbade him becoming an assessor, as ‘they were afraid lest they should lose their “mana”’. The government’s newspaper, Te Karere Maori, was not well distributed within the Waikato, and as Pātara’s writings within Te Hokioi were considered to be effective in their designs, ‘it was determined to set up a Maori newspaper (the Pihoihoi) in opposition to the Maori Gazette (the Hokioi) published as the official organ of the native King.’ Gorst added this role to his other duties, publishing Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke from the school at Ōtawhao, from 2nd February, 1863.

Gorst told his readers his paper certainly wasn’t the hokioi, the dangerous, mythical, warlike bird. ‘That bird makes a screaming noise, as a sign—the proclamation of war and the shedding of blood.’ Gorst anticipated trouble, saying ‘[s]ome are angry with me and say, that my chirping is unauthorised, as well as my sitting upon the house to sing, and so they cast stones at me that I might become alarmed and fly away’. Gorst also promised to describe truthfully events in Waikato and beyond whether they be good or evil, and to print all correspondence that came his way. Finally, with his statement, ‘[i]f the cry of the Hokioi be wrong, that small thing the “Pihoihoi” is able to combat with it if its chirpings be founded on truth’, it was clear that this new newspaper was laying down a challenge to the Kingitanga and its paper, Te Hokioi.

Te Hokioi claimed not to be interested in a contest, saying to Te Pihoihoi ‘Friend, act moderately, look for a way for both of us [to get on], and stop the way you are

151 This episode is described in Gorst (2001), pp 101-2. An account also appeared in the NewZealander, which was translated and published, with an introduction, in Te Karere Maori, 25/2/1862:1-6.
152 Te Karere Maori, 25/2/1862:5. ‘...he wehi no ratou kei ngaro to ratou mana.’
153 Sewell, p 17; see also Gorst (2001), p 138.
154 Te Pihoihoi, 2/2/1863:1, ‘Ko taua manu e tangi tioro, he whai tohu whakaatu i te pakanga i te whakahkekenga toto...’; The opening article was reprinted in Te Karere Maori, 30/3/1863:22 with an accompanying translation.
155 Te Pihoihoi, 2/2/1863:1, ‘Ko etahi e riri kau ana ki au, e mea ana, he pokano taku korihihi, me taku noho noa ake ki te tuau o taku whare korihi ai, a epe mai ana ratou i te kowhatu, kia tinia au e te matakau, kia ree atu ai au.’; Te Karere Maori, 30/3/1863:22-23.
156 Te Pihoihoi, 2/2/1863:2, ‘Ki te he te tangi o te Hokioi, e taea ano te patu e tara mei iti e Te Pihoihoi ina pono tona korihiitanga.’; Te Karere Maori,30/3/1863:24.
acting towards me'. Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke continued the attack, declaring ‘My friend, Te Hokioi, you say ‘look for a way for both of us.’ Now, in my opinion, a good way for us would be to point out the errors in my words, and not to give me a bad name.’ Even after its rival’s demise Te Hokioi professed itself not to interested, saying ‘we do not want a newspaper war which would be a source of sadness for both of us, but that we live peacefully and find ways [of administering] the states and the lands.’

Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke

Gorst was seeking to promote mana kāwanatanga, but his paper chose not to directly engage Te Hokioi’s arguments about the Treaty of Waitangi. Rather, it attacked the validity and efficacy of the Māori King, particularly in an article in the first issue entitled ‘The Evil of King Activity’. Quoting Scripture, it wrote in a disparaging tone that a king must be able to protect the weak and dispense justice, and pointed to two instances where the Kingitanga had failed: the supposed plunder of Pākehā settlers in Waikato, and the evasion from justice of one of the king’s soldiers for attempted rape of a Pākehā girl near Whanganui. Because the Kingitanga was based upon the king’s mana, the article attacked the king personally. It concluded with:

Now look, my friends. Does Matutaera have the mana [power] to suppress evil deeds such as the crime at Whanganui, and the crimes within Waikato, or does he not? If he does have the mana, then he is greatly at fault for not suppressing those evils, but if he doesn’t have the mana or strength to suppress those evils, then he is very wrong in insisting groundlessly on being called a king.

Reeves, an early New Zealand historian, suggested that ‘[t]he Lark out-argued the Phœnix’, that is, Gorst’s newspaper generally had the better of Te Hokioi, which led to his expulsion. However, Gorst is quite clear that Māori found ‘The Evil of King

---

157 Te Hokioi, 15/2/1863:2. ‘...e hoa kia atahohonau, rapu atu i te tikanga mo taua kaati to penei, ki a au.’
158 Te Pihoihoi, 9/3/1863:11. ‘E hoa, e te Hokioi, e mea ana koe, ‘rapua atu he tikanga mo taua.’ Na, ki toku mahara, te tikanga pai mo taua kia ata whakaaturia mai nga he o aku korero; a kia kaua e whakapiritia he ingoa kino ki runga i a au.’
159 Te Hokioi, 26/4/1863:3. ‘...kahore matou e pai ki te whawhai-pepa, ko te take ke puta pouri ki tetehi ki tetehi, engari te noho marie tatou me te kimi i nga tikanga o nga kingitanga o nga whenua.’
160 Te Pihoihoi, 2/2/1863:3. ‘Na ka kite koutou, e aku hoa, he mana ra nei ta Matutaera hei pehi i nga hanga kino pera me te he i Whanganui, me nga he hoki i roto i Waikato, kahore ra nei, me he mana tona, nui atu tona he ekore nei ia e pehi i aua kino; ki te mea kaore ona mana, ona kaha ki te pehi i aua kino, he he nui tona, e tohe huhuakore nei kia karangatia noatia ia hei kingi.’
161 Reeves, p 206.
Activity' particularly offensive, and the appearance of this article led to calls for his ejection.  

Issues in Contention

The administration of justice

The Kingitanga were well aware that their mana needed to be grounded in law administered by its own judges. A general lawlessness prevailed in many Māori communities, regardless of whether they belonged to the Kingitanga or Kuīnitanga. Justice often depended on the local chief or rūnanga involved in administering it. However, Te Hokioi saw its role as portraying Kingitanga justice as working and effective, while Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, as seen above, tried to show the opposite.

Magistrates were appointed by the Kingitanga, and on one occasion Te Hokioi published the names of judges who had been appointed to areas outside of the Waikato. No doubt this was to imply that the King’s writ was spreading into areas which were not, in reality, solidly behind the Kingitanga. Several judgements on land ownership made by Kingitanga magistrates were also published in Te Hokioi. The language of these judgements is formal and follows a regular pattern, starting with ‘A notice concerning the judgement on the land of...’. It is clear that these had been written for wider publication, in order to dignify the decisions made and to show that Māori were able to administer their own justice. This can be seen in one addendum to a judgement.

To the editor of Te Hokioi, of Aotearoa. Insert these words about the judgement on Nōpera’s land in the newspapers so all the tribes in Aotearoa will see it. However, these judgements were made by magistrates from more moderate areas, such as Ngāti Haua and Rangiaohia, and did not reflect a general adherence to the law.

---

162 Gorst (2001), pp 138-139.
163 Gorst (1908), pp 207, 209
164 Gorst (1908), pp 213-5.
165 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:4. This included appointments to Tauranga, Rotorua, Otaki-Rangitikei and Whanganui.
166 Te Hokioi, 15/1/1863:4; 15/2/1863:2. ‘He pukapuka whakaiatua mo te whakawakanga o te whenua o Nōpera ki roto i nga nuipepa kia kitea e nga iwi katoa, i runga i Aotearoa.’
within the Kingitanga. As one of the King’s judges pleaded, ‘if you discover a crime, talk to a judge or monitor: no man should strike out lest the law fall upon him.’

Notwithstanding the general failure of law in the “loyal” Māori areas, Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke sought to point out failings in the Kingitanga’s system. This was a constant theme. Even in an article detailing the industrial school at Otawhao and how local Māori were taking advantage of the services provided by its trainees, Gorst was able to give an example involving two prominent Kingitanga personalities, which underscored the point.

A pair of trousers were sewn for Wiremu Tamehana, for which he paid £1. Those trousers didn’t get to Tamehana because Tioriori, the magistrate, grabbed them on the road, and kept those trousers for himself.

One crime that the Kingitanga were keen to stop was the importation of alcohol into the Waikato. Chiefs complained to Gorst about the practice, and on several occasions they confiscated quantities of alcohol from Pākehā traders. The Government deemed these seizures of goods to be illegal, but attempted to use the problem to entice the Kingitanga into the workings of government law. When Gorst was appointed to the Waikato, he was instructed to inform the more moderate chiefs of the advantages of Grey’s Tikanga Hou in allowing Māori magistrates to stem the alcohol trade. He assured Waikato chiefs that Grey was happy to create a law prohibiting the importation of liquor into the Kingitanga. According to Gorst:

[i]t was received with universal satisfaction by the King natives, for it did not occur to them at first that it was a virtual admission of the Queen’s sovereignty in their territory.

Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke published one major article concerning the alcohol trade in an attempt to encourage the Waikato chiefs to cooperate with the government. This article displayed the supposed commonality of purpose between the two sides, saying

all the runanga have instituted laws against liquor being brought into Waikato, and this has been strengthened by the Pākehā side, that is, by the Governor, so that it is really binding. What a good law!

---

168 Te Hokioi, 15/1/1863:4. ‘Na, e hoa ma ki te mea ka kite koutou i te hara, korerotia ki te kaiwhakawa, ki te Monita ranei: kaua tetahi tangata e peatu ki a ia kei hinga atu te ture ki a ia.’
169 Te Pihoihoi, 9/3/1863:17. ‘Kotahi tarau i tuhia mo Wiremu Tamehana, utua ana e ia 11. Kihai aua tarau i tae ki a Tamehana, na Tioriori, kai-whakawa, i tango i te ara, a ka monatia era tarau.’
171 Gorst (1908), p 176.
172 Te Pihoihoi, 23/2/1863:9. ‘...kua turia e nga runanga katoa he ture kia kaua e riro mai te waipiro i roto i Waikato, kua whakakahangia hoki e te taha Pakeha ara e Te Kawana, koia i tino pumau ai. Katahi ano te ture pai!’
It then pointed to cases, including one where the confiscated alcohol was consumed by those guarding it, where the Kingitanga had not been able to effectively enforce the law. It ended with "[b]ut the Māori side and Pākehā side should work together, the Governor and Matutaera, Rewi and Gorst, and then the laws will have mana."^175

Adjoining this article was a letter sent by Native Minister, Francis Dillon Bell, to the Māori King, suggesting the appointment of government inspectors, to search for alcohol, and to lock it up in bond stores along the Waikato River. He also proposed to pay £50 salaries to magistrates appointed by the governor.^174 Despite these advances, the Kingitanga were not persuaded to become further involved with the government to deal with this problem, and continued to act independently.^175

Roads and gunboats

As noted above, Waikato Māori saw as military threats the road constructed towards their territory, the fortifications on their border, and the possibility of a gunboat plying the Waikato river. Roads were also a contentious issue for tribes regardless of how they viewed the Kingitanga.^176 On one hand, roads were a tikanga pai, a Pākehā practice that could bring prosperity through trade. As noted in Chapter 6, accepting roads also meant that tribes would expose themselves to influences they could not control, such as greater political interference from government officials. Even non-Kingitanga tribes agonised over roads. Accepting roads in their area required a political decision from tribes, and their acceptance was often proclaimed in as public and outspoken manner as tribes who opposed roads. Such tribes were praised by the government for such announcements.^177

The Waikato tribes were certainly in favour of trade. However, the Waikato river was their primary trade route, and they did not trust the Governor enough to agree to roads. According to Te Hokioi, Grey had made several requests of Pōtatau that a road be put through Waikato, but he avoided the decision by asserting that it

---

173 Te Pihoihoi, 23/2/1863:9-10. 'Engari kia mahi tahi te taha Maori te taha Pakeha, ko Kawana raua ko Matutaera, ko Rewi raua ko Te Kohi, katahi ano ka whai mana nga ture.'
174 Te Pihoihoi, 23/2/1863:10.
175 For example Wiremu Tamihana and others made a judgement to return alcohol to Jack Edwards, most likely in April, 1863. See Te Hokioi, 26/4/1863:4.
176 See Chapter 6.
177 For example, see Te Karere Maori, 31/10/1857:9-10; 15/3/1858:1-3; 16/4/1859:1-2; Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, 15/7/1861:12-13.
had to be made collectively by all the chiefs of Waikato. The general opposition of Waikato, however, did not stop Ngāti Mahanga agreeing to a government road from Whāingaroa (Raglan) inland to the Waipa River. Ngāti Mahanga were led by the chief Wiremu Nēra Te Awaitaia, who was considered a government loyalist and who had steadfastly opposed the Kingitanga. Wiremu Tamihana called a meeting at Pēria in October 1862 to discuss what should be done about this road. As indicated above, many chiefs from around the country attended this meeting. Also present was Te Awaitaia’s brother, Hēmi Mātene, who asserted ‘my piece [of land] belongs to me, it is not right to stop my road.’ This was quite a fundamental question for the Kingitanga: to what degree did their collective mana override the mana of individual chiefs or tribes. Wiremu Tamihana was quite adamant that the road should be stopped, telling Hēmi Mātene to stop pushing for the road to be built, think about the people. Because the Pākehā is you [and your brother’s] friend, I have seen in the newspaper that £500 [will be spent, and workers will get] 4 shillings a day. So I consider this to be a dangerous thing that you and [your ] Pākehā friends are urging because I am concerned that large guns will be brought along that road which will be close to Ngāruawāhia.

Te Hokioi felt similarly about the Waikato River, and the prospect of a tima (‘steamer’ or government gunboat) cruising on it. The issue first appeared when Hira Kerei Teatua wrote of discussions he and others had had with Grey.

[The governor said again, it is my fixed intention that I send two steamers into Waikato. Even if every chief of New Zealand attacks my policy, it will not be changed. We told [him] that that was wrong, that Māori had the prerogative over their own river, it doesn’t belong to you.] According to Gorst, to the chiefs’ threat that Māori would resist any intrusion, Grey replied that the gunboats would be armoured and therefore safe. As seen above, Te Hokioi saw the access of the steamer as the issue of the mana of the Waikato River. It reiterated that when Māori stated that the river was ‘open’, it only applied to trade. At no time, had Māori ever given any approval for government gunboats to penetrate

---

178 Te Hokioi, 15/6/1862:2.
179 Te Hokioi, 10/11/1862:1. ‘...naku ano toku pihi ka ore e tika te kati i taku rori.’
180 Te Hokioi, 10/11/1862:1. ‘...kati ra te tohe ki a mahia te rori ma hara mai ki te iwi, no te mea he Pakeha to korua hoa, kua kite hoki a hau i te Nupepa e ki ana: e irima rau pauna moni e wha hereni mo te ra, na ko na koa a hau i mahara ai he mate tenei e tohea mai e koutou, ko hoa Pakeha; he tu pato hoki noku kei haria mai nga punui i runga i taura rori, e tata ana hoki ki Ngāruawahia...’
181 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:1. ‘...ka ki ano a te kawana, he kupu tuturu tenei naku, ka tukua atu e a hau e rua tima ki roto o Waikato, ahakoa ko nga Rangatira katoa o nuitirenui hei patu i taku kupu e kore e mate, ka mea atu matou kahe tena kei nga maori ano te ritenga mo tana awa e hara teri i a koe...’
183 See above in this chapter.
into their territory. To support this stand, *Te Hokioi* also published a letter from Karaitiana of Ahuriri that he had spoken to McLean, and both had agreed that gunboats should not sail up the Waikato River.

Grey espoused his ‘love’ for Waikato. However, with Māori so sensitive to government actions, he, and his newspapers, also sought to justify his policies and to minimise any implications that Māori might see in them, and to quell any rumours that might arise. As noted above, *Te Karere Maori* stated that the government’s road building was not to threaten Waikato, but to defend Auckland. Similarly, at a Christmas party at Waiuku attended by Grey,

> the issue of road building was discussed (i.e. the roads heading to Auckland). They [the Māori] were happy with this plan due to the poor state of the roads, and their anxiety about the soldiers going to Te la [Redoubt] disappeared.

Here the paper implied that the roads are trade routes (heading to the towns) which would be beneficial for Māori. The local Māori, Waikato tribespeople living outside the Kingitanga territory, are portrayed as having confidence in the government actions.

*Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* chose to engage *Te Hokioi* on the issue of the gunboat. The latter, *Te Pihoihoi* suggested, had had its say, ‘now the Pākehā side will be calmly considered.’ It argued that the rights of Pākehā settlers were under threat from Māori and needed protection, and that a steamer would provide better communications, given the poor roads, and strong current of the river. It then accused Māori of not being fearful, but of wanting to create fear by threatening to shoot at the steamer.

---

184 *Te Hokioi*, 15/2/1863:1.
185 *Te Hokioi*, 15/2/1863:2. This was most likely to have been Karaitiana Takamoana who, while sympathetic to some Kingitanga ideas, was not an active supporter. He eventually sided with the government in 1863 against the Pai Marire.
186 Examples of these include informing chiefs at Pokeno that a wharf being built at Mangatawhiri was just for the transportation of food to soldiers at Te la, ‘he mea kei rapurapu koutou ki te tikanga o ta ratou mahi’ (in case you don’t know what they are up to.) This was subsequently re-printed in *Te Hokioi*, 24/3/1863:1. Likewise building work at Gorst’s school at Te Awamutu led to rumours that a Pākehā town was been planned there, which were denied in *Te Pihoihoi*, 9/3/1863:18.
187 *Te Karere Maori*, 16/12/1861:15.
188 *Te Karere Maori*, 15/1/1862:10. ‘...ka korerotia te tikanga o te mahi huarahi (ara, o nga Rori e ahu atu ana ki te Taone). Ka pai ratou ki taa tikanga, no te kino hoki o nga huarahi, a kore noa iho ta ratou tupato mo te haerenga o nga Hoia ki te la.’; The official English version differs slightly: ‘At this meeting, we understand, the question of road making was considered, and there was a general agreement as to the necessity of making roads; some uneasiness caused by the movement of the troops, subsided, when the object of that movement, came to be fully understood.’
You say the steamer is a fear-inspiring thing, and “what is known is that that steamer is built of steel.” We say such thinking is ignorance, because it is not built out of steel to make it more powerful offensively – a wooden steamer would be just as good for that. The only reason for the steel is to protect the innocent sailors from the bullets of your fear-inspiring guns.\(^{190}\)

It is doubtful if many Māori were gullible enough to accept this logic. Moreover, the article did not discuss what right the government had to send gunboats up the river – that right was presumed, as understood in its notions of the sovereignty given by the Treaty of Waitangi.

**Te Kohekohe**

Te Kohekohe, a Māori village on the Waikato River, provided another source of conflict between the two rival newspapers. The village was located inside the Kingitanga territory, within about five miles from the Crown’s border fort at Te Ia, under the chief, Wiremu Te Whēoro, a consistent opponent of the Kingitanga and supporter of the government.\(^{191}\) On the 8\(^{th}\) February 1863, some Māori from Pōkeno rushed south to Rangiriri, informing the people there that a government building was being built at Te Kohekohe.

[They say that there are ten parts: a courthouse of five rooms, two rooms for a school, two as bedrooms and one room as a kitchen, [these] are the purposes of that large building. It is being built with its sides enclosed [with barricades] with an opening in the centre.\(^{192}\)]

The following day, a group from Waikato travelled to Te Kohekohe to remonstrate with Te Wheoro to send the timber back, and build it ‘on the Queen’s piece’.\(^{193}\) The group attempted to refloat the timber downstream, but the efforts of the local people rendered this ineffective. A larger party from Ngāruawāhia returned a week later under Wiremu Kumete. Despite the protestations of Gorst who had accompanied them to Rangiriri, the timber was sent back to Te Ia.\(^{194}\) It is unclear to what degree

---

\(^{190}\) *Te Pihoihoi*, 9/3/1863:11-12. ‘Ki ta koutou he mea whakawehiwhēi te tīma, a “ko nga mea e mohiotia ai ko te hanganga i tāua tīma ki te rino.” Ki ta matou he kuiware rava tenei whakaaro; no te mea eharā te hanganga ki te rino hei mea whakakahi mo te patu atu e rite tahii te kaha o te tīma rakau mo tāua mea; heoi ano te take o te rino hei tiaki i nga heremana harakore i nga mata a o koutou pu whak[ā]wehiwhēi.’

\(^{191}\) According to Gorst, Te Whēoro was one of the few genuine government supporters in Waikato. See Gorst (1908), p 203. He continued to support the government during the Waikato War, and with Waata Kūkutai was commended for his services in *Te Karere Maori*, 30/8/1863:5-6; 28/9/1863:14-15.

\(^{192}\) *Te Hokioi*, 24/3/1863:1. ‘...e kia ana e 10 nga ritenga, he Whare Whakawhā, e 5 nga Ruma, e kura, e 2 nga Ruma, 2 hoki nga ruma moenga, 1 ruma mo te tahu kai, ko nga tikanga ia o roto o tāua Whare nui atu, ko te hanga o tahu where he mea karapōti i nga taha, ko waenga, i tu whera. According to Gorst, the chiefs, Mohi and Ikaha, were from Manukau. See Gorst (2001), p 135.

\(^{193}\) *Te Hokioi*, 24/3/1863:1. ‘...ki te pīhi i a te kuini...’

\(^{194}\) Gorst (2001), pp 135-137.
this action was supported by the whole Kingitanga. Several moderate leaders, including Pātara, *Te Hokioi*’s editor, wrote to the Grey to say ‘the people are perturbed about Wiremu’s building at Te Kohekohe, but God will have the last say over these many issues.’ However, it is doubtful they wanted to provide Grey with a *causus belli*.

According to Gorst, the initial plans had been for a courthouse, and this had been extended to provide barracks for a native police force. Inasmuch as it was a “school”, it was to be a police school, where young Māori men would be enlisted and trained to help enforce the Queen’s law. Grey had also redesigned the plans so that the building could easily be converted into a blockhouse. The Kingitanga supporters correctly saw this as a government effort to assert its *mana* within the King’s “piece”.

*Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* devoted most of its 23 March publication to the Te Kohekohe incident. This was based on a report Gorst had sent to Grey before the arrival of second party at Te Kohekohe. This newspaper run was seized by Ngāti Maniapoto before it could be issued, but shows how Gorst intended the topic to be discussed. Preceding the main article was a personal attack on Mōhi and Ihaka, the chiefs who had raised the alarm over the building, accusing them of receiving wages from the government, but seeking to curry favour with the Kingitanga as well. The first section concluded ominously with ‘Friends, chiefs of Waikato, do not push for war on account of what these sorts have to say.’

The principal article on ‘the trouble at Te Kohekohe’ consisted mainly of the conversations of Te Wheoro (and other local people of Te Kohekohe) with the initial party. The text described the Kingitanga side in menacing tones: the initial messengers tell Puteruha of Te Kohekohe, “you and your father will succumb”... The Kingitanga party is portrayed as a host, ‘the group arrives, [made up of men from]...
Ngāti Po, Ngāti Tapa, Ngāti Hini, Te Ngaungau, Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Teata, with their guns'.

They order away not only the carpenters and timber, but Te Whēoro and his people as well. Despite Gorst later writing that the struggle to float the timber was 'carried out without bloodshed and without even a blow struck in anger', the newspaper report was more dramatic: 'they fought, although not for long, people were covered in blood, suffered from the [rough] timber. In contrast, Te Whēoro is shown upholding his individual chiefly mana (under the government's sovereignty) in the face of ignorance and bullying of the Kingitanga. His relationship with his 'wife', the government, is paramount: the fears of the Kingitanga are set at naught.

Wiremu Te Whēoro is up [to speak]: “Welcome, my grandparents and my parents. I will never send my wife away, she is a woman whom I embrace, a treasure which I brought here. I got this precious thing for me, and for you. It is not that this treasure is for me alone, but for both of us: if you do not want her, then leave my treasure for me.”

Te Kihirini is up again: “I say that you should give up your wife. She is a whore, and I don't want her to stay here because I fear that I will die.”

Wiremu is up again: “I will not agree, because I have not yet seen any fault or immorality in my wife. If I discover any adultery, then it is up to me to abandon her, or keep her. [I tell you] this, I will never agree to send my treasure back.”

Te Hokioi turned to the events in more detail in its April issue. By this stage, Gorst had already been expelled and the article sought to justify not only the Te Kohekohe incident but also the expulsion. The article also included some of the conversations between Wiremu te Whēoro and ‘the people’ who went to remove the timber, although not in the detail of Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke. Te Hokioi again set out the evil intentions of the building, that a structure that was originally to be a church, was now plainly going to be a military barracks. The first group to descend on Te

201 Te Pihoihoi, 23/3/1863:20. ‘Muri iho ka tae mai te ope, Ngatipo, Nagtitapa, Ngatihini Te Ngaungau, Ngaungahau, Ngatiwha, Ngatihana, me a ratou pu.’


203 This is the only occasion that the metaphor of “wife” occurs in the newspapers. Terms such “tuakana” or “matua” might have been more usual. Perhaps by the use of “wife”, Te Whēoro is suggesting that it was his decision, rather than an imposed decision, to build the courthouse. He is also intimating the closeness of his bond with the government.

204 Te Pihoihoi, 23/3/1863:20. ‘Kei runga a Wiremu Te Wheoro:- “Haere mai aku tupuna, haere mai aku matua, ekore taku wahine e whakahokia e au, he wahine kua pa ki toki kiri, he taonga tiki naku, ki te whare o tera tangata, ka whiwhi au ki toki taonga, hei taonga moku, hei taonga mou; eharai i te mea moku anake tenei taonga, engari mo tawa tahi: ki te kore koe e pai, heoi ano, waiho ki au i toki taonga.”

Kei runga ano a Te Kihirini:- “E mea ana ahau, me whakarere to wahine, he wahine puremu to wahine, e kore au e pai kia waiho i konei, he wehi nuku kei mate au.”

Kei runga ano a Wiremu:- Ekorou e e whakaee. No te mea, kahore ano ahau i kete i te he, i te puremu ranei, a taku wahine: kia kete au i te puremu, maku ano te whakaaro ki te whakarere ranei, ki te popuru ranei. Ko tenei, ekore rawa ahau e whakaee kia whakahokia toki taonga.”
Kohekohe are presented as temperate in contrast to Te Whēoro, who is described as *pakeke* (obstinate) to the wishes of the people, and unable to be moved. Also printed were the conversation between Wiremu Kumete and Gorst. Gorst describes Kumete as 'a reckless madcap' but the conversations reported in *Te Hokioi* attempt to show Kumete vainly trying to reason with Gorst, asking him to have the timbers returned to Te Ia without the need for Māori intervention.

*Te Hokioi*'s article finished with the party which had shifted the timber camping at Te Riparoa, where they discussed Gorst's sins: his removal of a Kīngitanga boundary post at Mangatāwhiri, his newspaper activities, and his refusal to order the Te Kohekohe timber back to Te Ia.

[What we wanted, that is, the *Rūnanga* and all the chiefs of Waikato, was to remove Gorst and all his people, and return them to Te Ia, to stop his obstinacy, his stubbornness, and his provocation.]

As it happened, Rewi Maniapoto had by this stage already ejected Gorst. Despite the unity shown in *Te Hokioi*, this move did not, according to Gorst, find favour with the moderate faction within the Kīngitanga. The King's magistrates, Taati Te Waru and Tioriori, had rushed to Te Awamutu to forestall any violence against Gorst.

Pātara Te Tuhi also wrote to Rewi condemning his actions. However, with events in Taranaki again threatening to embroil the Kīngitanga in war with the government, it is clear that in April the Kīngitanga (including *Te Hokioi*) felt the need to present a united front.

**Taranaki**

Taranaki was a propaganda issue for both the government and Kīngitanga because it was conflated into more than a mere land issue. Although the war in Taranaki had subsided in 1861, the issues which had started the war and had arisen since, remained unresolved. Grey, still insisted, unrealistically, that Māori return or pay for all the plunder they had seized at Taranaki. As *Te Hokioi* reported Kereopa of Rotorua saying, 'it is like a bushel of wheat which spilt open on the ground – who

---

206 *Te Hokioi*, 26/4/1863:4. ‘...ko ta matou i pai ai, ara, ko ta te Runanga me nga Rangatira katoa o Waikato, me taiapo atu i a te kohi ratou ko ana mea katoa, me whakahoki atu ki te ia, kei turi, kei pake, kei whakatete.’
207 Gorst (2001), p 141.
208 Gorst (2001), pp 144, 147-8
209 The settlers driven from Tātaraimaka, for example, did not consider there was much plunder that could be returned. See *Taranaki Herald*, 8/2/1862:3.
is to gather it up and make it agree with its former weight?" 210 However, with events there at a standstill, Taranaki was treated by Te Hokioi more as a retrospective grievance, than a hot news item. Te Rangitāke was not initially an adherent of the King and the Waitara dispute did not involve the Kingitanga directly. However, the Kingitanga was linked to the dispute because of their general antipathy to land sales, and because groups of Waikato and Ngāti Maniapoto warriors headed south to assist the Māori cause. Te Hokioi’s editor, Pātara Te Tuhi, was part of the moderate faction within the Kingitanga who, despite sympathy for Te Rangitāke, opposed direct involvement in the Waitara dispute. It was with these sentiments perhaps that Te Hokioi printed ‘A Dream’, an anti-war tract. This was based on a rebuttal by Bishop Selwyn of Rēnata Kawepō’s reproach of the government’s actions in Taranaki. In effect, Te Hokioi’s “Dream” was a criticism of the violence of both the Governor and Taranaki Māori. 211 However, the Kingitanga did have an interest in Taranaki. As Te Hokioi wrote, many of the former slaves of Waikato had returned back to that region, and ‘Taranaki and Ngāti Ruanui were the first tribes the [King’s] flags came to’. 212 Also, Pōtatau had instructed his men not to go to Taranaki, but then felt let down by Governor Browne for not consulting him and other leading chiefs, as had been the custom under Grey’s first governorship, and for attacking Te Rangitāke within two weeks of sending a letter professing his peaceful intentions. 213

The two ‘birds’ in the Waikato printed various speeches and letters discussing the Taranaki War. This included discussions between the Governor and Tāti te Waru and Tamihana at Taupiri printed in Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke, and selections from missionaries’ letters published by Te Hokioi. 214 Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke also printed a letter sent by Riwai Te Ahu, a Te Ati Awa clergyman, to his kinsman, Te Rangitāke, urging him to agree to letting the Waitara issue be judged.

210 Te Hokioi, 10/11/1862:1. ‘... e rite ana hoki ki te puhera witi kua pakaru nei ki te whenua, a ma wai e kohikohi kia rite ai ki te taimaha o mua.’ [translation from AJHR, 1863, E12, p 15.]
212 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:2. ‘...ko Taranaki raua ko Ngati-Ruanui nga lwi i tae tuatahi atu nga kara...’
213 Te Hokioi, 8/12/1862:2.
214 Te Pihoihoi, 10/2/1863:7; Te Hokioi, 15/1/1863:3.
It is said that your chiefly friends of Waikato are pushing you not to allow an enquiry on Waitara. This rejection makes us sad because the reason for Governor Browne's strong hostility towards you has gone.215

This was followed by Te Rangitāke’s response that the Pākehā needed to leave Waitara first.216 Te Pihoihoi included these letters to show the readers that it was the Māori, not the Governor, who were not prepared to settle.

In early April, 1863, imperial forces occupied Tātaraimaka. Rewi Maniapoto was informed of this by the rūnanga of Mataitawa of Taranaki.217 According to Gorst, Rewi wished to embroil the whole of Waikato in war by attacking the Pākehā settlements around Auckland, but this was resisted by Wiremu Tamihana and the moderate wing of the Kingitanga.218 On 7 May, Bell, the Native Minister, wrote to the King and his council concerning the killing of the soldiers at Ōakura. The letter was subsequently published in Te Karere Maori, and the final Te Hokioi.219

However, the Kingitanga paper omitted the opening paragraph, in which it was stated:

The Ngatiawas also consented, that there would be no disturbances about Tataraimaka.

The governor then proceeded with the work that he had long been considering, to put an end to the quarrels of the Ngatiawa, and let them all live in peace together at Waitara.220

Te Hokioi also omitted from the original accounts of plots to seize or kill the Governor. The remainder of the text detailed an account of the killings at Ōakura which had supposedly been committed ‘under the name of Matutaera [the King].’221

Allusions were made to the former friendship that had existed between the Governor and Pōtatau, but a warning was also included: ‘[a]ll who take part with these murderers, he will treat as murderers—they must choose between the two.’222

215 Te Pihoihoi, 9/3/1863:14. ‘E kia ana, na ou hoa rangatira o Waikato i tungatungra koe, kia kaua e tukua e whakawakia Waitara. Na pouri ana matou ki tenei pukapuka whakakore, no te mea ka ngaro te take o te kaha i riri ai a te Kawana Paraone ki a koe...’


217 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:2


219 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:1 Te Karere Maori, 1/6/1863:1-4. There are minor orthographical differences between the texts produced by Te Karere Maori and Te Hokioi. However, the letter did contain the phrase ‘Na, ko te wa pu ano tenei hei whakakite i te pono o a koutou kupu mo te pai...’ [Now is the time to show the truth of your words for peace. [TKM]], which was rendered as ‘Na, ko te wapu ano tenei hei whakakite i te pono o a kerei kupu mo te pai...’ [Now is the time for Grey to show the truth of his words for peace].

220 Te Karere Maori, 1/6/1863:2. ‘I whakaae hoki a Ngatiawa, kia kaua e tupe ake i a ratou he he mo Tataraimaka. No reira, timata tonu atu te mahi a te Kawana, kua whakaarohia noataia e ia, kia whakamutua nga ngangaretanga o Ngatiawa, kia noho huihui ratou i Waitara, i runga i te rangimarie.’ In the nineteenth century, the Te Ati Awa tribe was also known as Ngāti Awa.

221 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:1.

222 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:1. ‘...ko nga tangata katoa e whakahoa ana ki aua kai kohuru, ka kia e te Kawana he kohuru tahi ratou. Me ata hurihuri marie te tangata, ko tehea taha ranei tana e pai at.’ [translation from TKM, 1/6/1863:4]
Te Hokioi followed this letter with an account written by the riinanga of Mataitawa to Rewi, justifying their actions. Firstly, 'when the governor came to Tataraimaka with his soldiers, barracks were erected, and the soldiers stationed there.' One of the chiefs remonstrated with the governor to no avail. Then, 'the boundary post for the area, at Kurukuru, was pulled out by the governor, then we said that was the mate [death / misfortune] of this island'. Bell’s letter had used the word kōhuru [murder] several times. As Gorst explains:

There are several technical words in Maori to express 'killing.' It was necessary for the natives to consider, whether or not due warning had been given, whether there was a just ground for a quarrel, and many other circumstances, before they could determine whether the word 'kōhuru,' by which we render murder, could be correctly applied to the case.

The riinanga were therefore at pains to show the Governor’s actions constituted just grounds; that the actual killings were not kōhuru, but a justifiable response to Grey’s actions. A chief tried to warn the approaching soldiers to leave: ‘he approached the officer and said, “go, go back, you will die”, [but the officer] said “no, I won’t listen to you”, then they argued with each other.’ Finally it was the belligerent actions of the British which precipitated the fighting. Te Hokioi presented the two accounts in a seemingly even handed manner. However, given the increasing distrust and friction between the Kingitanga and the government, it is doubtful that the editor, or his Māori readers, would have concluded that the killings were kōhuru.

The government construed that Te Rangitāke’s opposition to the sale of the land in 1860 did not relate to his personal ownership, or that he, representing his tribe, could restrict the owners’ ability to sell. Notwithstanding Te Rangitāke’s actual claims to the land, his actions as a chief were in accord with the practices of the time. Due to the persisting strength of tribal structures at this time, and to government inaction, chiefs and tribes had continued to effectively exercise many of their traditional rights. Māori therefore saw the government’s stance over Waitara as a departure from the status quo: kawanatanga now clashed with tino rangatiratanga. For the government, the acceptance of chiefly mana implied polities which did not fit

---

223 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:2. '...i te haerenga o te Kawana ki Tataraimaka; me ana Hoia, ka tu te Paraki, ka waiho atu nga Hoia...'
224 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:2. '...ko te pou o te rohe, ko kurukuru, kua unuhia e te kawana, ka tabi matou matou ka ki atu ko te mate tena o te motu nei.'
226 Te Hokioi, 21/5/1863:2. '...katae kite Apiha ka ki atu haere e hoki, ka mate koutou, ka ki mai kahore; ekore au e rongo ia koe, tohe atu tohe mai tohe atu tohe mai...'
the sovereign / subject dichotomy of the English constitution. Having precipitated a war in Taranaki, the government needed to show its opponents as unreasonable or wicked. The Kingitanga, through its newspaper *Te Hokioi*, sought to paint the government’s actions in Taranaki in a similar light.

**The Waikato War**

The Waikato War began when General Cameron and his troops crossed the Mangatāwhiri Stream on 12th July 1863. Although the possibility of war had dominated the thoughts of both Māori and Pākehā for some time, *Te Karere Māori* of 18th July was hardly strident, opening with an account of the marriage of the Prince of Wales, and closing with the benefits of fresh air, water and regular washing. Apart from the Haiti articles discussed in Chapter 4, the only reference to the current troubles was a letter from a Wairarapa assessor, Raniera Te Iho-o-te-rangi, expressing his sadness at the Ōakura massacre which he had read about in the newspaper. Cameron’s troops defeated the Kingitanga in battle at Koheroa on 17 July, then fighting for several months was limited to smaller scale skirmishes and attacks around the Hūnua Ranges. *Te Karere Māori* of 30th August is a mere eight pages. The only war news was a despatch from General Cameron extolling the help provided to his campaign by the loyalist Waikato chiefs, Waata Kūkūtai and Wiremu Te Whēoro. However, the paper does contain several letters from both Māori and Pākehā of Mahurangi, Puhoi, concerning the death of a Mr. Calder. All were relieved that Calder died of natural causes, and was not murdered by a Māori, as had been feared. This demonstrates the underlying racial tensions, even north of Auckland, which perhaps explains why the newspaper was not keen to inflame the situation by extensive war news.

The last edition of *Te Karere Māori* of 28th September finally devoted itself to the war, consisting mainly of 17 letters from Māori, all written in May and June, deploring the Ōakura massacre. The newspaper no doubt printed these letters as moral support for the government’s actions against the Waikato, although the

---

227 This argument was rather specious as Te Rangitāke did have a personal interest in Waitara.
228 *Te Karere Māori*, 18/7/1862:1-4, 32.
229 *Te Karere Māori*, 18/7/1862:16.
232 *Te Karere Māori*, 28/9/1862:1-11
massacre had actually been a local Taranaki affair. The paper then turned to justifying
the invasion. An article blamed Rewi and Herewini for inciting the Ōakura attack by
performing a violently worded ngeri, and by planning to attack Pākehā.

After the Europeans had fallen at Taranaki the Waikato busied themselves holding
secret Runangas to slay the Europeans of Te Ia, Auckland, and its neighbourhood.
This is not a tale invented by the Europeans; no, the information is derived from
letters written to the Governor by natives of Waikato, and of other places in this
Island.

The paper included four letters from Māori giving details of plots by Waikato chiefs
to attack Auckland, several implicating Tamihana and Tāwhiao. The government
therefore justified its invasion to Māori on the basis of Māori sources, with a ngeri,
and letters from Māori themselves.

Gorst suggests that Waikato Māori had interpreted bonfires lit on 1st July to
celebrate the Prince of Wales’s marriage as war signals, and were panicked into
holding runanga at which a number of options were mooted. He writes that

Tamihana and others kept Rewi from attacking Auckland, for a period of two months and
a half, while the town was comparatively defenseless; and there is no reason to suppose
they would have failed to restrain him when the town was under the protection of ten
thousand soldiers.

Gorst also cites a letter from Rēnata Kawepō to Isaac Featherston questioning the
motive of the war, in which he stated that the moderate Kingitanga chiefs held Rewi
back from war. Grey may have possibly believed the rumours of war, but it is
likely that it was merely a convenient pretext. Atkinson noted in his journal on 30
April, before the Ōakura killings, that Grey was informing his ministers that war was
inevitable. While the threat of war existed for months, the letters implicating
Waikato were not written until early July, yet the Auckland 1st Class Militia was

---

233 Te Karere Maori, 28/9/1862:12. The paper included the words of the ngeri, and translation, as
follows.

E! e! Ko wai tera e kokoti mai ra i te ika Ahiroa!
E! e! Te urunga o Kea ka taka!
E! e! Kareaunui ka ngaupi tuku manawa!
Puhikura! Puhikura! Puhikura!
Ka whakatautapa ki Kawhia!
Huakina! Huakina! Puhia!

O! O! Who’s that yonder, cutting up the fish of Ahiroa?
O! O! The pillow of Kea falls!
O! O! Kareaunui gnaws at my heart!
Plume of red! Plume of red! Plume of the Kaka!
We’ll sing our war song at Kawhia!
Surprise! Surprise! Fire!

234 Te Karere Maori, 28/9/1863:12. ‘Muri iho i te hinganga o nga Pakeha ki Taranaki, ko te mahi a
Waikato he runanga puku mo te patu i nga Pakeha o Te Ia, o Akarana, me ona wahi katoa. E hara tenei
i te kupu tito na te Pakeha; kaore, na nga tangata Maori amo o Waikato, o era atu wahi o te motu nei...’

236 Also AJHR, 1865 (E11), cited in Gorst (2001), p 168.
called out on 23rd June,239 and the army was sufficiently ready to invade on the 14th July.

_**Te Karere Maori**_'s ambivalence to the political situation may reflect that at this stressful time, the newspaper became a low priority. Its demise shows that the Native Department no longer valued its propaganda activities. The paper’s lack of focus contrasts with _Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri_, a new paper established by McLean in June 1863 for Māori of the Hawkes Bay and Wairarapa.240 As a local paper, _Te Waka_ appears more connected to local issues, for example, allowing a number of letters about an alleged case of mākutu in Wairoa.241 Ahuriri Māori were happy to express loyalty to the government, but felt unhappy that it should propose “police” barracks for the area.242 That Pākehā should need government protection was an affront to Māori mana. As chiefs at Mōhaka wrote to McLean,

> if some Māori come to fight our Pākehā, we and our Pākehā will fight those intruding Māori. ... Don’t send soldiers to these places listed above. ... My friend McLean, leave it to us to help our Pākehā.243

Ngāti Kahungunu leaders wanted to keep war from their district. At a meeting at Pāwhakairo, Rēnata Kawepō, formerly a Kingitanga supporter, resolved that Pākehā and Māori would protect each other. The meeting resolved that ‘if a tribe interferes to wreck this decision, then we are all Pākehā’.244 The war in Waikato had raised tensions in Hawkes Bay, as some hapū had Kingitanga sympathies,245 and Kingitanga supporters from the Urewera were attempting to encourage the local Māori to revolt.246 For this reason, the newspaper stressed that race relations had always been good in the region, and that Ngāti Kahungunu were too industrious and civilised to indulge in murdering Pākehā.247

---

239 Maxwell, p 67.
240 _Te Waka Maori [o Ahuriri]_ was the only Māori language newspaper until 1874. Receiving government funding it became a national paper in 1871, abbreviating its name to _Te Waka Māori_, and continued to publish until 1879. The Māori-run _Te Wananga_ operated between 1874-1878.
243 _Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri_, 5/9/1863:2. ‘Ki te haere mai etahi māori ki te riri ki a matou pakeha, ko matou me a matou pakeha ta matou riri ki nga māori pokanoa. ... Ko te hoia kaua e homai ki enei wahi i whakahaua nei i runga ake na. ... E taku hoa e Ma, waiho ma matou ano e awhina a matou pakeha[.]’
244 _Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri_, 8/8/1863:1. ‘Ki te poka mai tetehi iwi ki te whakahino i tenei korero, he pakeha katoa tatou...’
245 For example, see _Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri_, 8/8/1863:4; 22/8/1863:1.
246 _Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri_, 25/7/1863:3; 22/8/1863:1.
Te Waka also provided much more information on the war than the government’s Te Karere Māori, with its first issue detailing the government’s attacks on Taranaki Māori as utu for the Ōakura massacre. It also covered minor matters, such as the arrest of Aporo, the leader of the tauā which expelled Gorst from Te Awamutu, and the banishment of the Waikato chief, Ahu Te Neri, from Auckland. The paper also published the Governor’s proclamation of 11 July to Waikato in which he justified his intention to invade, with the ominous words that those who resisted would ‘forfeit the right to the possession of their lands guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Waitangi’. The paper also printed notices from Governor Grey stating he would protect loyal Māori, and that the ban on trade applied only to those fighting the government. Given that this information, appearing from the governor’s pen, was important, and potentially affected all Māori, it is indeed strange that Te Karere Māori did not see fit to print it.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the political developments affecting Māori in the post-Kohimarama era, especially as they were portrayed in the newspapers. During this period, Te Karere Māori/Te Manuhiri Tuarangi continued as a major propaganda weapon for the government, but was joined also by other newspapers commenting on political issues. Browne continued as governor for another year, elaborating a vision to bring Māori within the confines of British administration through a system of local government, district courts, and further national meetings of chiefs. However, he did not consider that this could be done until the Kingitanga had been cleared away. With this in mind, he prepared for war, and demanded submission from Waikato. Te Haeata, as it did before Kohimarama, continued to support the government’s actions whilst Browne remained as governor.


249. Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri, 11/7/1863:1. According to Gorst, ‘Neri came to town and saw the Governor, to whom he began to talk in his old saucy way about his King, and his objection to the Governor’s magistrates. But, instead of his buffoonery being good-naturedly listened to, as it used to be, he was abruptly ordered to leave the Governor’s presence, and informed that if found an hour later in Auckland, he would be sent to gaol.’

250. Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri, 8/8/1863:4. ‘...ka noa te tikanga i pumai ai o ratou whenua, ki a ratou, ara, te tikanga i whakatakoria e te Tiriti o Waitangi[.]’
While hostilities had ended in Taranaki, Browne had been unable to bring about a peace that was likely to last. The Crown held the disputed Waitara while Māori held the Tātaraimaka Block as a counter balance. Browne’s actions in Taranaki had troubled many Māori, including those who had attended Kohimarama. One chief who did not attend, Rēnata Kawepō, was prepared to openly debate the issue with the Wellington superintendent, Fitzgerald, and publish an account of the contest. While reported in English language newspapers, this received little coverage in the Māori language newspapers, although Te Manuhiri Tuarangi did try to limit its impact with an article attacking some of Kawepō’s criticisms. Charles Davis also attacked Browne in his two annuals, Ko Aotearoa, although he reserved his most strident criticism until after Browne had departed as governor.

The remaining two years of peace were dominated by Browne’s replacement, Sir George Grey. Grey’s aims were the same as Browne’s, to bring Māori under the rule of British law and administration. However, while Browne planned an assault on the Waikato to eliminate the Kingitanga, Grey decided to employ more subtle methods. He introduced his Tikanga Hou, an adaptation of Browne’s plans for courts and self-government within Māori districts. He aimed at keeping Māori divided politically with districts whilst drawing them in under the maru of the government. Although these New Institutions were largely unsuccessful outside of Northland, the government used Te Karere Maori in a sustained propaganda effort to promote the scheme.

At the same time, Grey attempted to undermine the influence of the Kingitanga. Neither he, nor Te Karere Maori, were prepared to acknowledge the Kingitanga as a body representing the political aspirations of Māori. Visiting Waikato, Grey engaged several Kingitanga chiefs in debate. Te Karere Maori subsequently published an account of these debates in which Grey was portrayed as peaceful and reasonable, and the Kingitanga as intransigent and menacing. This government propaganda was sufficient for some chiefs to transfer their allegiance to the Crown. Grey also attempted to assert the mana of the government within the Kingitanga: by installing John Gorst as a magistrate at Te Awamutu; by attempting to build roads into Waikato, and a courthouse at Kohekohe; and by threatening to sail gunboats up the Waikato.

251 Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri, 5/9/1863:3.
252 See above.
Having acquired its own press, the Kingitanga fought against the government’s propaganda campaign with its own newspaper, *Te Hokioi*. This paper sought to establish a legitimacy for the Kingitanga. It also disputed the government’s right to assert its *mana* over them, arguing that the Treaty of Waitangi had been a deception, and therefore was not valid. Because *Te Hokioi* was proving a successful propaganda tool for the Kingitanga, Grey instructed Gorst to set up a rival newspaper, *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke*. For several months in 1863, these two newspapers engaged in a propaganda battle, each attempting to denigrate the other side, until Gorst was expelled by a *taua* of Ngāti Maniapoto warriors incensed with an article attacking Matutaera, the Māori King.

Although Grey had professed his peaceful intentions to the Kingitanga, he had indeed prepared for war, in particular, building a road which would allow easy transport of soldiers and equipment to the Kingitanga border. In April, he retook Tātaraimaka, and a month later Ngāti Ruanui responded by killing a group of soldiers at Oakura. Fearing that the Kingitanga would again join the war in Taranaki, and with rumours of an attack on Auckland as a pretext, Grey made the decision to invade the Waikato to crush the Kingitanga.

With the prospect of war, the Kingitanga evacuated its press, but was unable to resume printing. *Te Karere Maori* continued publishing for several months after the invasion, but the government did not use this time to mount an effective propaganda campaign to complement its war effort. Indeed once the government had opted for a military solution, it appears to have lost all interest in both newspaper propaganda, and its *Tikanga Hou*. The newly established *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri* continued on as a local newspaper, until establishing itself as a national Māori language newspaper, *Te Waka Maori o Niu Tirani*, in 1871.
Conclusion

The Treaty of Waitangi, with its conflicting Māori and English versions, fails to adequately lay a firm blueprint for the relationship between Māori and the Crown. Consequently, from 1840 to the present, Māori have been negotiating that relationship. Māori society was underpinned by mana, the rights, power and authority of chiefs and hapū over land and resources. The Treaty gave birth to a new mana, mana kāwanatanga, the power of government. In the years prior to the government’s invasion of the Waikato in 1863, most Māori lived away from the effective reach of mana kāwanatanga, that is, despite the changes wrought by colonisation, Māori still effectively exercised their mana whenua, and ordered their lives without undue interference from government officials. With ongoing colonisation, it was obvious to Māori at the time that their society, and its relationship with the Crown, was changing, and would continue to change. The question was, would Māori be subsumed, and disappear, within the Pākehā society, or would they be able to maintain their own identity and mana. Some saw increasing cooperation with the Crown and its institutions the best option for prosperity, whereas others considered that the Kingitanga was the best way to keep their lands, mana and identity.

The Crown worked towards successful Pākehā colonisation, and, in order to facilitate settlement, wanted changes to its relationship with Māori. It expected Māori to fit into the new society, by selling land to allow Pākehā settlement, and by accepting mana kāwanatanga, and by embracing the “civilisation” that settlement offered. Unlike its colonising activities in North America and Australia, the Crown considered its efforts in New Zealand to be a ‘new and humane system’, different from previous examples of British colonisation. It offered Māori all the benefits that would accrue to the Pākehā settlers, that is, a win-win situation for both Māori and Pākehā.

In an effort to promote this system, the Native Department of the New Zealand Government published its own newspapers, from January 1842 to January 1846, from January 1849 to May 1854, and from January 1855 to September 1863. This thesis investigated newspaper activity through that third period of government newspaper publishing. Its paper, named The Māori Messenger or Te Karere Maori, and briefly
as *Te Manuhiri Tuarangi and Māori Intelligencer* in 1861, appeared consistently throughout this eight year period, and its pages form the bulk of the total Māori language newspapers production of this time.

It was institutions, and individuals connected with them, that chose newspapers as a means of communicating with Māori. The Wesleyan missionary, Thomas Buddle, published *Te Haeata* for three years. Walter Buller, as a junior government official and son of a Wesleyan missionary, published his own newspaper, *Te Karere o Poneke*, in Wellington for 16 months. Charles Davis, a religious campaigner and twice editor of *Te Karere Māori*, put out three short-lived publications whilst not employed by the Native Department. The government’s chief land purchaser, and the Superintendent of the Hawkes Bay province, Donald McLean, was responsible for *Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri*. The Kingitanga, desiring to counter the dominant colonialist discourse, published *Te Hokioi*. In an effort to limit the effects of the Kingitanga’s paper, the government established *Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke* in Te Awamutu.

Māori language newspapers have not always had a good press. As discussed in Chapter 1, some contemporary Pākehā commentators thought the government’s *Te Karere Maori* altogether too dry. Historians, such as Sinclair and Ward, perhaps influenced by the liberal and secular prejudices of twentieth century academia, assumed that Māori would have similarly dismissed that newspaper as not worthy of being read. Indeed, to modern tastes, the newspapers might appear condescending and offensive, even promoting cultural genocide. However, nineteenth century Māori did not possess twenty-first century sensibilities: they could tolerate the often sanctimonious tone of the newspapers, because they were already used to a rich diet of religious moralising and improving advice from missionaries. As seen in the correspondence pages of papers such as *Te Karere o Poneke*, many Māori wanted modernity and progress, and saw the newspaper as a conduit. Māori also valued newspapers because they were one of the few sources of information other than the spoken word. They scanned the market pages for price fluctuations, but also interpreted the government’s motives and intentions from what was printed in the newspapers. Newspapers also offered Māori a larger alternative marae, where their debates and discussions could be heard across the country. Many Māori, writing to government officials, requested that their letters be printed in *Te Karere Maori*.

---

1 *Te Karere Maori*, 14/7/1860:10. ‘tikanga hou, whakaora tangata’
Academic attitudes to the newspapers are starting to change. For example, Angela Ballara describes the Māori language newspaper corpus as an incredibly rich resource, not only for Māori political history, but for waiata, whakapapa, cultural forms and practices, social history, the development of language and many other matters ... unprecedented as witness to Māori activities and opinion ... provid[ing] one antidote to the kind of historical writing about Māori which relies on Pākehā sources of information.²

However, this thesis has argued that those controlling the newspapers resolved to use them for political and social purposes, causing these publications to become historical agents in their own right. The newspapers, therefore, do not merely provide a window on the past, but actually helped to shape the course of history. The banishment of Gorst and Te Pihoihoi from Te Awamutu, for example, increased the bellicose sentiments within the Waikato. Newspapers influenced Māori thought and decision-making. Māori farmers, for example, relying on the market prices published in Te Karere o Poneke, considered that Pākehā not prepared to pay that price were trying to cheat them. Newspapers were sometimes read aloud, and discussed, at meetings. For example, the rūnanga at Aotea decided to accept Grey's Tikanga Hou after Te Karere Maori was read out loud to the meeting,³ while Māori at Puketawa, Taranaki, met to discuss the debates between Grey and Kingitanga orators, being reported in Te Karere Maori.⁴

Most of the Pākehā-run newspapers were interested in “civilising” Māori, that is, encouraging them to abandon most of their traditional customs, and adopt European habits and attitudes. This desire to change Māori was predicated on a number of “truths” that Pākehā found self-evident. First, they believed that humanity was continuously advancing in terms of civilisation; that Europeans, particularly the British, were in the vanguard of this advance. They thought Māori should share in this progress, not just because it was a good thing in itself, but because Māori would not survive without it, if they were to survive at all. However, civilisation and colonisation went hand in hand. The incoming immigrants wanted to create a stable

---

³ Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:17-18.
⁴ Te Karere Maori, 1/5/1862:13, “When your newspapers arrived at Taranaki. We saw an account of your visit to Waikato, and considered the subject of your conversation. We met together at Porikapa Tukutuku’s place, on Saturday, the 1st March, and on Monday, the 3rd of March Porikapa addressed us from the Word of God, to give us understanding; he then told us what he had read in the newspaper, and asked which Runanga would support what the Governor had said.” [source]
society, one based on, but better than, that which they had left. The government expected Māori to embrace the new system, by submitting to English law and the political tutelage of Pākehā. Failure to do so was seen as a violation of the Treaty of Waitangi. They also wanted to see Māori engaging with the market economy, and, most importantly, releasing their “waste” land for Pākehā settlers.

The changes expected of Māori were comprehensive, encompassing social, cultural, commercial, legal and political domains. Māori were expected not merely to be receptive to these changes, but eager to be guided by their Pākehā tuakana. As described in Chapter 2, this discourse of civilisation required a new lexicon in order to be communicated. The Pākehā promoting progress and civilisation to Māori co-opted existing Māori words, giving them new meanings to cope with the new concepts. However, this lexicon, with its “good” and “bad” words, tended to dichotomise Pākehā and Māori, instead of promoting the concept of one people developing together.

This thesis has also stressed that the newspapers were propaganda devices, in that they sought to change Māori attitudes and behaviour, socially, politically, and culturally. Chapter 4 outlined various propaganda techniques, and provided examples from the newspapers. The propaganda nature of the newspapers, particularly Te Karere Māori, is particularly evident in political matters, when the government was trying to limit Māori sympathy for both Te Rangitāke in Taranaki, and the Kingitanga. Indeed, when the government organised one of its largest propaganda efforts, the great meeting of chiefs at Kohimarama in 1860, it utilised its newspaper to complement its efforts at the meeting, by publishing its proceedings over a period of five months.

Despite occasional efforts from Charles Davis, the government’s political propaganda was not effectively challenged in the newspapers until 1862, when the Kingitanga started publishing Te Hokioi. This newspaper projected the vision of a modern independent Māori state under the mana of the Māori King, in which Māori land would be protected from the predations of the Pākehā. They therefore attacked the government’s claim to mana kōwanatanga over the whole country, asserting that the Treaty of Waitangi had no validity over those who rejected it. In an effort to counter this propaganda, the government established a rival newspaper, Te Pihoihoi, at Te Awamutu, within the lands of the King. Te Hokioi and Te Pihoihoi fought an
ideological battle for several months in 1863, arguing over the extent to which the King could represent Māori, and whether the Governor would interfere with the Māori districts in the central North Island, until Ngāti Maniapoto warriors banished the government press and its editor back to the Queen’s territory. The Kingitanga was a nascent Māori nationalism. In order to show the movement’s dreams were possible, Te Hokioi sought to supply an overseas example of a successful “black” anti-colonialist state, and gave a truncated history of Haiti. This was a significant piece of propaganda because it portrayed enough truth for a compelling case, whilst omitting any facts that might spoil it. Te Karere Maori supplied its own version of Haitian history, with the facts sufficiently adjusted to argue for continued Māori loyalty to the Crown. Indeed, as shown in Chapters 7 and 8, the newspapers expended much of their space on political propaganda throughout the research period. Significantly, it was only in September 1863, after the government had committed itself to solving its “Native difficulties” by war, that it ceased its production of Te Karere Maori.

As seen in Chapter 6, Pākehā communicating with Māori through the newspapers, shared a common set of cultural values and beliefs. Their presentation of information designed to help Māori “improve” was therefore similar in nature. However, there is sufficient evidence to show that there was no conspiracy between government, missionaries, and other Pākehā intellectuals to orchestrate a single campaign to facilitate the aims of colonisation. The government newspaper, Te Karere Maori / Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, certainly promoted the sale of land, land individualisation, the acceptance of law and roads, and Pākehā political dominance. They were generally supported in these aims by Te Haeata and Te Karere o Poneke. However, unlike the government, Te Haeata certainly did not promote increased Māori involvement in commerce, believing that it would interfere with religious devotions. Unlike Te Karere Maori which promoted Christianity as part of the civilising package but did not overtly support any particular church, Te Haeata was unashamedly anti-Catholic. Te Haeata supported the government actions in Taranaki, and shared its anti-Kingitanga stance, but effectively withdrew from political comment once Grey returned as Governor in 1861. Te Karere o Poneke, despite its Wesleyan connections, favoured Māori commerce, but also promoted Māori involvement in the new electoral system. This certainly ran counter to the
government’s line. Despite its rhetoric of *he iwi kotahi*, it actively discouraged Māori interest in Pākehā politics, whilst advancing the concept of a personal relationship with a paternal and benevolent governor. The prospect of Māori participating in provincial and national elections certainly displeased some influential Pākehā, and it appears that some pressure may have been put upon Walter Buller, a young government official and editor of *Te Karere o Poneke*, to moderate his message. Finally, Charles Davis was a Pākehā editor who was a vocal critic of government actions in Taranaki, and a sympathiser of the Kingitanga, particularly through his annual, *Ko Aotearoa*. Of the Pākehā editors, he alone critiqued the government’s land buying practices. However, even when it appears that the newspapers as a whole are promulgating one general civilising message, there are distinct differences in emphasis. For example, *Te Karere Maori* sought Māori acceptance of *mana kāwanatanga*; *Te Karere o Poneke* called for Māori to adopt Pākehā ways in order to become citizens; *Te Haeata* wanted Māori to be good Christians.

An important aim of this thesis has been to give voice to those who engaged with the newspapers, both Māori and Pākehā. As seen above, there was consensus among the Pākehā contributors on some issues, but there was no one orchestrated Pākehā voice. Similarly, while Māori opinion could at times lean towards a single position, such as unease over Browne’s actions in Taranaki, Māori indeed presented a variety of opinions over a wide range of issues. Even in Pākehā-run papers, Māori espoused different opinions on how land issues should be dealt with. For example, some tūtūā expressed their dissatisfaction that rangatira benefitted most from land sales. While some Māori warmed to ritenga Pākehā, it is clear that some tikanga Māori, such as mākutu, were still firmly entrenched in Māori society. The thesis also shows that, when it came to political allegiances, individual Māori could change their opinions over a relatively short space of time. For example, Hēnare Taratoa, appears willing to assimilate in 1858, but later died fighting the British, while Rēnata Kawepō was openly sympathetic to the Kingitanga, yet fought for the Crown in the late 1860s.

There has been a modern tendency by some writers to portray any Māori resistance to colonisation as commendable, and by inference, that Māori who collaborated with, or accepted *mana kāwanatanga* were either traitors, or had been duped. Kuni Jenkins suggests that the acquisition of literacy by Māori, in itself, allowed their minds to be colonised. In Chapter 2, I dispute the notion that literacy
per se changes the way people think, preferring Street’s model that it is schooling rather than literacy that has the greatest impact. Māori were generally not exposed to sustained schooling before the 1867 Native Schools Act. I therefore argue that Māori minds had not been “colonised” during this research period, and that they made rational choices on how they interacted with the Crown based on their own iwi and hapū concerns as they saw them. Co-operation with the Crown was not only the path of least resistance, but for many Māori, the most appropriate path. Since the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori had lived for twenty years in a changing society, which might, with Grey’s Tikanga Hou, allow the possibility of limited autonomy. In contrast to what the Kingitanga could offer, this “amalgamated” society appeared to be bringing peace, wealth and progress. Those Māori who opted for co-operation did not know that the settlers would not be interested in sharing the fruits with them. It was these tribes, who cooperated with the Crown in the expectation of partnership and a share in the nation’s wealth, that later challenged the primacy of mana kōwanatanga from the 1870s to the end of the century, and notably through the Kotahitanga movement. They too used newspapers to advance their cause, although their story falls outside of the scope of this thesis.

In the 1860s, many Māori were happy to write to newspapers giving their allegiance to the Queen, or expressing their desire to adopt Pākehā customs. However, this did not stop Māori from speaking their minds, asserting their rights, or criticising what they saw as Pākehā inconsistency. They were also prepared to use the newspapers for their own purposes, for example, when Wi Tako Ngātata exposed Te Hāpuku in Te Karere o Poneke for his warlike intentions, or when the rūnanga at Hautōtara, in Wairarapa, had its decision on a piece of land, agreed to by all parties, published in order to stop any further argument. There were Māori who did not write to newspapers and perhaps did not even read them. The voice of Māori women does not feature in the newspapers of this time. Men rarely discussed Māori women, except for occasional expressions of concerns about their health or morality. The thesis, therefore, cannot claim to re-present the voice of all Māori, merely those whose words or deeds appear in the newspapers.

This thesis would be all the poorer in giving voice to Māori, had not the Kingitanga published Te Hokioi. This paper was not a prolific generator of pages
when compared to the overall newspaper output. It did, however, operate from an ideological position that was at variance with its contemporaries. It was run specifically to support the Kingitanga, and to project a vision of a viable Māori independence. Because its position sat in opposition to the colonising discourse promoted in *Te Karere Maori*, *Te Hokioi* put considerable effort into critiquing the government’s statements and actions. While some scholars have utilised material from *Te Hokioi*, I believe that this thesis is the first to analyse that newspaper’s ideology in a comprehensive manner.

While this thesis covers a relatively short period of New Zealand history, it is one that has been well worked by historians. It was a time in which some Māori saw the opportunity for the bicultural future for New Zealand that many of its people now strive for. The newspapers are a good medium to explore this potential, because they dealt with the ideas and aspirations of both Māori and Pākehā. Certainly many Māori were keen to explore the possibilities of co-operation: despite the war in Taranaki, chiefs at Kohimarama were still confident that they could do business with the government. However, it was the government, that is, both the governors and the settler politicians, who proved unwilling to allow Māori a voice with mana.

The newspapers researched for this thesis comprise but a small portion of the total corpus of *Ngā Niupepa Maori*. It is likely that more work will be undertaken on the newspapers, both research on the activities and messages of the newspapers themselves, and the extraction of information as evidence for other projects. At present, there are still huge gaps in the research. For example, study on *Te Wananga* and *Te Waka Māori o Niu Tirani* would shed more light on land dealings and the Repudiation Movement as well as the decline of Māori agriculture; the pages of *Huia Tangata Kotahi* and other newspapers would give more information on the Kōtalitanga Movement; research into the early twentieth century Anglican Māori papers would not only reveal more about how Māori interacted with that Church, but also the dreams of the young men who formed the Young Māori Party. Historians could also utilise the newspapers for a wide range of research, including Māori social and religious history, the Treaty of Waitangi and gender issues. What is now needed is scholars with the ability to read those newspapers *i roto i te reo Māori*.

---

5 Of the 1855-1863 period studied, *Te Hokioi’s* output was barely 1%. Even if limited to eleven months that *Te Hokioi* was publishing, its output was about 12½% of the total published in that period.
### Glossary

**Māori Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori Word</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ariki</td>
<td>paramount chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hākari</td>
<td>feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>clan group, sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāwhekaihe</td>
<td>half-caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he iwi kotahi</td>
<td>one people, government policy of “amalgamation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingarangi</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>tribe, people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāinga</td>
<td>Māori settlement, village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karakia</td>
<td>incantation, prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karanga</td>
<td>call to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāwana</td>
<td>governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāwanatanga</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawenata</td>
<td>covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingitanga</td>
<td>kingdom, Māori King Movement, land and/or people under the <em>mana</em> of the Māori king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiri mā</td>
<td>white skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiri mangu</td>
<td>black skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komiti</td>
<td>committee, council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūare, kūware</td>
<td>commoner, ignorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuinitanga</td>
<td>land under the <em>mana</em> of the Crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūpapa</td>
<td>neutral, Māori allied to the Crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahi</td>
<td>activity, work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākutu</td>
<td>witchcraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>power, authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana kāwanatanga</td>
<td><em>mana</em> of the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana Kingi</td>
<td><em>mana</em> of the Māori king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana motuhake</td>
<td>separate authority, independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana tipuna</td>
<td><em>mana</em> derived from ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana whenua</td>
<td><em>mana</em> of Māori over their lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>indigenous people of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>open space in front of the meeting house where <em>whaikōrero</em> takes place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārama</td>
<td>clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maru</td>
<td>shade, protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matua</td>
<td>father, parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mere</td>
<td>short club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngākau</td>
<td>heart, inclination, nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngeri</td>
<td>chant with actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ora, oranga</td>
<td>life, well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pā</td>
<td>fortification, fortified Māori village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paipera Tapu</td>
<td>Holy Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>European, British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pokanoa</td>
<td>without authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupuri whenua</td>
<td>hold back the land from sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatira</td>
<td>chief, chiefly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatiratanga</td>
<td>chiefly attributes, chiefly authority, independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ritenga  custom, practice
rongo      hear, obey
rūnanga    meeting, council, conference
tamariki   children
tāmoko     tatoo, facial tatoo
tāngata    people
tangihanga funeral
taonga     possession, treasure
tapu       restricted, scared, spiritually based restriction
taua       war party, group of warriors
teina      younger sibling
tika       proper, correct
tikanga    custom, practice, system
Tikanga Hou Government policy of the “New Institutions”
tīnana     body
tohunga    expert, sage, priest
tuakana    older sibling
tuku whenua give up land for sale
tumuaki    head of an organisation, Civil Commissioner
ture       law
tūtūā      commoner, slave
utu        payment, recompense, revenge
wāhi tapu  sacred place
waiaata    song, singing
waka       canoe, tribes linked through an original colonising canoe
whaikōrero oratory, formal speaking on the marae
whakapapa  genealogy
whakataukī proverb, saying
whānau     family
whare      house, building
wharepuni  communal sleeping house

Alternate or full Māori names.

Honiana   Te Puni / Te Puni-kōkopu
Kawepō, Rēnata Tama-ki-Hikurangi
Kingi, Wiremu Te Rangitāke
Matutaera  Tāwhiao / Pōtatau
Pātara, Wiremu Te Tuhi
Rewi      Rewi Maniapoto / Manga
Tako, Wiremu Wi Tako Ngātata
Tamihana, Wiremu Tarapipipi / Te Waharoa
Te Teira  Mānuka
Te Wherowhero Pōtatau
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### Table 7: Details of the Māori Language Newspapers, January 1855 - September 1863.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>newspaper</th>
<th>editor</th>
<th>size (mm)</th>
<th>first</th>
<th>last</th>
<th>issues</th>
<th>pages</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Lang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Karere Maori - The Maori Messenger</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>250 x 200</td>
<td>1/1855</td>
<td>10/1863</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Māori English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Karere o Poneke</td>
<td>Walter Buller.</td>
<td>270 x 210</td>
<td>10/1857</td>
<td>12/1858</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>£1 p.a.</td>
<td>independenta</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Waka o te Iwi</td>
<td>Charles Davis</td>
<td>450 x 320</td>
<td>10/1857</td>
<td>11/1857</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whetu o te Tau</td>
<td>Charles Davis</td>
<td>300 x 210</td>
<td>6/1858</td>
<td>9/1858</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Haeata</td>
<td>Thomas Buddle</td>
<td>290 x 230</td>
<td>4/1859</td>
<td>3/1862</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Onehunga</td>
<td>2/6 p.a. or 3d per copy</td>
<td>Wesleyan Church</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko Aotearoa - The Maori Recorder</td>
<td>Charles Davis</td>
<td>210 x 140</td>
<td>1/1861</td>
<td>1/1862</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>Māori English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Hokioi e Rere Atu na</td>
<td>Pātara Te Tuhi</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>9/1861</td>
<td>5/1863</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ngāruawāhia</td>
<td>3d per copy</td>
<td>Kingitanga</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke i Runga i te Tuamu</td>
<td>John Gorst</td>
<td>260 x 190</td>
<td>2/1863</td>
<td>3/1863</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ōtawhao (Te Awamutu)</td>
<td>probably free</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Māori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a Te Karere o Poneke was run independently, but did receive one payment of £40 from the government for running costs.
*b Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke prepared a fifth issue of 4 pages, but this was captured by Ngāti Maniapoto before it could be disseminated.
+c Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri continued publishing until July 1871. In October 1871 the government took full control of the newspaper, and renamed it Te Waka o Niu Tireni.
+d Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri may have been funded by the government, but to what extent is unknown.
Table 8: Timeline of Newspaper Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Te Karere Maori</th>
<th>Te Karere o Poneke</th>
<th>Te Waka o te Iwi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Te Karere Maori</th>
<th>Te Karere o Poneke</th>
<th>Te Whetu o te Tau</th>
<th>Te Haeata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Te Karere Maori*</th>
<th>Te Haeata</th>
<th>Ko Aotearoa</th>
<th>Te Hokioi</th>
<th>Te Pihoihoi Mokemoke</th>
<th>Te Waka Maori o Ahuriri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Known as Te Manuhiri Tuarangi, March – November, 1861.
Appendix 3

Map 1

South Auckland and Lower Waikato

[Originally produced by Stanfords Geographical Establishment, for J.E. Gorst The Maori King: or, the Story of our Quarrel with the Natives of New Zealand. (London: Macmillan, 1864) supplement.]
Map 2

Waipa and Upper Waikato

[Gorst (1864) supplement.]
This map indicates known locations referred to in the thesis.

For South Auckland and Waikato locations, refer to maps 1 & 2.

1. Hokianga
2. Kaipara
3. Manukau
4. Whāingaroa / Raglan
5. Aotea
6. Kāwhia
7. Kerikeri
8. Kororareka / Russell
9. Waimeate
10. Pūhoi
11. Kohimarama
12. Papakura
13. Ngāruawāhia
14. Tauranga
15. Maketū
16. Rotorua
17. Te Wairoa / Rotomahana
18. Waiapu
This map indicates known locations referred to in the thesis:

1. Wellington
2. Nelson
3. New Plymouth / Ngāmotu (& Ōmata)
4. Whanganui
5. Napier / Ahuriri
6. Tūranga
7. Wairoa
8. Waikanae
9. Otaki
10. Kapiti Island
11. Waitara
12. Tātaraimaka (& Ōakura)
13. Taupō
14. Waitōtara
15. Rangitīkei
16. Moutoa
17. Papawai
18. Masterton / Māhītāone
19. Pitoone / Petone
20. Tūrangi
21. Aorere Goldfields