

**A short history of land alienation
in the
South Manukau District**

Peter McBurney & Nat Green

Auckland

July 2012

Contents

CONTENTS	2
PREFACE	5
Synopsis	5
The Authors.....	6
Copyright.....	7
1. BACKGROUND HISTORY.....	9
1.1 A brief pre-Treaty history of the region	9
1.2 The establishment of Auckland.....	11
1.3 Land disputes south of the Manukau Harbour	13
1.3.1 Political and economic changes in the 1840s	13
1.3.2 The Taurangaruru conflict.....	15
2. CROWN PURCHASES IN SOUTH MANUKAU.....	20
2.1 Waste Lands of the Crown	20
2.2 Land Purchases East of Patumāhoe.....	23
2.2.1 The Pūkaki, Te Karaka and Manukau purchases	24
2.2.2 The Pukekohe and Ramarama purchases 1842-1853	25
2.2.3 The Paraheka and Roto purchases, 1848.....	31
2.3 Land Purchases between Pukekohe and Waiuku	32
2.3.1 The Waiuku No. 1 purchase	32
2.3.2 The Whakaupoko purchase	35
2.3.3 The Patumāhoe and Titi Reserves	37
2.3.4 The Pukekohe Reserve	38
3. THE WAIKATO WAR AND THE CONFISCATION OF THE SOUTH AUCKLAND RESERVES	43
3.1 The Kīngitanga and the Waikato War.....	43
3.2 The Confiscation of South Manukau Lands.....	52
3.2.1 The New Zealand Settlements Act 1863	52
3.2.2 The confiscation of Patumāhoe & other reserves.....	55

3.2.3 The Patumāhoe Compensation Court hearing.....	56
4. SOUTH MANUKAU IWI TRADITIONS OVERVIEW	63
4.1 Introduction	63
4.2 Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua.....	65
4.3 Ngā Hekenga mai nō Waikato	66
4.4 Te Patumāhoe.....	67
5. BRIEF ACCOUNTS OF SOUTH MANUKAU HAPŪ & IWI.....	69
5.1 Ngāti Te Ata.....	69
5.1.1 Marae.....	69
5.1.2 Traditions.....	69
5.2 Ngāti Tamaoho.....	72
5.2.1 Marae.....	72
5.2.2 Traditions.....	72
5.3 Te Akitai.....	75
5.3.1 Marae.....	75
5.3.2 Traditions.....	75
5.4 Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki (Ngāti Tai)	78
5.4.1 Marae.....	78
5.4.2 Ngāti Taihaua Traditions.....	78
5.4.3 Ngāti Pare Traditions.....	80
5.4.4 Te Uri o Te Ao Traditions.....	80
5.5 Te Uri o Pou (Ngāti Pou)	83
5.5.1 Marae.....	83
5.5.2 Traditions.....	83
5.6 Ngāti Tipa.....	86
5.6.1 Marae.....	86
5.6.2 Traditions.....	86
5.7 Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei.....	88
5.7.1 Marae.....	88
5.7.2 Traditions.....	88
5.8 Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa.....	91

5.8.1 Marae	91
5.8.2 Traditions.....	91
5.9 Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Hauā.....	94
5.9.1 Marae	94
5.9.2 Traditions.....	95
6. CONCLUSIONS	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101
Primary Sources	101
Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL)	101
Archives New Zealand, Auckland (ANZ-A).....	101
Archives New Zealand, Wellington (ANZ-W)	101
Auckland Institute and Museum, (AIM)	101
University of Waikato Library (UWL).....	102
Land Information New Zealand (LINZ).....	102
Maori Land Court Minute Books (MB)	102
Raupatu Document Bank (RDB).....	102
Secondary Sources	103
Books and Articles	103
Government Publications	104
Newspapers.....	105

Preface

Synopsis

This report rehearses the broader historical events leading up to the Crown's land purchasing activities south of the Manukau Harbour, which saw the land alienated from Māori customary title. The land wars of the 1860s were followed by widespread land confiscations that saw local Māori stripped of the reserves set aside from the original land sales. This included the Patumāhoe and Pukekohe Reserves, and a series of reserves along the Waikato River, which left many Māori in South Manukau landless.

The report also seeks to identify the Māori chiefs and their respective hapū and iwi who owned the land (exercised mana/rangatiratanga) prior to its alienation to the Crown. This is not straightforward because the early land sales were characterised by disputes between local iwi over who owned the land, a problem that was solved at the time by including a wide cross-section of local hapū and iwi in the land purchase deeds.

The Authors

Peter McBurney (author of Part 1) was born in Ōtāhuhu and grew up in Māngere Bridge, South Auckland. His father, Don McBurney, is the great-grandson of a military settler named John McBurney who emigrated from Belfast Northern Ireland in 1876. His mother, Jean McBurney, is an ordained Anglican priest (retired).

McBurney qualified with a BA in 1995, majoring in anthropology and Māori studies. Since that time he has worked as a freelance historian and researcher, producing reports for the Waitangi Tribunal, the Environment Court and the Office of Treaty Settlements. Topics covered include the taking of Māori land for public works, the operation of the Native Land Court, the New Zealand Land Wars, legal challenges of the colonial regime undertaken by Māori, and the development of Māori organisations aimed at promoting Māori autonomy and self-determination. Most recently, (2010-2012), McBurney has served as lead historian on a project designed to facilitate Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki's Treaty settlement negotiations. An overview report, co-authored with Nat Green, was produced, covering the pre-Treaty and colonial history of Tāmaki Makaurau from the perspective of Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki.

Nathew (Nat) Karl Green (author of Part 2) was born at Tāmaki Makaurau, and was raised between Hauraki and Waikato by his mother and grandparents. Green is of Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki descent, and his tūrangawaewae is Umupuia Marae. He also traces descent from Te Waiohua, Ngāriki, Ngāti Pou, Te Akitai, Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Kārewa, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Hauā, Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Hourua, Ngāti Pāoa, Ngāti Tipa and Ngāti Naho, among others.

While holding no formal tertiary qualifications, Nat draws on many years of study and experience in the field of whakapapa and tradition. Since 2008, he has produced several cultural heritage reports on behalf of Umupuia Marae, Te Waka Tōtara Trust, and the Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Tribal Trust. He also works in an advisory capacity to Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki's Resource Management representatives, has contributed chapters on Ngāi Tai to local history books, and is engaged in various public education initiatives involving local schools and community groups. The summarised sketches of South Auckland hapū and iwi contained in Part 2 of this report complement the work Green is engaged with for Ngāi Tai.

Copyright

The authors assert their copyright in relation to this report entitled “A short history of land alienation in the South Manukau District”. We place the following conditions on the future use of the information contained in the report.

1. The publication, transmission or quotation of any part of the report may only be done with the written approval of the authors.
2. The authors reserve the right to use the research contained in the report in other contexts.

Contact Details

Peter McBurney

+64 21 259 6269

peter.mcburney@orcon.net.nz

Nat Green

+64 27 231 1074

natgreen.research@gmail.com

Part 1

A History of Land Alienation in the Southern Manukau District

1. Background history

1.1 A brief pre-Treaty history of the region

At about 1800, the district south of the Manukau Harbour was populated by a number of closely related iwi including Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Tamaoho, and Te Akitai, while further south and east were Ngāti Pou, Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Kārewa and various hapū of Ngāi Tai (Ngāti Taihaua, Te Uri o Te Ao-Tāwhirangi and Ngāti Pare).¹ These were all affiliated to Te Waiohua, which was the collective name for a cluster of iwi of Tainui origin that once held a pre-eminent position across the whole of the wider Tāmaki Makaurau region.

During the mid-late 1700s, Te Waiohua (and Ngā Iwi) of the Tāmaki Makaurau and Manukau regions, under the prominent chief Kiwi Tāmaki, came into conflict with Te Taoū and Ngāti Whātua from the Kaipara district. The latter were led by Te Wahaakiaki and his nephews Waitāheke and Tuperiri.² In the South Manukau district, Te Taoū forces attacked the Ngā Iwi/Waiohua people in their pā at Tarataua to the south of the Awhitu Peninsula, before returning to assault Pukehorokatoa on the north of Awhitu. At Pukehorokatoa Te Taoū were repelled and forced back to the north Manukau Heads, but ultimately regrouped to engage Te Waiohua at Paruroa (Big Muddy Creek), where Te Wahaakiaki succeeded in killing Kiwi Tāmaki and routing his forces. Tuperiri, whose sister had been killed in an earlier battle, went on to consolidate further victories over Te Waiohua on the central Tāmaki Isthmus and at Māngere, eventually taking possession of Kiwi's citadel at Maungakiekie (One Tree Hill).³

Speaking in the Native Land Court in the mid-nineteenth century, elderly rangatira such as Pāora Te Iwi and Hetaraka Takapuna were adamant that Te Waiohua had not

¹ These South Auckland iwi are discussed in greater detail in Part 2 of this report.

² Waitāheke and Tuperiri were the sons of Te Wahaakiaki's first cousin, Hukatere, and would thus be considered tamaiti (children, nephews etc) of his, according to their whakapapa.

³ Fenton's Ōrākei Judgment in *Important Judgments: Delivered in the Compensation Court and Native Land Court. 1866-1879*, 1879, p. 63. Fenton assigns the date of 1741 to the campaigns in which Kiwi Tāmaki was killed, however, both Kiwi Tāmaki and Tuperiri had grandchildren still living in the mid-late 1860s, with former allies and contemporaries of Kiwi still in living memory by that time, indicating that the conflicts probably occurred in the latter part of the 1700s.

been completely destroyed by various invasions from Waikato and Kaipara. Te Iwi described how Waikato, Ngāti Whātua, Ngāti Maru and Ngāti Pāoa had all attacked Te Waiohua at different times, but added: “They were not all slaughtered, they maintained their mana still”.⁴ Within his own living memory, he considered Pēpene Te Tihi of Te Akitai, and Hetaraka Takapuna’s father Pūrehurehu of Ngāti Tai, to represent great chiefs of Te Waiohua who had persisted at Tāmaki and Manukau long after Kiwi Tāmaki’s time, and “the remnant who were spared” of Ngā Iwi.⁵

The two decades prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi were dominated by the turbulent period known as the Musket Wars, which began in earnest at Tāmaki Makaurau in late 1821 with Hongi Hika’s attack on Ngāi Pāoa’s twin pā of Mokoia-Mauinaina near present-day Panmure. Hongi’s incursions, particularly his devastating attack on Waikato the following year, in which he used the Ōtāhuhu and Awaroa portages to gain access to the Waikato River, forced the inhabitants of the southern Manukau district to abandon their homes and seek shelter with their Waikato kin.⁶ The refugees lived for a time near Maungatautari until evicted by Ngāti Hauā following the battle of Taumatawīwī in late 1830. After Taumatawīwī, Ngāti Pāoa and Marutūahu cautiously returned to Hauraki, while Ngāti Whātua and their southern Manukau kin went to Te Horo on the Waipā River where they remained for a further 5-6 years under the protection of Te Wherowhero, the Waikato ariki.⁷

By the mid-1830s, plans were afoot for the people of Tāmaki and surrounding districts to reoccupy their former homes. This was not a foregone conclusion, as new animosities had arisen between Ngāti Whātua and Ngāti Pāoa, following a succession of raids and counter-raids between the two. Tensions between Ngāti Pāoa and Waikato also remained high, and it was not until Henry Williams of the Church Missionary Society intervened that a number of peacemaking hui were held, including a crucial hui at Ōtāhuhu in early 1836. There, the Reverend Williams arranged for the lay preacher William Fairburn to purchase a large area of land between the Tāmaki

⁴ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 192.

⁵ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 196-197.

⁶ The people of South Auckland may not all have gone to Waikato directly after Mokoia-Mauinaina, as some may have sheltered with kin in the Waitakere Ranges. However, after the battle of Ikaaranganui in 1825, the Tāmaki, Kaipara and Hauraki districts were abandoned for between five and ten years, although fishing parties occasionally ventured back to the Hauraki Gulf for short periods.

⁷ Stone, R. J. C., *From Tamaki-makau-rau to Auckland*, Auckland, AUP, 2001, pp. 108-125.

and Wairoa Rivers, and extending westwards to the shores of the Manukau Harbour, in order to create a buffer zone between the rival iwi.⁸ Fairburn moved with his family from the Thames, setting up a new mission station and school at Maraetai.

Under the terms of the peacemaking and with Te Wherowhero's protection, the people of Tāmaki were gradually able to return, firstly to lands about the Manukau, and finally to Ōrākei and the shores of the Waitematā. Various pieces of land about the Manukau and on Tāmaki Isthmus were given to Te Wherowhero and other leading chiefs of Ngāti Mahuta and other Lower Waikato iwi who accompanied the returning exiles, in recognition of the hospitality they had provided.

Despite these peace initiatives, the tribal landscape across Tāmaki and the southern Manukau district remained volatile into the 1840s, after Tāmaki had been selected as the site of the town of Auckland and the new colonial capital.⁹ To the east, tensions over the Fairburn purchase had been dealt with by Fairburn signing additional deeds and making payments to chiefs pressing claims to the land. Faced with the reality that Māori continued to occupy their settlements, cultivate their gardens, and bury their dead on the territory he had ostensibly purchased, Fairburn signed a deed promising the return of a third of the territory to all of the iwi that had taken part in the original sale.¹⁰ West of the Fairburn block, south of the Manukau and on the Isthmus, the returning tribes jockeyed for position, initially competing for the best cultivation lands and, after 1840, taking advantage of opportunities presented by the Crown's land purchase activities, as the latter sought to expand the perimeter of settlement around the town of Auckland and its outliers.

1.2 The establishment of Auckland

In 1840, the lands between the Manukau Harbour and Waikato Heads were held under Native customary title. However, after Governor Hobson decided that Tāmaki would be the site of the new colony's capital, the fledgling town of Auckland sprang up,

⁸ Stone, 2001, pp. 150-168.

⁹ The final peacemaking between Ngāti Whātua and Ngāti Pāoa took place at Kohimārama in 1841, around the time the Hauraki tribes completed two major land transactions with the Crown, that of Kohimārama itself and the huge Mahurangi purchase.

¹⁰ This repatriation did not eventuate, as most of the land purchased by Fairburn was appropriated by the Crown under its surplus lands policy.

initially on the 3,000 acres purchased by the Crown from Ngāti Whātua in September 1840.¹¹ Over the next few years the Crown embarked on a series of land purchases to expand the settlement to provide for the anticipated flood of new migrants. Most of Tāmaki Isthmus had been purchased by 1842, apart from a corridor between Hobson Bay and the Manukau Harbour that remained in Māori ownership, the southern portion of which was subject to private purchases under the pre-emption waiver regime in 1844-45.¹²

While Tāmaki Māori had actively encouraged the establishment of the capital in their district, it is equally clear that from a Māori viewpoint many of the consequences of extensive land sales proved both unforeseen and undesirable. This was largely due to cultural differences in the way Māori and Europeans viewed such transactions. As the Waitangi Tribunal has noted: “Western land sales were diametrically opposed to the traditional concepts. They severed relationships and terminated obligations, while, for Maori, continuing obligations and relationships were essential.”¹³ Thus, according to a Māori understanding, the express purpose of land transactions was to build enduring relationships between the parties involved, which in the early years meant between the tāngata whenua of Tāmaki and the Crown.

This may explain why in June 1841 Ngāti Whātua sold 12,000 acres south and west of the original Crown block at the bargain basement price of two hundred pounds plus goods, just months after the Crown had realised a significant profit from a bidding frenzy by speculators chasing sections in the original 3,000-acre block. Presumably, Ngāti Whātua expected further advantages to be forthcoming after these sales took place. Once they became aware that the Crown had a different approach, Tāmaki Māori tried to lock in future benefits by negotiating the inclusion of ‘tenths’ in later purchase deeds. For example, under the terms of the 1854 Hūnua deed, the Crown would put aside one tenth of the profit it realised from on-selling the land for the purchase of hospitals and schools catering specifically for the Ngāi Tai vendors.¹⁴

¹¹ See: Stone, 2001, pp. 267ff, and p. 297. The Governor did not take up residence in Auckland until March 1841, after a number of public buildings had been constructed.

¹² Stone, 2001, p. 300.

¹³ Waitangi Tribunal, *Muriwhenua Land Report*. Wellington, 1997, p. 74.

¹⁴ In the case of the Hūnua purchase, the implementation of the ten percent clause was at best haphazard and did not deliver the benefits the Ngāi Tai chiefs had hoped for. The Government’s rationale for the low prices paid for Māori land is examined in chapter 2.1, below.

Another source of friction arising from the Crown's land purchase activities was the difficulty in clearly identifying rights-holders in the land, a question made all the more difficult when rights were often claimed by two or more iwi. Responsibility for untangling the intricacies of Māori land tenure rested with the Protectorate of Aborigines, headed by Chief Protector George Clarke. However, as with the rest of the early colonial administration, the Protectorate was under-manned and over-burdened, with protectors acting as interpreters in all interactions between the Government and Māori, which paradoxically included land sales. Indeed, when Governor FitzRoy waived the Crown's right of pre-emption and allowed direct land sales between Māori and private individuals, officers from the Protectorate often acted as agents for European purchasers, which clearly conflicted with their role as protectors. In order to compensate for the inadequate investigation of ownership rights, the Crown responded by paying off all parties claiming rights, although such claims were often resolved only after much protest and petitioning of the Governor by the aggrieved parties.

1.3 Land disputes south of the Manukau Harbour

1.3.1 Political and economic changes in the 1840s

Traditionally, the Māori economy was based on a mobile population, with hapū groups moving between a number of settlement sites, each of which focused on particular food resources. While some settlement sites were semi-permanent, with defensive pā close by for security, hapū moved regularly between sites, as gardens were rotated to preserve soil viability.¹⁵ Temporary encampments, often with their own cultivations, were set up by fishing and bird gathering parties. Along with other forest and marine resources, these were taken across a wide area according to seasonal availability.

¹⁵ Resource use around the Manukau Harbour between 1820 and 1840 has been very well described in an unpublished (and uncompleted) thesis by Agnes Sullivan, entitled "Maori Gardening in Tamaki before 1840: Part I, Traditional, Ethnographic and other Historical Documentary Sources" (unpublished and uncorrected Draft), n.d.

Political relationships between hapū and iwi were mediated by common whanaungatanga (kinship), which allowed the various groups to co-exist and share resources, so long as protocols laid down by rangatira and tohunga were observed. While disputes between relatives and neighbours were not uncommon and could lead to violent conflict, the strength of the relationships acted as a restraining influence and provided mechanisms for peace to be restored and maintained.

In the 1840s, the establishment of Auckland and the Crown's land purchase activities across the region that followed wrought lasting changes to these traditional relationships. One of the most significant agents for change was the gradual, but relentless imposition of the European economic system based on trade in commodities and monetary exchange. While this process had been occurring in one form or another since first contact, it intensified following the establishment of Crown sovereignty. As Hauraki historian Paul Monin has written, Māori found they had to maintain themselves in two economies: the new settler economy, which encouraged the acquisition of capital intensive items such as mills and schooners; and the traditional Māori economy, which involved gift exchanges, manākitanga (hospitality) and the hākari (feasts) that accompanied tangihanga (mourning periods/funerals) and other ceremonial occasions. These dual obligations placed a heavy strain on tribal resources, at times taking individual chiefs to the edge of bankruptcy.¹⁶

In South Auckland in the early 1840s this process was still in its infancy, but its effects were nevertheless already being felt. Elsewhere in Northland and Hauraki, extractive industries such as whaling and sealing, flax and timber, and later gold mining and gum digging, provided sources of income for Māori communities, and for individual chiefs. With the establishment of Auckland, the people of the South Manukau and Lower Waikato districts had a ready market for food produce of all kinds, including seafood, pork, potatoes and fruit (mainly peaches). After 1840, however, the main source of tribal income would be land sales, which, although they delivered substantial returns in the short term, were always going to be limited to the amount of land available.

¹⁶ Monin, P., *Hauraki Contested, 1769-1875*, Wellington, Bridget Williams Books, 2001, p. 160.

1.3.2 The Taurangaruru conflict

According to one source, trouble between the southern Manukau iwi of Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho over land at Waiuku may have started as early as 1834. An early European visitor to the district, Charles Marshall, recorded a fight over disputed land at Taurangaruru in that year, in which Ngāti Te Ata with their Ngāti Pou allies squared off against Ngāti Tamaoho with their Ngāti Tipa allies.¹⁷ As this was at least eight years prior to the Crown's land purchase activities in the district, the dispute could be attributable to competition for good cultivation land at what was a prime location overlooking the Waiuku Estuary, as the two iwi attempted to reclaim their ancestral lands after exile in the Waikato.

Be that as it may, by the early 1840s disputes between iwi over rights to sell land to the Crown were evident on the isthmus and in the south Manukau district, with Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho involved in controversial land sales in each of these localities. Both iwi had been given land on the isthmus by Āpihai Te Kawau of Ngāti Whātua upon their return from Waikato, in the aforementioned corridor between the northern Manukau shore and present-day Newmarket. According to Te Kawau's reading of tikanga (custom), as chief of Ngāti Whātua he retained rangatiratanga (authority) over the Isthmus, but he was unable to prevent Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho selling their interests.¹⁸ Te Kawau's protests were in vain because the remit of the Land Claims Commission set up to investigate the sales was limited to considering whether the price paid was fair, not whether the vendors had a right to sell in the first place.

It also appears that Ngāti Whātua became involved in the dispute between Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata in the South Manukau district. In 1843, Ngāti Te Ata sold land at Pukekohe to the Crown, although the vendors' rights to do so were challenged by Ngāti Tamaoho.¹⁹ According to witnesses at the Ōrākei hearing in 1868, land at Remuera and Maungakiekie (One Tree Hill) was sold under the pre-emption waiver

¹⁷ Charles Marshall, "Waikato Forty Years Ago", in, Lieut.-Colonel J.H.A. St. John, *Pakeha Rambles through Maori Lands*, Wellington, 1873, p. 28.

¹⁸ Stone, 2001, p. 294.

¹⁹ Pukekohe No. 1 Block, 7 December 1843, Deed No. 250, in: Turton, H. H., *Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Vol. 1, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 1874, pp. 309-310. The circumstances surrounding the Pukekohe sale are discussed further in section 2.2.2, below.

scheme and the proceeds used to buy guns and powder to arm Ngāti Te Ata.²⁰ In September 1845, it was reported that Ngāti Te Ata had seized horses belonging to Wetere Te Kauae of Ngāti Tamaoho, leading to fears that a war might start at any moment.²¹ At issue was land at Taurangaruru, where Ngāti Tamaoho had built a pā, on the western side of the Waiuku River.²²

In November, under their chiefs Wetere Te Kauae and Epiha Putini (a.k.a. Jabez Bunting),²³ Ngāti Tamaoho moved onto the disputed land, digging a trench to mark their boundary and made ready to fight any objectors. Ngāti Te Ata, led by ‘Katepa’ (Te Katipa) responded by yelling insults at their adversaries for several hours, apparently trying to goad them to fight. The “stern interference” of the Wesleyan missionary Thomas Buddle persuaded Ngāti Tamaoho to resist the provocation, although the CMS missionary Robert Maunsell could not prevent Ngāti Te Ata from filling in the trench before they departed for the Waikato “to settle some dispute with another tribe on the river”.²⁴

The dispute continued to rankle as, in early December, Ngāti Tamaoho returned and dug another trench, prompting Ngāti Te Ata to confront them a second time. The latter were reinforced by their Ngāti Pou allies, making up a powerful force of 200 well-armed men. Maunsell was once again involved, urging Ngāti Te Ata to remain quiet while he negotiated with Ngāti Tamaoho. However, the missionary’s entreaty was ignored and Ngāti Te Ata moved forward till they were within touching distance of the Ngāti Tamaoho, whereupon both sides abruptly sat down. After sitting in silence for an hour, a few chiefs from each side made short speeches and the two parties quietly withdrew. Maunsell then persuaded most of those present to take part

²⁰ Evidence of Pāora Tūhaere and others, Ōrākei Rehearing, November 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 2.

²¹ *New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian*, 27/9/1845.

²² For the location of Taurangaruru, see: Roll Map A83, F4; & A79, “Plan of 115 Country Allotments in the Waipipi Block, Waiuku West”.

²³ ‘Jabez Bunting’, transliterated as Epiha Putini in Te Reo Māori, was the baptismal name of the Ngāti Tamaoho chief Te Rangiata-ahua. He was the son of Te Tuhi, chief of Purapura, and Te Po, described as “a chieftainness of celebrity”. Obituary, “Epiha Putini Te Rangiata-Ahua”, *Daily Southern Cross*, 11/4/1856, p. 3. Epiha Putini was Wetere Te Kauae’s nephew, but as the latter was childless, was adopted by him as a son.

²⁴ “Native Differences”, *New-Zealander*, 8/11/1845, p. 2.

in a church service, after which they agreed to disperse. At this point Maunsell left to attend his wife who was about to give birth.²⁵

At dawn the following day, Ngāti Tamaoho made a symbolic gesture at the disputed boundary by firing a volley into the trench. This alarmed the nearby Ngāti Te Ata, and a group of young men rushed towards Ngāti Tamaoho firing their guns. In the short but heavy exchange that followed several Ngāti Te Ata youths were killed and a number of Ngāti Tamaoho wounded, one seriously.²⁶ Crucially, the casualties included several high-ranking young men, which transformed the dispute from a minor family squabble to a major confrontation with the potential to bring in powerful allies of both sides from Tāmaki and the Waikato.²⁷ Maunsell wrote to the Colonial Secretary requesting assistance from the Governor, but was told he was fully occupied in the North. Benjamin Ashwell, Maunsell's colleague at the Port Waikato Mission, arrived and persuaded Ngāti Pou to leave peacefully, which they did after first firing their guns at the boundary in a reciprocal display to Ngāti Tamaoho.

Hostilities broke out again on 3 January 1846 when Te Katipa of Ngāti Te Ata led his forces in an attack on Wetere's pā on the banks of the Awaroa River. The *New-Zealander* reports:

At dawn of day, Katepa [*sic*] and his tribe advanced on the pa of Wetere, firing into it, and challenging their adversaries to come out and engage openly, on the field. Wetere and Jabez Bunting, after some hesitation, assented, and the firing was kept up until mid-day, when, by mutual consent, each party retired to their pa for food. In the afternoon hostilities recommenced, and continued until sun-down; but there was no casualty on either side, killed or wounded...²⁸

There appears to have been a concerted effort on both sides to avoid a repeat of the tragic events of the previous month; the newspaper assumed as much, comparing the encounter to a European duel, whose intent was to preserve the honour of the adversaries without causing any actual injury. When Te Wherowhero subsequently arrived, he told the combatants that as he was related to them both he would not suffer

²⁵ R. Maunsell to CMS. 26 January 1846. Micro-MS-Coll-004-035. ATL. 44.

²⁶ "Native War", *New-Zealander*, 13/12/1845, p. 2; and *New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian*, 17/12/1846.

²⁷ "Native War", *New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian*, 17/12/1846.

²⁸ "Native Quarrel", *New-Zealander*, 10/1/1846, p. 2.

the continuance of the strife. In the interests of peace, Wetere and Jabez retired temporarily to Ihumatao.²⁹

That these conflicts were at least partly driven by disputes over land sales to the Crown is made clear by missionary correspondence. Whereas Maunsell was closest to Ngāti Te Ata, Wesleyan missionary Thomas Buddle's sympathies lay with Ngāti Tamaoho. Reporting to the 'Hon. Fathers and Brethren' in England, he noted that he was pleased that "our people were not the aggressors and have only acted on the defensive". He accused Ngāti Te Ata of being quarrelsome and aggressive, adding that they had sold several blocks of land belonging to Ngāti Tamaoho. According to Buddle,

[Epiha Putini] bore with it for some time until they [Ngāti Te Ata] had made some ten or eleven sales of land to which he at least had equal claims when having remonstrated in vain he resolved they should go no further and that he would defend his property. This he did by proceeding to cut boundaries... to mark his rights.³⁰

In March 1846, further disputes over land and fishing rights took place, in which Ngāti Te Ata and their Ngāti Pou allies were aligned against Ngāti Tipa. According to Maunsell, more than twenty were killed, mostly belonging to Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Pou.³¹ A close relative of Āpihai Te Kawau named Te Ropiha was among the dead, which threatened to bring Ngāti Whātua into the conflict. When the latter indicated that they wished to retrieve Te Ropiha's body from the Manukau district, the Waikato tribes perceived their actions as hostile, fearing that Ngāti Whātua would seek utu for their kinsman.³²

Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Mahuta assembled in force on the southern shore of the Manukau, warning that they would fight if Ngāti Whātua ventured across the Harbour. Ngāti Whātua agreed to stay on the northern side of the Manukau, but placed a tapu on all the roads leading into Auckland. This was then breached when the Waikato tribes drove a mob of pigs into Auckland, and three pigs were seized by Ngāti Whātua. Waikato were enraged and returned to their own territory to plot

²⁹ "Native Quarrel", *New-Zealander*, 10/1/1846, p. 2.

³⁰ T. Buddle to "Hon Fathers and Brethren", 2 May 1846. Micro-MS-0778. ATL.

³¹ R. Maunsell to CMS. March 17, 1846. Micro-MS-Coll-004-035. 112.

³² "Natives", *New-Zealander*, 25/4/1846, p. 2.

revenge. According to the *New-Zealander*, Waikato considered Ngāti Whātua to be living on their Auckland lands only by sufferance of Te Wherowhero and other Waikato chiefs. For his part, Āpihai Te Kāwau denied that he had any involvement in the tapu, and called upon Te Wherowhero to intervene.³³

In fact, Te Wherowhero had been working since March 1846 with Wētere Te Kāuae and Epiha Putini on a peace mission designed to settle all outstanding conflicts.³⁴ Five large hui took place, at Kirikiriroa, Whatawhata, Whaki, Tukupoto and Kaumatuku, and in May 1846, peace was finally declared at a hui in Manukau.³⁵

Following Te Wherowhero's peacemaking, Ngāti Tamaoho remained at Ihumatao with its rich cultivation land, across the harbour from their settlement at Pehiakura.³⁶ In 1849, Aihepene Kaihau of Ngāti Te Ata occupied Epiha Putini's land at Pehiakura, described by the *New-Zealander* as "one of Jabez Bunting's most important places".³⁷ It appears that Kaihau was trying to provoke further conflict in order to obtain utu for the death of his son in the earlier dispute. According to the newspaper, Putini received plenty of encouragement from his own people to react aggressively to Kaihau's actions, but gave the following mild response: "No, let us withdraw from Pehiakura and leave it to him at present. Let us sit down now at Ihumatao. I intend to sit here. I will do so quietly unless they attack us here..."³⁸

Putini's restraint was an important factor in cementing Te Wherowhero's peace, but while South Auckland Māori no longer resorted to armed force to solve their differences, the Crown's land purchase activity in the district continued to generate disputes between the tribes for several years afterwards. Moreover, as Benjamin Ashwell reported, the conflict of the 1840s had taken a heavy toll in terms of lives lost and disruption to productive work. With the region in turmoil over such a prolonged period, stock and cultivations had been neglected which in turn led to scarce food supplies.³⁹

³³ "Natives", *New-Zealander*, 25/4/1846, p. 2.

³⁴ "Native War", *New-Zealander*, 21/3/1846, p. 2.

³⁵ R. Maunsell to CMS, 1 June 1846. Micro-MS-Coll-004-035. ATL. 336.

³⁶ *New-Zealander*, 28/7/1847, p. 2. Pehiakura is on the Āwhitu Peninsula, north of Waiuku.

³⁷ *New-Zealander*, 3/10/1849, p. 2.

³⁸ *New-Zealander*, 3/10/1849, p. 2.

³⁹ B. Ashwell. Report for 1847. Micro-MS-Coll-004-036. ATL. 129.

2. Crown purchases in South Manukau

2.1 Waste Lands of the Crown

This section briefly examines the philosophical underpinnings of the Crown's early land settlement policies in order to shed light on such contemporary notions as 'Waste Lands of the Crown', customary title versus Crown title and the justification for the low prices paid for Māori land.

In 1844, a British House of Commons Select Committee was convened to debate how best to proceed with the settlement of the colony of New Zealand. In response to submissions by the New Zealand Company lobby, the Committee condemned the Treaty of Waitangi "as part of a series of injudicious proceedings" and passed "a resolution urging that measures should be taken to obtain for the Crown a title to all land not actually occupied or enjoyed by the Māori."⁴⁰ According to the Committee, Māori claims to all 'waste or wild lands' had no basis in law; 'waste land' being defined as any wild, uncultivated land not domesticated by human endeavour. The idea had driven the agricultural and economic reforms that took place in Britain during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, whereby the enclosure of communally held land gave farmers "control of large fields suitable for the production of cash crops and surpluses, whilst local peasants and humble tenants lost their means of subsistence. ... General Enclosure Acts in 1801, 1836 and 1845 facilitated this process."⁴¹

In 1846, Colonial Secretary Earl Grey's Royal Instructions to incoming Governor Sir George Grey included a chapter dealing with 'Waste Lands of the Crown'. The Governor was instructed to draw up charters, listing lands over which the 'Aboriginal Natives' claimed valid titles of property or occupancy. Any land that did not conform to the listed criteria was to be considered as vested in the Crown.⁴² The Colonial Secretary concluded:

⁴⁰ Williams, David, V., 1999, *Te Kooti Tango Whenua: The Native Land Court 1864-1909*, p. 108.

⁴¹ Davis, N. 2000, *The Isles: A History*. London, Papermac, p. 637.

⁴² Cited in Williams, 1999, p. 109. In support of his arguments, Earl Grey referred to Dr Arnold of Rugby School, who in 1831 stated that "... rights to land derived exclusively from human labour being

From the moment that British dominion was proclaimed in New Zealand, all lands not actually occupied in the sense in which alone occupation can give a right of possession ought to have been considered as the property of the Crown in its capacity as Trustee for the whole community....⁴³

Colonization theory and its practice proved to be two different things, however. As settlers remained a small minority “scattered ... all over the Country in positions where the Government cannot protect them”,⁴⁴ it was not feasible for the Governor to implement a policy of freely appropriating uncultivated land in the face of powerful Māori opposition. Governor Grey was reported to be in “such a fever of agitation” about the new policies that he could not sleep at night, so convinced was he that they would “cause bloodshed and tumult from one end of the country to the other.” Chief Justice Sir William Martin and Bishop Selwyn echoed his fears, and “Te Wherowhero and other Waikato chiefs signed a letter to the Queen seeking reassurance that the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi would not be violated.”⁴⁵ Martin wrote a pamphlet vigorously attacking Earl Grey’s Waste Land policy, in which he stated:

Britain had not acquired any land in the country if the land had an owner according to native custom, whether the land was occupied or not. And it was clear, from Government reports, that ‘there was not an acre of New Zealand which did not have an owner according to native custom’.⁴⁶

Sir George Grey’s position was dictated by expediency rather than principle. He recognised the impracticality of the Crown assuming ownership of all the uncultivated land in the country, but he was far from convinced that Māori could legitimately claim ownership of it either.⁴⁷ The ‘problem’ that he and the Colonial Office faced was that, by the Treaty of Waitangi, Britain had recognised Māori rights to all the

expended upon it and that ‘uncivilized peoples’ had no rights in land unless it had been ‘tamed to their use’.” Cited in Williams, 1999, p. 109.

⁴³ Earl Grey to Grey, 23 December 1846, GBPP/CNZ, Shannon, Irish University Press, 1969, vol. 5, pp. 523-5. Cited in Williams, 1999, p. 110.

⁴⁴ Ward, Alan, *A Show of Justice*, 1973, p. 82.

⁴⁵ Hackshaw, Frederika, “Nineteenth Century Notions of Aboriginal Title”, in Kawharu, (ed.), *Waitangi: Māori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*, 1989, p. 104.

⁴⁶ Cited in Hackshaw, 1989, p. 108.

⁴⁷ Writing to Earl Grey in 1848, he stated that ‘there were, even in the North Island, large tracts of land to which no tribe had legal claim’. GBPP, 1849 [Comd 1120], p. 24. Grey/Earl Grey, 15 May 1848. Cited in McLintock, A. H., 1958, p. 66.

land in New Zealand, 'waste' or occupied. David Williams quotes Paul Adams, who wrote:

The solution, as it dawned on Earl Grey and Governor Grey, lay in the concession which the Crown had procured from the Maoris of a monopoly right to buy that land. If the pre-emption monopoly was used extensively and rigorously, it would effectively neutralise the wide recognition of Maori land rights. Thus, as Earl Grey recommended to his namesake, the purchase of land by the Crown should be carried forward 'as rapidly as possible', partly because the longer the delay the more costly it would be, but chiefly because it was of the 'utmost importance' with a view to the regular colonisation of New Zealand, that the control of all the waste lands should be as completely as possible in the hands of the Government'.⁴⁸

Thus, all land not used by Māori for their subsistence was to be purchased as quickly and as cheaply as possible. When a purchase was completed, the land in question was proclaimed as 'Waste Lands of the Crown'. Once surveys were carried out and Crown titles issued, the land could be proclaimed for settlement. The surveyed allotments were then put up for auction, or offered to settlers under a ballot process.

Governor Grey's land purchase policy, implemented by land purchase commissioners headed by Donald McLean, was based on the theory that Māori land had no value in and of itself – it was only through the settlement of Europeans bringing the benefits of civilization that the land would realise its true value. This justified the low prices the Crown was prepared to pay for Māori land. In the 1850s, McLean went so far as to limit Māori reserves because he believed that Māori "would be better served by buying back land from the Crown as individuals."⁴⁹ Writing about early provincial Hawke's Bay, Angela Ballara and Gary Scott comment:

In [McLean's] private agenda, it did not matter if Māori were induced to part with more land than they could afford to lose, because their future, if they had any, was to live as Europeans. ... He was convinced that Māori society was doomed to disappear before the tide of European colonization; his concern and his instructions inclined him to achieve that process by the

⁴⁸ Adams, P, 1977, *Fatal Necessity*, p. 209. Cited in Williams, 1999, p. 111.

⁴⁹ Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Whanganui-a-Orotu*, [Wai-45], Wellington, 1995, p. 40.

cheapest and fastest method compatible with peace. His task was to ‘manage’ Māori, and separate them from their land.⁵⁰

McLean justified the price disparity between that paid to Māori for their land and that which came from their resale by the government by claiming:

... it was right that [Māori] should know that in government hands the land would increase in value. The government would spend money on roads, bridges, etc. to induce settlers to come among the Maoris as friends, “bringing their wealth with them to a strange land, among a strange people, whom they were to enrich by doing so”. Though the land produced nothing but fern, thereafter there would be “wealth and abundance for the rising generations” of the native race. Their lifeless piece of land might yet produce much that would contribute to their greatness and prosperity.⁵¹

Fundamental to the Crown’s land purchase policy was the imposition of a new system of land tenure, which entailed the extinguishment of Native customary title and its replacement with Crown title. The Supreme Court’s ruling in the case of *Regina v J J Symonds 1849*, recognised the Crown as the only source of legal title in New Zealand. “The decision meant that customary tenure was insufficient to establish proprietorship if brought before a court of law. Only a Crown grant gave full protection with regards to ownership of a defined piece of land.”⁵²

2.2 Land Purchases East of Patumāhoe

The alienation of Māori-owned land in the South Manukau district to the Crown began in early 1842 and continued without let up for twenty years until most of the land was in Crown or private ownership, apart from a scattered collection of reserves the chiefs managed to hold back from sale. The following is a brief account of the first land sales east of Patumāhoe.

⁵⁰ Ballara, Angela and Gary Scott, “Crown Purchases of Māori land in early provincial Hawke’s Bay”, Waitangi Tribunal, 1994, p. 80.

⁵¹ Fargher, R. W., 1947, p. 39; citing McLean’s Diary, 17 April 1851, MS Papers, ATL.

⁵² Ward, Alan, *An Unsettled History*, Waitangi Tribunal, 1999, p. 101.

2.2.1 The Pūkaki, Te Karaka and Manukau purchases

In January 1842, Chief Protector of Aborigines George Clarke instructed Edward Meurant to proceed to the Manukau district to meet the chief Tihi about land he proposed to sell to the Government.⁵³ Clarke duly reported to the Colonial Secretary that Tihi wished to sell 30,000 acres on the east side of the Manukau for the consideration of £400, six horses, two bags of flour and two bags of sugar.⁵⁴ The purchase of this land, subsequently known as Pūkaki, was finalised in May 1842.⁵⁵

Also in May, Jabez Bunting (Epiha Putini) of Ngāti Tamaoho, notified Clarke that he wished to sell 2,000 acres near Papakura called 'Te Karaka'.⁵⁶

In August 1842, the Ngāti Te Ata chief Kaihau offered part of the Awhitu Peninsula for sale. Known as the Manukau block, its area was estimated at 20,000 acres. Kaihau wanted £500, with an immediate deposit of £100 as security for the purchase.⁵⁷

None of these blocks were surveyed at the time (in many cases, this would not occur for another ten years); rather, the boundaries were described by prominent landmarks such as trees, hills, promontories, river courses, or even holes dug in the ground. The inaccuracy inherent in such a system often led to disputes, as in the case of the Pukekohe Reserve, which is discussed below.

Colonial Secretary Shortland informed Clarke that the Governor had authorised a deposit of £50 to be paid on the Manukau block, and gave instructions that a surveyor was to accompany Meurant on his next visit in order to ascertain the boundaries of the land. Shortland added that "any portion of the stipulated payment, which the natives may be disposed to take in goods from the Colonial Store, will be duly issued upon your requisition."⁵⁸ This was an all-too-common feature of early purchases, which

⁵³ Clarke to Meurant, 12 January 1842, in Turton, H. H., *An Epitome of Official Documents Relative to Native Affairs and Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 1883, p. 277. 'Tihi' is Pepene Te Tihi, the father of Ihaka Takaanini Te Tihi, both chiefs of Te Akitai and Ngāti Tamaoho.

⁵⁴ George Clarke to Colonial Secretary, 24 January 1842, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 277.

⁵⁵ Willoughby Shortland, Colonial Secretary, to George Clarke, 27 May 1842, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 278.

⁵⁶ Clarke to Shortland, 27 May 1842, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 278.

⁵⁷ Clarke to Shortland 17 August 1842, in: Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 278-279.

⁵⁸ Willoughby Shortland, Colonial Secretary, to George Clarke, Chief Protector, 29 August 1842, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 279.

though it undoubtedly served the needs of Māori wishing to avail themselves of European trade goods, had the potential to encourage indebtedness, as chiefs (and others) ran up bills with storekeepers that could only be paid for by land sales.

In December 1842, the sale of the Manukau block was nearing completion, but it was also attracting complaints from the chiefs of Ngāti Tamaoho, Putini and Wetere. In a letter to Shortland, George Clarke acknowledged that the land belonged to several tribes, adding:

I consider the titles of two of the principal of these claimants, viz., the Ngatiteata and the Ngatitamaoho, to be extinguished by the accompanying deed, but I question whether that of the Ngatipo[u] is so; as however the consideration given is considerably within the ratio that has been estimated as the cost of land per acre, there will be ample funds in the hands of the Government to meet any other equitable demands that may be made.⁵⁹

Although no explicit link has been found, this would appear to be one of the issues that led to the series of skirmishes between Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata later referred to as the Battle of Taurangaruru.

2.2.2 The Pukekohe and Ramarama purchases 1842-1853

The Pukekohe purchase was acknowledged as a bone of contention between Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata (and their respective allies) that led to the dispute at Taurangaruru. In August 1842, Waaka Kaihau of Ngāti Te Ata offered the Pukekohe block for sale to the Crown, and payments in cash and goods were made to the value of £320.⁶⁰ Ngāti Tamaoho and their allies Ngāti Mahanga and the Ngāti Hauā opposed the sale, asserting that the descendants of Te Whare Aitu, represented by Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū, had the strongest rights in the block.⁶¹ Mohi belonged to Te Akitai, who were closely related to Ngāti Tamaoho. Perhaps because of the latter's opposition, it took some time to finalise the purchase, but eventually, on 7 December

⁵⁹ Clarke to Colonial Secretary, 9 December 1843, in: Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 279-280.

⁶⁰ "Memorandum: Purchased from Ngatiteata in 1842", John Grant Johnson to Native Secretary, 7 May 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 284. It appears that the cash amounted to £150, with a lengthy catalogue of goods making up the remainder.

⁶¹ "Memorandum: Purchased from Ngatiteata in 1842", John Grant Johnson to Native Secretary, 7 May 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 284.

1843, a deed was signed by Kaihau and eight other chiefs of Ngāti Te Ata, and George Clarke for the Crown.

The Pukekohe block extended from the south-eastern shore of the Manukau Harbour southwards towards the Waikato River. The south west corner of the block met the Waikato River, while the Tuakau and Tirikōhua blocks formed the rest of the southern boundary. The deed noted that certain places were to be retained by the vendors, including 'Te Karaka', 'Te Rapa', 'Pukekohe', and other places along the Waikato River. Putini had objected to the inclusion of Te Karaka within the parameters of the block, but Clarke had dismissed his objections on the basis that the part of 'Te Karaka' included in the Pukekohe block was not the same piece as that offered for sale earlier by Putini.⁶² In fact, later maps show a 'Karaka Reserve' located on the western head of the Pahurehure River (or Inlet), which would comply with Putini's description of the location and size of his piece. On the same map, the northern part of the Pukekohe block is labelled 'Te Karaka'.⁶³ Putini's step-father Wīremu Wetere also threatened trouble at this time on account of the Ngāti Te Ata land sales, prompting Clarke to instruct Meurant to pay him a visit and remind him that he would 'be answerable for any breach of the peace'.⁶⁴

As we have seen, these entreaties went unheeded, and by 1845 Ngāti Tamaoho and their close relatives and neighbours, Ngāti Te Ata, were virtually at war. But Ngāti Te Ata were not alone in wanting to sell land. In June 1846, one month after Te Wherowhero's peace was finalised, Epiha Putini and six other chiefs of Ngāti Tamaoho signed a deed transferring the Ramarama block to the Crown. The Ramarama block lies to the east of the Pukekohe block, running north-south between the Manukau Harbour at Drury and the Waikato River east of Tuakau. On 30 November following, Ngāti Tamaoho signed a receipt for the sum of £200, plus a catalogue of goods as the full consideration for the sale.⁶⁵ Predictably, this caused Ngāti Te Ata and other neighbouring iwi to voice their objections, as they sought to ensure they received due consideration for their own interests in Ramarama.

⁶² Putini's complaints are referred to in a letter from George Clarke to Rev. John Whiteley, 7 December 1843, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 279.

⁶³ LINZ Plan: Roll Map A33 (F3).

⁶⁴ George Clarke to Surveyor-General, 13 December 1843, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 280.

⁶⁵ Ramarama Block, 10 June 1846, Deed No. 404, in: Turton, H. H., *Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Vol. 1, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 1874, pp. 563-565.

These complaints were added to a growing list of objections and petitions emanating from aggrieved parties concerning Crown purchases across the wider Tāmaki district. Finally, in the early 1850s, the Crown responded by appointing Interpreter and Native Land Purchase Commissioner John Grant Johnson to investigate all outstanding claims. Johnson interviewed chiefs throughout the region and reported back to the Native Secretary. In general, the Government's response to marginal claimants was to pay a relatively small sum to satisfy them; although in some cases such as at Mahurangi and Maraetai, significant reserves were created for iwi who had been rendered landless by previous sales. The Crown's pragmatic response tacitly recognised that Māori customary tenure consisted of complex systems of overlapping rights, often involving several tribes, and that one-off payments to the representatives of a single iwi were seldom sufficient to alienate all tribal interests.

In December 1852, Johnson notified the Native Secretary that he had completed the Ramarama purchase, stating that he had:

marked and settled the boundaries of the Ramarama purchase with the original Native sellers and the owners of the adjoining land, according to the enclosed plan, taken by magnetic bearings, with estimated distances; and that this block, containing about 18,000 acres, is now ready for the Assistant-Surveyor to proceed with the survey. These boundaries are strictly in accordance with the description given by Jabez Bunting at the date of the purchase in 1844.⁶⁶

Thus, although the Ramarama deed was not signed until June 1846, the Crown had been negotiating the purchase since early 1844, when Epiha Putini first laid out the boundaries of the block and was paid two hundred pounds.⁶⁷ And despite Johnson's optimism, the purchase was still incomplete, as the interests of Ngāti Te Ata and various neighbouring hapū and iwi had yet to be accounted for.

In a memorandum addressed to the Surveyor General, Johnson explained the circumstances of the Ramarama purchase as follows:

⁶⁶ John Grant Johnson to the Native Secretary, 27 December 1852; in: Turton, H. H., *An Epitome of Official Documents Relative to Native Affairs and Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 1883, p. 346.

⁶⁷ Deeds Receipt No. 97. Ramarama Block, Lower Waikato District, 29 February 1844, in: Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 759.

... A continued opposition [to the Pukekohe purchase] was maintained by Mohi's party until the close of the year, 1852, when Mohi's supporters, the Ngatitamaoho, proposed to give a great feast to the chiefs of Waikato, and to make large presents to them, which presents were to be procured by the sale to Government of two tracts of land, viz., Ramarama and Waiau. The sale of these lands was, however, opposed by the Ngatiteata, and mutual concessions were made between the two parties, the Ngatiteata withdrawing their opposition from Ramarama and Waiau, on the understanding that the other party were to withdraw their claims from Pukekohe: with a proviso that a share of the remaining payment should be made to satisfy Mohi's claim

The Ngatiteata then received a further payment of £100: and at the Remuera feast the above arrangements were finally completed by a payment of six casks of tobacco to Mohi, which was distributed amongst his supporters. These facts are all admitted by the natives.

From the perusal of the foregoing it will be seen that Mohi, though the principal owner, has actually received a very small payment for this land: and in consideration of these circumstances the Government have offered him and his adherents £200 in satisfaction of all their claims: but as they have been sellers of small pieces of land under the pre-emption proclamation for considerable prices, which they seem to regard as the standard value of land, they will not consent to the terms offered them.⁶⁸

The Ramarama deed contains an addendum in the form of an "Endorsement", with an unspecified date in 1852, whereby the Crown agreed to pay the sum of £50 to the leading members of a number of iwi, named as: Te Uri Raro, Te Akitai, Ngāriki, Ngāti Ura, Ngāti Whātua, Ngāti Pari (Pare), Te Uringutu, Ngāti Haumia, Ngāti Kura, Ngāti Pou and Ngāti Rangi. The fifty pounds was to be divided between a total of 62 signatories.⁶⁹

Tucked in between the Pukekohe and Ramarama blocks was the Maro-o-Hinewai block, at the south of which was the Māori settlement of Tuhi Mata, later defined as the Tuhimata (Native) Reserve containing 640 acres. This reserve would remain papatupu land (i.e. under customary Native title) until it was confiscated following the Waikato War in the mid-1860s (see below). Johnson arranged the purchase of Maro-o-Hinewai at a meeting with Pēpene (Te Tihi), Te Ngā (should be Te Ngū?) and

⁶⁸ "Memorandum: Purchased from Ngatiteata in 1842", John Grant Johnson to Native Secretary, 7 May 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 284.

⁶⁹ Deeds Receipt No. 97. Ramarama Block, Lower Waikato District, 29 February 1844, in: Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 759.

Haimona on 14 May 1853. The vendors wanted £300 for the 3,000-acre block, but Johnson thought he could persuade them to accept £250.⁷⁰

Map showing Māori Land Blocks and Reserves, c.1850s⁷¹



Commissioner Johnson made good on his promise to Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū, arranging the purchase of 'Pukekohe No. 2' as a way of extinguishing Te Akitai claims in the Pukekohe block. Pukekohe No. 2 has the same boundaries as Pukekohe No. 1, apart from a substantial reserve, which was cut out from within the block for the continued use and maintenance of Te Akitai. The reserve, which upon survey was found to contain 5,381 acres, was named Te Awa Nui o Taikehu, or the Pukekohe Reserve.⁷² The Pukekohe No. 2 deed is dated 17 June 1853, while the consideration paid to Mohi was £200, as per Johnson's original offer.⁷³ Also in June 1853, Johnson met with members of Ngāti Kārewa, described by Johnson as a branch of Ngāti Pou, who claimed rights in the southern portion of the Pukekohe block. Johnson intimated

⁷⁰ Johnson to Native Secretary, 14 May 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 284.

⁷¹ LINZ Plan: Roll Map A33 (F5)

⁷² The footprint of present-day Pukekohe township overlays the north eastern portion of the reserve.

⁷³ Pukekohe No. 2, Deed No. 267, 17 June 1853, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 324.

that he could 'liquidate' their claims by paying them at the same rate as Ngāti Te Ata.⁷⁴

Johnson's enthusiasm for acquiring land for the Crown reflected prevailing colonial attitudes that any Māori-owned land 'lying idle' and not brought under the plough should be forfeited. Such attitudes are highlighted in a report Johnson wrote on land the Crown had been offered between the Pukekohe block and the Waikato River during his journey through the district in June 1853. He states:

I have ... received an offer of a valuable tract of country lying between Tirikohua and Tuakau. The demands of the owners have been as yet too extravagant to be acceded to, but should the Government be pleased to order me to proceed in the negotiations for this tract, I entertain no doubt of being able to curtail their demands to a reasonable amount; and should this be accomplished, and the purchase completed, it would have the effect of confining the Tuakau natives to a reserve (not excessive in quantity) to the land they actually require, and to concentrate their energies in the agricultural pursuits in which they are now embarking in conjunction with the new flour mill in course of erection at Tuakau.⁷⁵

While on this particular expedition, Johnson ventured eastwards to Whangamarino, where he found a feast had just taken place with a large number of Waikato Māori present under the chief Te Wharepū. Fierce discussions had been held concerning the land lying between Lake Waikare and the Hauraki district, known as Waerenga. The chiefs had decided to lay a tapu over the area prohibiting the sale of any part of it by 'individuals asserting urgent claims'. Johnson reported:

I think any attempt at present to acquire this tract would not be attended with success, and only tend to foment their quarrels amongst themselves, which are now assuming a serious aspect. Te Whero Whero is at present in Waikato, endeavoring [*sic*] to obtain from the Ngatihaua a recognition of his claim to Waerenga; and has stated that should the adverse party persevere in its pretensions, he will sanction an appeal to arms in the coming summer.⁷⁶

Such tensions over the effects of land sales led directly to the formation of the Kīngitanga, referred to as a 'land league' by the colonists, while to Māori it was a

⁷⁴ Johnson to Native Secretary, 14 June 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 285.

⁷⁵ Johnson to Native Secretary, 14 June 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 285.

⁷⁶ Johnson to Native Secretary, 14 June 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 285.

pragmatic response, enabling them ‘to hold the land and stop the flow of blood’. The assertion of ‘urgent claims’ by individuals was precisely what was occurring in the South Manukau district, as chiefs laid claim to land by selling it, which inevitably led to the alienation of the entire district.

2.2.3 The Paraheka and Roto purchases, 1848

Earlier, in 1848, Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū and Te Akitai had asserted rights to the central/eastern side of the South Manukau district by selling to the Crown the ‘Akitai’, or ‘Paraheka’ block, a long narrow piece of land running north-south on the western side of the Pukekohe block between the Manukau Harbour and a point level with the northern end of the Pukekohe Reserve. The Patumāhoe Reserve abuts its south western boundary. For a consideration of four mares, Te Akitai chiefs, Mohi, Īhāia and Pua signed a deed of sale for the block on 19 January 1848.⁷⁷

At a later unspecified date, ‘Kaiiau’ (Kaihou?) and Te Aihepene of Ngāti Te Ata signed a receipt for two pounds for their interests in the land named Paraheka previously sold by Te Akitai. They acknowledged, “We have heard the description of the boundaries read we agree to the sale of the land.”⁷⁸ At the southern end of the Paraheka block, though not shown on the above map, a small area was cut out and named ‘Roto’. In effect, the Roto block comprises that part of the Paraheka block lying immediately to the east of the Patumāhoe Reserve (although the latter was yet to be created). Roto was sold to the Crown by Te Keene (Tangaroa) and Hoera, who described themselves as belonging to Ngāti Whātua. The consideration of £50 paid for this small piece stood in sharp contrast to the four mares paid to Te Akitai for the whole of Paraheka. No information has been found to explain this apparent anomaly.

⁷⁷ Paraheka Deed, No. 252, 19 January 1848, in Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 311.

⁷⁸ Paraheka Deed, No. 252, 19 January 1848, in Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 312.

2.3 Land Purchases between Pukekohe and Waiuku

‘Waiuku No. 1’ and ‘Whakaupoko’ appear to be different names for the same area of land, which was purchased twice from different sets of owners. Some of the reserves set aside were common to both blocks, including Patumāhoe Reserve.

2.3.1 The Waiuku No. 1 purchase

By the early 1850s, all of the land east of Patumāhoe as far as the Hūnua block had been sold to the Crown, apart from the various reserves. Meanwhile, tensions continued to run high among Māori because of proposed land sales on the Waiuku side, and on the Awhitu Peninsula. On 4 November 1852, Waata Kukutai of Ngāti Tīpa wrote to the Governor offering to sell land at Te Awaroa, Paetawa, Whakapapa (Whātāpaka), Te Waihoroiokiore and other localities south of the Manukau. He claimed to be motivated by the actions of Te Katipa of Ngāti Te Ata, who, he said, was dealing with the land by stealth. He told the Governor that Ngāti Tīpa were:

... concerned about the stealthy work of Te Katipa regarding our land. We know that his work is a wrong work, his work by stealth. Now we beg to inform you that we are willing to give up these large pieces of land to you; and, if you approve, write it in a letter to us. Now this is another word we have for you. Should the Ngatiteata arrive to speak with you concerning these lands, do not attend to them, to their speech. They are stealing our land. Beware of that man, Katipa; he is a thief. Do not give away your goods for nothing.⁷⁹

Kukutai’s solution to the dispute with Te Katipa was for Ngāti Tīpa to sell the greater part of the land to the Crown, and he named the chiefs whom he considered to be entitled.

Commented on the letter, Interpreter Johnson stated:

The lands alluded to in this letter are on the east side of Waiuku, and include Foley’s claim.... As far as I can learn, the writer’s claims are valid, and as they are a party who have always opposed the sale of land to the Europeans, but have now come forward to offer land for sale, it would be attended with

⁷⁹ Waata Kukutai to the Governor, 4 November 1852; in: Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 282-283.

good effect, if a purchase were made from them, absorbing the claim of Foley, of which a portion has been sold to Mr. Codlin, provided they can settle with Katipa. The land offered is very desirable.⁸⁰

Te Katipa had originally sold the land to Foley, who on-sold to Codlin, much to the indignation of Ngāti Tipa. In November 1852, a man named Ruihana, who was listed as an owner by Kukutai and was, according to the Native Secretary, “one of the most turbulent chiefs of the Waikato district,” expressed his disapproval by taking “upwards of 100 men to Codlin’s place, and cut[ting] down part of his fence.”⁸¹ The Surveyor-General, C. W. Ligar, thought that the best solution would be for the Crown to procure “a quiet title ... for all or any of the land remaining in that district”, and recommended sending Johnson to negotiate the purchase next time he was in the district.⁸²

Thus, after defining the boundaries of the Ramarama block, Johnson went to see Ngāti Tipa, sending in a report on the negotiations on New Year’s Day 1853. He found that four iwi had interests in the block: Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Te Hinga. The latter may have been linked to Ngāti Te Ata, as Johnson stated that the first three named were in favour of selling to the Crown, but this was opposed by Te Katipa and Ngāti Te Ata. Johnson attempted to effect a reconciliation between the antagonists prior to the purchase, and eventually Ngāti Tipa agreed to allow Te Katipa and Ngāti Te Ata to participate in the sale and receive a share of the payment. Johnson stated:

I employed a Chief named Karaka, who acts as a neutral negotiator and peace maker in all the Native differences in the Waikato river, to settle this difficulty before proceeding to mark the land or take further steps in the matter, and I feel confident that from these measures, his consent will be fully obtained in a few days.⁸³

⁸⁰ Memorandum: Johnson to Native Secretary, 8 November 1852, in Turton, *Epitome*, p. 283.

⁸¹ Native Secretary to Lieutenant-Governor, 27 November 1852, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 283.

⁸² Surveyor-General C. W. Ligar to Lieutenant-Governor, 7 December 1852, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 283.

⁸³ Johnson to Native Secretary, 1 January 1853, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 283. ‘Karaka’ is probably Arama Karaka Te Makutu, the brother of Pāora Tūhaere’s wife, Paramene Ngāwihi.

Later correspondence reveals that Johnson's confidence may have been misplaced. Writing of the Waiuku transactions in 1862, District Lands Commissioner John Rogan stated:

In purchasing the Waiuku Block, which had been under negotiation for upwards of six years, and which was claimed conjointly by the Ngatiteata and Ngatitipa Tribes, neither of those tribes admitting the right of the other to sell, it was found necessary to deal separately with each tribe, and accordingly £1,500 was paid to Ngatitipa to satisfy their claims to the block. Neither Aihepene nor any of the Ngatiteata Natives signed this deed or received any portion of the money, as they were only entitled to their own share, which was set apart and paid to them in two instalments of £500 and £600, to the first of which Aihepene's name is attached. The boundaries cited in this deed describe the whole of the Waiuku purchase. In that part of the block, for which £1,500 was paid to the Ngatitipa, is a Native reserve called Aka-aka, 445 acres, which Aihepene now claims. It will be found that this claim will not be recognized by Waata Kukutai and his people.⁸⁴

The Waiuku No. 1 deed, which was signed in April 1854, partly confirms Rogan's report, although Aihepene Kaihau does not figure as one of the signatories. These are led by Arama Karaka and Ruihana Te Wakaheke, with 23 others representing the principal chiefs of the following hapū and iwi: Ngāti Tīpa, Te Maungaunga, Te Aua, Ngāti Rangi, Te Uriotapu, Ngāti Pari, Tainui, Ngāti Tāhinga, Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Te Ata.⁸⁵ Although Ngāti Te Ata are included on the list of iwi having rights, the other iwi identified as vendors were vehemently opposed to Ngāti Te Ata's land sale negotiations.

Presumably, if Aihepene Kaihau did sign the receipt for the £500 on behalf of Ngāti Te Ata, it was for Ngāti Te Ata's *share* of the purchase money, not for the entire amount. The inclusion of Ngāti Te Ata along with the other iwi listed was probably as much of a concession as Kukutai was prepared to make. Kukutai's own name is not on the Waiuku No. 1 deed, either. But he is named on the Whakaupoko deed (see below), which appears to be a second sale of the same block of land under a different name.

The Waiuku deed gives the following boundaries for Waiuku No. 1:

⁸⁴ Memorandum: J. Rogan on Waiuku, 19 August 1862, in Turton, *Epitome*, p. 40.

⁸⁵ Waiuku No. 1 Deed, No. 273, 29 April 1854, in: Turton, H. H., *Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Vol. 1, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 1874, pp. 329-331.

The boundaries of this land commence at te Tawa following the boundary line of Pukekohe until it joins the boundary of the upper part of Paraheka it follows that boundary in a westerly direction until it reaches the dry Puriri trees on the line of Paraheka until it reaches Tangitu it then follows the course of the river Watapaka crossing over to the boundary of Waiau from thence to the boundary of Kahawai from thence until it reaches the river of Waiuku at Kaiaraara it follows the course of the river to Okoheko Ohurua Te whai-o-matakino it crosses to te Pahia te Pai-o-Kaiwaka from thence until it reaches Mr. Dalziel's boundary it follows that boundary to Tokatiraha it follows the course of the river Purapura it then follows the boundary of Mr. Dalziel to the westward in a line with a dry tree called te Pukaho from thence crossing directly over to one side of Opotu Tahanikau Kaimekameka Totaratahi until it reaches Waikato it follows the course of the river of Otaua te Awaroa Otutarea Paiaka te Uku te Akaaka te Papa Mawhitiwhiti te Awakoromiko Moturoa Kahaka, Mangawhero te Uaua te Tawa Rangipokia Ngateke te Awa matangi te Mauku te Taroa here it finishes.⁸⁶

A series of reserves, described as “spots of land within these boundaries which are to be reserved as places for ourselves”, are listed as: “Patumahoe, Puhitahi, Te Marie Rawhitiroa, Ko Purapura, ko te Uku, ko te Akaaka, te Papa, until it reaches Waikopurepure, Te Papakaikihikihi, Te Ruaunga, Te Awamatangi, ko Rangipokia.”⁸⁷

The deed declares that once the boundaries of the greater block and each of the reserves are finalised: “Then shall also the final payments be arranged and fixed for these lands.”⁸⁸ This assessment proved overly optimistic, as claims and counter-claims to the Waiuku lands continued to be made by the various iwi groups with interests in the area.

2.3.2 The Whakaupoko purchase

On 11 November 1854, Arama Karaka and Waata Kukutai headed a list of 48 signatories to a deed alienating the Whakaupoko block to the Crown.⁸⁹ Approximately half of the 25 named in the Waiuku No. 1 deed are also in Whakaupoko, including Arama Karaka, Ruihana, Poharama, Ihaka Takaanini, Te Kepa Te Ngoi, Haimona, Panapa Tūwao, Rūpene Apaerangi, William Frederick, Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū, Epiha

⁸⁶ Waiuku No. 1 Deed, No. 273, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 330.

⁸⁷ Waiuku No. 1 Deed, No. 273, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 331.

⁸⁸ Waiuku No. 1 Deed, No. 273, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, p. 331.

⁸⁹ Whakaupoko Deed, No. 275, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, pp. 332-333.

Pūtara and Reihana Te Rewai. According to the deed, they represented the following iwi and hapū:

Ngatitipa Ngatitamaoho, Te Uriotapu, te Akitai, Ngatipare, Ngatiwhatua, of Waikato; that is, of all the people entirely; to give up their land at Waiuku, te Whakaupoko to Victoria the Queen of England or to the Kings or Queens who may succeed her for ever and ever:—And these tribes likewise;—te Maungaunga, Ngatirangi and te Uriraro.⁹⁰

The boundaries given for the Whakaupoko block are not absolutely identical to those given for Waiuku No. 1, but the two boundary lists nonetheless contain many of the same place names.⁹¹ On the western side, ‘Dalziel’s boundary’ near the settlement of Waiuku is mentioned in both, as are Whātāpaka and the Paraheka block boundary on the eastern side. The two blocks are therefore bracketed east and west within the same parameters. Other common localities can be identified, such as Waiiau; the Whātāpaka, Waiuku and Mauku Rivers; and the reserves along the Waikato River. The lists of reserves in the two deeds are similar without being identical (the Patumāhoe, Puhitahi, Purapura and Te Akaaka Reserves are common to both lists). Altogether, this suggests that the two blocks occupy approximately the same area, with only minor differences between them. Discrepancies between the reserves lists may be explained by the differences in the lists of those entitled, while the reserves shared in common could equally be explained by the names included in both lists. The Whakaupoko block includes the Titi Reserve, which is a hill just south of Mauku and south-south-west of the Patumāhoe Reserve.

During the late 1850s and early 1860s, the Crown completed formalities on the land purchases it had made in the South Manukau district. The blocks were finally surveyed, including the reserves, and residual claims by various chiefs were considered and either paid off or rejected according to the strength of support from their peers and the judgment of the Land Purchase Commissioner. Ngāti Te Ata continued to sell land, systematically disposing of various blocks on the Awhitu Peninsula and the land on the sea coast southwards as far as the mouth of the Waikato River.

⁹⁰ Whakaupoko Deed, No. 275, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, pp. 332-333.

⁹¹ Because locations for many of the Māori place names are no longer known, it is not possible to trace the boundaries of the blocks precisely from the boundary descriptions given in the deeds.

2.3.3 The Patumāhoe and Titi Reserves

John Rogan described Titi as “a reserve in the Waiuku, for which £20 was paid to Katipa and Wetere Te Kauae in August 1855, and £130 was paid to Katipa and a number of his people as a final surrender of the land in 1856.” No further payments were deemed necessary as Te Katipa and Wetere were considered to represent all legitimate owners. The deed alienating Titi to the Crown was signed on 17 March 1856.⁹²

The chief most prominently associated with the Patumāhoe Reserve was Poharama, who was a signatory to both the Waiuku No. 1 and the Whakaupoko deeds. Poharama was a direct descendant of Ranga-a-rua, who according to the traditions was the foundation of ancestral rights in that area. Poharama’s son was Te Ropiha, who was killed in 1846 in one of the later actions at Taurangaruru. His death caused Āpihai Te Kawau and other Ngāti Whātua much grief, threatening to bring the people of Ōrākei into the dispute. This was because Poharama’s maternal great-aunt, Maringi, was Āpihai’s maternal grandmother. Thus, Āpihai Te Kawau’s connection to these lands derived from his Ngāoho, Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata ancestry, rather than through his father’s Te Taoū lineage. The alienation of the Patumāhoe Reserve is discussed at the end of chapter 3 (below).

⁹² Titi Deed, No. 278, Turton, *Maori Deeds*, pp. 337-338.

2.3.4 The Pukekohe Reserve

In February 1857, John Grant Johnson was instructed to arrange the survey of the Pukekohe Native Reserve. In the four years since the Crown's purchase of Pukekohe No. 2 block from Te Akitai, land in the area had increased in value as a number of allotments had been sold to settlers. However, although a number of allotments had been surveyed, the boundaries of the Pukekohe Reserve had not, which was causing problems because parts of the reserve had been sold to Europeans in error. The reserve boundaries were described in the 1853 deed as:

Beginning at the post at Rangiwihiri, and going on in the line of Mr. Bailey on Ngapuketurua and Puketarakihi, entering the forest and on to Tutaenui, then going in a westerly direction until it cuts the northern boundary of Tirikohua, to the second hole, then going on to the West, entering the line coming from Ahu a te Ruarangi at the Manukau to the long road to Waikato...⁹³

While these boundaries did not have the precision of a survey, they nevertheless described the area Te Akitai wished to retain on account of the cultivations, kāinga and urupā it contained.

McLean instructed Johnson to be mindful that the terms of the Pukekohe No. 2 deed be strictly observed, and ensure that 'an equal quantity of waste land' as that taken in error from the reserve be made available to Te Akitai. McLean was equally mindful of the Government's need to "fulfil its engagement with the European purchasers who have selected portions of this reserve".⁹⁴ Johnson would be accompanied by a surveyor appointed by the Provincial Government; as it was "essential that the boundaries may now be so clearly defined in the presence of the Natives that no future disputes may arise out of this purchase."

It appears that Johnson failed to complete this commission, as the Governor received a letter from Mohi in July 1857 complaining that Te Akitai were unable to cultivate

⁹³ Pukekohe 2 Deed, enclosure to: McLean to Johnson, 3 February 1857, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 288.

⁹⁴ McLean to Johnson, 3 February 1857, in: Turton, *Epitome*, p. 288.

their reserved lands because they had been occupied by Europeans.⁹⁵ Johnson was asked to report on why he had been unable to resolve the situation. It emerged that he had gone to Pukekohe with the surveyor, Edwin Fairburn, but had found Mohi and Te Akitai absent at a tangi. Johnson gave the surveyor instructions as to the boundaries, before leaving to attend to urgent business elsewhere. Johnson claimed that even if Mohi had been present, it was not in his power to define the boundaries according to the original agreement, as that would have overturned the purchase agreements entered into between the settlers and the Crown; nor did he believe he had authority to hand over an equivalent area of Crown land to Te Akitai in exchange for the land taken from the reserve, despite his instructions to that effect from Chief Commissioner McLean.⁹⁶

The following September, Government Surveyor William Searancke investigated the complaints made by Mohi and Īhaka with respect to the survey of the Native reserve. He stated:

The memorandum of boundaries of the reserve, I am of opinion, has not been adhered to in the survey made by Mr. E. Fairburn, the officer employed in laying out the sections in this block; a large part of the reserve, about 850 acres, having been alienated by the Crown to himself and Mr. T. Russell. The error appears to have arisen from the surveyor being unaccompanied by any of the Natives interested in the reserve.⁹⁷

In other words, having been assigned the task of surveying the boundary between the reserve and land in which he himself had a financial interest, Fairburn had cut 850 acres out of the reserve. Searancke added that Mohi and Īhaka had gone to Auckland to discuss their concerns with the Surveyor-General who had promised to rectify the matter, but this had not occurred. Searancke did not consider that he had authority to resolve the dispute according to the terms demanded by Te Akitai. He said: “Mohi strongly urged that the land in dispute should be given up to him as a part of the

⁹⁵ ‘Chief Mohi to the Governor’, 17 July 1857, translation, enclosure to: Asst. Native Secretary T. H. Smith (acting for the Chief Commissioner) to Johnson, Re: Mohi to Governor Browne, 1 August 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 290-291. Mohi stated in his letter that it was the third time he had written to the Governor on the matter.

⁹⁶ Johnson to Smith, 12 August 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 291-292.

⁹⁷ Searancke to McLean, 16 September 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 292-293.

reserve, as originally agreed to; that he did not wish to sell it, on account of the numerous burial-places on it.”⁹⁸

By November 1857, the matter was still unresolved. Te Akitai repeatedly protested against the occupation of the reserve land, both verbally and in writing; and they had “also repeatedly cautioned the settlers themselves, in a firm though friendly manner, against making improvements on land which was especially reserved by themselves at the time of the sale.”⁹⁹ As a result of Mohi and Īhaka’s protests, Crown grants for the European sales had initially been withheld, although they were issued subsequently.

Searancke visited Pukekohe and inspected the boundaries in person, reporting that the reserve comprised a “large and very fertile tract of country, dotted with their former settlements and cultivations; the burial places also of several of their chiefs were pointed out upon the land thus claimed...”.¹⁰⁰ Fairburn had surveyed off an area of Crown land to replace the appropriated portion of reserve, but Mohi and Īhaka rejected this as wholly unacceptable. Searancke appreciated the delicacy of the situation, believing that he could not afford to acknowledge Te Akitai’s right to any portion of land sold by the Government to private individuals, as it “would tend to shake that confidence in the value of a title from the Crown, which it is desirable to maintain undisturbed...”.¹⁰¹ He therefore treated the matter lightly, as a casual error by a surveyor arising from his ignorance of the locality. For the moment, Mohi and Īhaka accepted this, so long as their protests were heeded and the land restored to their possession.

While Fairburn’s survey had cut 850 acres out of the reserve for himself, the total area affected was much greater. Searancke reported:

The extent of land claimed by the Natives as included in their reserve, but which has been sold by the Crown to private individuals, is about Two thousands and ninety-nine acres (2,099 acres). On this there are three

⁹⁸ Searancke to McLean, 16 September 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 292-293.

⁹⁹ Searancke to McLean, 17 November 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 294-295.

¹⁰⁰ Searancke to McLean, 17 November 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 294-295.

¹⁰¹ Searancke to McLean, 17 November 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 294-295.

residents, Messrs. Carruth, Meldrum, and Arrowsmith, occupying together 793 acres.¹⁰²

Searancke refrained from committing himself to any definite course of action, hoping that Mohi and Īhaka would suggest a solution, but they had not done so. Meanwhile, the settlers had made their position clear, claiming that Māori should be constrained by the same maximum acreage as European settlers, which stood at two square miles, or 2,560 acres. This course of action, which was not countenanced by the Government, would see even more land cut out of the reserve and allocated for settlement.

Mohi, meanwhile, wrote to the Governor in December, appealing for the recognition of his rights to preserve a permanent place for his children and his burial places, not on the basis of Māori custom, but according to “the law of the Queen and the New Zealand Government”.¹⁰³ He blamed Fairburn’s survey for causing the dispute.

Mohi’s letter was forwarded to the Governor by Bishop Selwyn, who wrote an accompanying missive setting out the context of the dispute. The Bishop noted that he had consistently advised Māori to “sell their surplus lands to the Government, and to accept grants for sufficient reserves for themselves...”,¹⁰⁴ intimating that his intervention was not intended to cause any embarrassment, but simply to bring an injustice to the urgent notice of the Government. According to Bishop Selwyn, Edwin Fairburn had been sent to survey parts of the Pukekohe block in 1854, when he laid out sections for purchase. Immediately upon his return from performing this task, he made an application on his own behalf for a section that was now shown to occupy a significant part of the Māori Reserve. In the interim, however, Fairburn had on-sold the section to settlers, who had begun cultivating the land.¹⁰⁵

Encouraged by the Bishop’s support, Īhaka and Mohi convinced themselves that they would soon have their land returned to them, telling the Governor in a letter that the

¹⁰² Searancke to McLean, 17 November 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 294-295.

¹⁰³ Mohi (Te Ahi a Te Ngū) to the Governor, (translation), 4 December 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, p. 295.

¹⁰⁴ Bishop of New Zealand to the Governor, and Enclosure, 4 December 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 295-296.

¹⁰⁵ Bishop of New Zealand to the Governor, and Enclosure, 4 December 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 295-296.

houses and fences that had been erected should be left where they were, as the timber had come from their own land. They added: “Friend the Governor, will you be quick in sending the Europeans away from off our land, as we are intending to go thither to cultivate our land at Pukekohe.”¹⁰⁶ However, their optimism was to prove unfounded.

In July 1858, another Crown official in John Rogan was assigned to investigate Te Akitai’s protests over the Pukekohe Reserve. After carrying out a thorough examination of the boundaries, Rogan concluded that an area of 2,600 acres, or almost half of the reserve, had been cut off by Fairburn’s survey and granted by the Crown to European settlers. In discussing the matter with Mohi, Rogan came to the view that the chief’s claims were well-founded and were supported by the previous reports submitted by Johnson. Rogan decided that the only solution was for the Crown to purchase the land taken in error, as the additional survey costs alone would amount to at least £60. For his part, Mohi was extremely reluctant to sell, asking what Rogan considered an exorbitant price of £300. Rogan countered by offering £50, but Mohi would not budge. After a lengthy stalemate, Rogan offered an additional £50, at which point Mohi pulled out the boundary markers, signalling his agreement.¹⁰⁷

On 26 July, Rogan forwarded a deed of conveyance signed by Mohi for Te Akitai transferring the portion of Pukekohe Reserve previously sold to European settlers to the Crown for a consideration of £100.¹⁰⁸ Three thousand acres remained in the hands of Te Akitai, much of which Mohi and Īhaka Takaanini leased out to Pākehā farmers. They retained this land until 1863, when the onset of the Waikato War forced them to choose between pledging loyalty to the British Crown, or joining their Waikato kin in resisting the invasion of their territory by Imperial troops.

¹⁰⁶ Mohi and Īhaka to the Governor, (translation), 7 December 1857, in Turton, *Epitome*, p. 296.

¹⁰⁷ John Rogan, District Commissioner to Donald McLean, Chief Commissioner, 19 July 1858, in Turton, *Epitome*, pp. 296-297.

¹⁰⁸ Rogan to McLean, 26 July 1858, in Turton, *Epitome*, p. 297.

3. The Waikato War and the Confiscation of the South Auckland Reserves

3.1 The Kīngitanga and the Waikato War

Clearly the Waikato War is a large subject, any thorough treatment of which is far beyond the scope of the current report. Nevertheless, the war and the confiscations that followed provided the justification and the means by which the hapū and iwi of the southern Manukau district lost most of their remaining land, and in particular, the reserves that had been set aside for them following the land sales of the previous two decades. In respect of the following account, it should be remembered that when it settled the Waikato raupatu claims with Tainui in 1995, the Crown acknowledged that the invasion of the Waikato begun in July 1863 was unjust, as were the extensive land confiscations that followed.¹⁰⁹

As noted above, the hapū and iwi of the southern Manukau district belonged to the broader tribal grouping known as Te Waiohua, which had strong affiliations to the Tainui people of the Lower Waikato. In the 1850s, Māori opposition to land sales saw the formation of kotahitanga (unification) movements that led in 1858 to the setting up of the Waikato ariki Te Wherowhero as the first Māori King. Upon his death two years later, Pōtatau Te Wherowhero was succeeded by his son Mātutaera, who later took the name Tāwhiao. While membership of the Kīngitanga was fairly obligatory for the people of the Waikato, a group of young Waikato chiefs (the Queenites) chose to remain loyal to the British Crown. While some of the most staunch King supporters wished to see all Pākehā expelled from the country, the majority appeared to favour a more cooperative approach, where the King and the British Crown could coexist, each having dominion over their respective realms.¹¹⁰

The southern Manukau district was politically divided along similar lines, with some chiefs supporting the Kingite cause and others, such as Waata Kukutai, pledging

¹⁰⁹ See: Preamble of the Waikato Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995; at: <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1995/0058/latest/DLM369893.html>.

¹¹⁰ See: Buddle, Reverend Thomas, *The Maori King Movement in New Zealand*, (Pamphlett), Auckland, *New-Zealander* Office, 1860, pp. 7-10.

support for the British Queen. At Ihumatao, on 22 May 1857, the tangi and exhumation of the bones took place of Epiha Putini (Jabez Bunting), the chief of Ngāti Tamaoho who had died the previous year. The tangi doubled as the latest in a series of large hui to discuss the question of setting up a Māori King. Chiefs from all over the Tāmaki district attended, as well as several well-known Pākehā, including the Reverend Thomas Buddle and Bishop Selwyn, who later reported, “It was probably the largest human gathering seen in that district since the white man came to New Zealand”.¹¹¹ Debates reported in contemporary newspapers illustrated the divergence of views on the necessity of setting up a Māori King.

The ambivalence of the chiefs of the southern Manukau district to the Kīngitanga was evident at a hui held at Ngaruawāhia on 1 June 1858. Along with other leaders of the lower Waikato tribes, Īhaka Takaanini of Te Akitai and Ngāti Tamaoho gave his qualified support to Pōtātau as holding the “Mana Māori”, but not to the extent of abdicating his own rangatiratanga over his lands around the Manukau. According to the *Daily Southern Cross*: “Īhaka emphatically remark[ed] that he held his own land independent, and would not give it up to anyone.”¹¹² Nonetheless, some five years later when pressed to choose between the Governor and the King, Takaanini chose the latter, a decision undoubtedly influenced by kinship obligations.

Tensions between Māori and Pākehā in South Auckland rose when war broke out in Taranaki as the decade drew to a close. In 1860 settlers from Drury, Papakura, Wairoa, Mauku and Waiuku formed bands of militia, one of which was known as the Southern Volunteer Rifle Corps.¹¹³ The extent of the agitation is indicated by events following the discovery of the body of a Māori man named Eriata (Elliott), found shot dead in the bush between Mauku and Patumāhoe. Threats of violence and revenge were made, and many settlers fled the area. On 31 October all settlers remaining in the district were taken on board the Government vessel, *Raven*. Eventually, through the efforts of Native Minister Donald McLean, Archdeacon Robert Maunsell, Bishop Selwyn, and local chiefs Waata Kukutai and Īhaka Takaanini, bloodshed was

¹¹¹ Tonson, A.E., *Old Manukau*, Onehunga, Self Published, 1966, p. 103.

¹¹² O’Malley, V., “Te Rohe Potae Political Engagement, 1840-1863”, Wellington, CFRT, 2010, p. 199; citing *Daily Southern Cross*, 11 June 1858.

¹¹³ ‘A Word to Country Settlers,’ *New-Zealander*, 2 May 1860, p. 2.

prevented. It was subsequently decided that Eriata had shot himself by accident.¹¹⁴ Eventually, finding that they had nothing to do, the corps of militia stood down, until tensions rose again in early 1863. When revived at the time of the Waikato War, the Mauku militia styled themselves the Forest Rifle Volunteers, with contingents manning stockades built at the tidal river landing on the Mauku River, and at St. Bride's Church, Mauku.¹¹⁵

Anxiety on the part of Waikato Māori was largely due to the construction of the Great South Road, which resumed in December 1861. This would extend the existing road south from Drury, across the Bombay Hills to Pokeno and the Mangatāwhiri River. It would provide unimpeded access for an invading army to the gateway to the King's territories and guarantee the delivery of regular supplies. The military purpose of the road was indicated by the contingents of troops stationed initially at various settler farms, and later housed in a series of fortified stockades and redoubts along the route.

In May 1863, the killing of nine soldiers in Taranaki once again brought tensions to a head. Governor Grey's despatches to London highlighted the dangers posed to the colony by Māori insurgency, suggesting that an attack on Auckland might be launched at any time.¹¹⁶ Historians (as well as some of Grey's contemporaries) have questioned whether such rumours were substantial enough to justify the invasion of the Waikato. There is no doubt that the Waikato was rife with rumours of an attack on Auckland in mid-1863, as letters poured in from magistrates, missionaries and friendly chiefs in the Lower Waikato warning of various plots and schemes to "drive Pakeha into the sea".¹¹⁷ According to one invasion plan, apparently devised in May 1861, the Waikato tribes would mass at Paparātā in the Hūnua Ranges and occupy high points at Maketū, the Razorback, Pukewhau and Tuhimata, allowing them to

¹¹⁴ See: Martyn, John, "Peace and War", *Journal of the Auckland Historical Society*, No. 7, October 1965, p. 40; and: Gorst, J. E., *The Maori King*, London, 1864, pp. 150-3.

¹¹⁵ The stockade at St. Bride's was built around the church itself (see sketch reproduced on page ?, below). The stockade at the river landing was known as the Mauku Stockade, while that at the church was known as St. Bride's, or the Mauku Church Stockade.

¹¹⁶ See for example, Grey to Newcastle, 4 July 1863, in AJHR, 1863, No. 72, E.-3, p. 54.

¹¹⁷ Various correspondence, in AJHR, 1863, No. 72, E.-3, pp. 54-62. John Gorst, who served as Resident Magistrate at Te Awamutu until June 1862, and as Civil Commissioner in the Waikato until evicted by the Kīngitanga in April 1863, had no doubts that an attack on Auckland had been mooted. But Gorst seriously doubted that such a plan could ever have been carried out, given the restraining influence of Tamihana and other moderates in the Māori King's counsel. Gorst, J. E., *The Maori King*, London, 1864 (2nd edition, 1959), p. 243.

command the Great South Road and maraud through the area, while Ngāti Pou from Tuakau were to attack Mauku and Waiuku.¹¹⁸ Whatever the truth of these rumours, Kingite aggression was tempered by the moderate voices of influential Waikato chiefs such as Tāmāti Ngāpora, Wīremu Nera and Wīremu Tamihana (all of whom were committed Christians), who were equally vehement in opposing war.¹¹⁹

In any event, on 9 July 1863, Governor Grey issued a proclamation requiring all Māori living at Ihumatao, Māngere, Pūkaki, Patumāhoe, Tuakau and Pokeno to take the oath of allegiance, and surrender their arms. Those willing to comply with the order would be protected, but, the proclamation stated: “Natives refusing to do so are hereby warned forthwith to leave the district aforesaid, and retire to Waikato, beyond Mangatawhiri. In case of them not complying with this order, they will be ejected.”¹²⁰

While in theory the proclamation applied to “all persons of the native race living in the Manukau district”, it was addressed specifically to the residents of the places listed, including Patumāhoe, whose loyalty was evidently suspected. Officials seeking signatories found few willing to comply. Within the area specified, most Ngāti Mahuta at Māngere declared their loyalty to the Maori King and departed. Similarly, most Ngāti Tamaoho from Ihumatao, Pūkaki, Kirikiri, Patumāhoe and Pokeno joined the Kingites, either by choice or by expulsion; as did Ngāti Pou from Tuakau.¹²¹

Outside the places where the oath was administered (but within the Manukau district), Ngāti Te Ata at Waiuku were officially regarded as loyal. Prior to the war Aihepene Kaihau undertook to protect the local settlers, but during the war the relationship between the settlers and the local Māori became increasingly uneasy, and some individual Ngāti Te Ata warriors threw in their lot with the Kingites. The day before the proclamation was issued, British troops under Lieutenant-General Duncan

¹¹⁸ ‘Further Papers Relating to the Native Insurrection’, AJHR, 1863, E 5B, pp. 4-5.

¹¹⁹ Tāmāti Ngāpora was the King’s uncle. He was based at Māngere Bridge, where he served as the Minister at St. James Church. Ngāpora and his Waikato congregation had built the church in 1856, to a ‘Selwyn’ design drafted by the Vicar of Onehunga, Dr. A. G. Purchas. Crown officials and civic leaders such as Sir William Martin, the former Chief Justice, were regular visitors, who saw Ngāpora as a powerful influence for peace. See: AJHR, 1860, F – No. 3, pp. 73 & 98.

¹²⁰ See: Raupatu Document Bank, vol. 55, pp. 21121-2, 21151, 21174-84; Sewell, Henry, *The New Zealand Native Rebellion*, Auckland, 1864, p. 26; and *Daily Southern Cross*, 11 July 1863, p. 3.

¹²¹ See: Grey to Newcastle, 1 August 1863, AJHR, 1863, E.-3A, p. 1. Gorst reports that, on hearing of the oath he must swear, Ngāpora asked, “Is the day of reaping then at hand?” On being told that it was, he observed, “Why has not the Governor put Waikato on her trial before stretching forth the strong hand?” Gorst, J, *The Maori King*, p. 246.

Cameron began their march to the Queen's Redoubt at Pokeno.¹²² Garrisons were retained at Auckland, Ōtāhuhu and Drury, and a detachment was ordered to Mauku, but the majority of available troops were posted to the Queen's Redoubt.¹²³

The new military road was pressed into service, not only by the colonial troops, but also by the Māori refugees heading south to Waikato. John Gorst describes the scene:

The road from Otahuhu to the Waikato was thronged with armed men of every description, from the veteran British soldier to the raw colonial shop-boy, shouldering his musket for the first time. Through this martial array the refugees from Pukaki, Mangere, and other places had to thread their way, as they went over to join the enemy. They became alarmed, and with good reason. Two of the [Te Akitai] chiefs, Ihaka [Takaanini] and Mohi [Te Ahi a Te Ngū], with their women, children, and young men, took refuge at a small native village, called Kirikiri, on the slopes of the Hunua forest, overlooking Papakura and Drury. There they stopped, and appeared to give up all intention of moving further. Wild reports began to be circulated. It was rumoured that the Maories meant to show fight at Kirikiri, that one hundred young warriors were collected and were building a Pa. Settlers, who had been scouring the bush to bring in cattle, had come upon their encampments; others had seen the Pa; and all were certain that reinforcements had been sent for from Waikato to enable the party to stand their ground. Counter reports were brought in, saying that the Kirikiri party were afraid to stir; that they had a number of old infirm people, women, children, and sick, without means of transport, and were horribly afraid of the soldiers who were scouring the plain below; that they were starving, and if they could but get food and some means of conveyance, would be only too thankful to be gone.¹²⁴

Grey sent Native Minister Dillon Bell to Kirikiri to “ascertain the real state of affairs, to supply the natives with food, if needed, and to make the best arrangement he could for getting them away from their dangerous vicinity to the outlying European villages.”¹²⁵ Gorst, as the former Civil Commissioner, accompanied Bell, the two men arriving at Drury on the evening of 13 July, where they met Bishop Selwyn. The Bishop, who had just been at Kirikiri, confirmed that the Māori refugees included a number of sick and infirm, unable to negotiate the forest tracks and afraid to use the road for fear of the troops. The Bishop told them, “Mohi and the young men made no

¹²² “The Military Ordered to the Front”, *Daily Southern Cross*, 9 July 1863, p. 3.

¹²³ Mould, Thomas R., *Sketch of Military Proceedings in New Zealand*, London, 1869, p. 17.

¹²⁴ Gorst, *The Maori King*, pp. 247-248.

¹²⁵ Gorst, *The Maori King*, p. 248.

secret of their intention to come back and fight in the ranges, so soon as they had taken their old people and children to a place of safety.”¹²⁶ The next day, Bell and Gorst went to Kirikiri, where they “found Ihaka, very ill, and half-a-dozen aged men, with a few women and children, in one of the houses”.

When Mohi arrived, he told Bell that he had been opposed to those advocating war, and would not have objected if the Governor had punished Rewi Maniapoto for his recklessness. But the invasion of the King’s territory without warning meant that he was bound to join his Waikato relatives in resistance; he would live and die with them.¹²⁷ Bell reiterated the Government position, that the invasion of the Waikato was in response to a secret conspiracy on the part of the Kīngitanga to attack Auckland and murder Europeans. Mohi and the others denied any knowledge of such a plot, adding that if the Governor could give them evidence, they would immediately take the oath of allegiance and remain on their lands. The old people, who were very hungry and frightened, accepted the offer of food, and the assurance of safe conduct on the road south.¹²⁸

However, later that night a telegram was received at Drury conveying the Governor’s order that the party at Kirikiri were to be made prisoners, and a detachment of troops was sent out to perform the task. Īhaka Takaanini, along with all the sick men and the women and children, was apprehended, but Mohi and the able-bodied men evaded capture. Gorst concluded that: “Mohi, thus relieved of his encumbrances, and of all ground for forbearance, immediately commenced hostilities.”¹²⁹ While Īhaka was himself an elderly man at this time, one of the “old and infirm” men in his party was his own father, Pēpene Te Tihi. Along with the other members of their party, both were imprisoned without trial on Motuhurakia (Rakino) Island, where Īhaka and Pēpene subsequently died. Īhaka’s widow, Riria, later claimed her husband’s estate, including the Patumāhoe Native Reserve, on behalf of herself and her children.

¹²⁶ Gorst, *The Maori King*, p. 248.

¹²⁷ Gorst, *The Maori King*, p. 249. Both Īhaka and Mohi had been Government Assessors, and Īhaka had been the keeper of the Native Hostel. See: Tonson, *Old Manukau*, 1966, pp. 68-69. Tonson also states that when Īhaka was interviewed by Bell, it was apparent that the mats he was lying on concealed a stash of arms and ammunition. Some of this was captured when Īhaka was apprehended on 16 July.

¹²⁸ Gorst, *The Maori King*, pp. 249-250.

¹²⁹ Gorst, *The Maori King*, p. 250.

Coincidentally, the day before Īhaka was interviewed by Dillon Bell, a settler named Meredith and his son were ambushed and killed while fencing their property near Ramarama.¹³⁰ According to Gorst, Īhaka was never held responsible for these killings, which were carried out by an unrelated group. Gorst was clearly sympathetic to the plight of the Te Akitai rangatira, commenting: “On whatever ground Ihaka and the innocent women and children were taken, their capture, just after safe conduct had been promised to them by a high officer of Government, had the unfortunate appearance of a gross breach of faith.”¹³¹

The Meredith ‘murders’ were the first blood shed in the Waikato War. They were followed by a succession of attacks on both armed and unarmed civilians over the next few months. Civilian deaths in the South Auckland area totalled 15 and included one woman and several boys. Besides the Merediths, they included James Hunt on 22 July 1863; Sylvester Calvert on 24 July; George Cooper also on 24 July; a Mr Scott on 27 August; Hugh MacLean and Robert Watson on 14 September; Job Hamlin on 14 October; Messrs Jackson and Sutherland, also on 14 October; Mr and Mrs Fahey on 15 October; and Richard and Nicholas Trust on 24 October. While Sylvester Calvert was an alleged looter of Māori settlements, the others had no known connection with the war. This list does not include civilians who were killed while openly involved in the war effort, such as James Armitage, killed while supervising the transport of military supplies at Camerontown on 7 September 1863; nor those who survived attack, like 10 year-old Joseph Wallis, tomahawked and left for dead with Job Hamlin on 14 October; nor members of the militia or volunteers who were attacked while unarmed, such as James Dromgool, killed at Mauku on 2 November 1863.

Both the Pukekohe East Presbyterian Church and St. Bride’s Anglican Church at Mauku had stockades built around them, although Cowan reports that the defences at the Pukekohe East Church were compromised because the bush around the church

¹³⁰ See: “Murder of the Messrs. Meredith”, *New Zealander*, 16 July 1863, p. 3; “Latest News from the Front”, *New Zealander*, 17 July 1863, p. 3; “Further Papers Relating to the Native Insurrection”, *AJHR*, 1863, E.-5B, p. 4; James Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars*, Vol. I: 1845-1864, 1922, p. 253; Maurice Lennard, *The Road to War: The 1863 Redoubts of South Auckland*, 1986, pp. 40-2.

¹³¹ Gorst, *The Maori King*, p. 250. Tonson reports that there were no grounds for detaining Īhaka Takaanini and that “his widow and remaining children were later compensated to the extent of £3,944, for a block of land at Pukekohe to which Ihaka had held a claim”. Tonson, *Old Manukau*, p. 78.

had not been cleared.¹³² This allowed attacking Māori to approach without detection, which is what occurred when the church was attacked on 13-14 September 1863. The Māori force of about 180 warriors was made up of a band of Ngāti Maniapoto from Upper Waikato, plus a group of Ngāti Pou from the Lower Waikato and southern Manukau districts.¹³³ Though the stockade held few defenders, they managed to hold off the superior attacking force until reinforcements in the form of Captain Moir and the First Waikato Militia arrived in the afternoon. According to Cowan, as many as 40 Māori were killed in the exchange, mostly Ngāi Pou, with British losses confined to the relieving force, who had three killed and eight wounded.¹³⁴

Also on 14 September, Burt's farm at Paerata, occupied by the Watson family, was attacked by a small force of Ngāti Pou. Fourteen-year-old Robert Watson received a fatal wound, and the ploughman Hugh McLean was caught out in the open and killed after running out of ammunition. The other family members managed to hold off the attack until reinforcements arrived.

The most significant battle on the western side of the South Auckland district occurred on 23 October 1863 at Titi, a hill just south of Mauku, and at the Bald Hills (Whakaupoko), a little farther south again. The Forest Rifle Volunteers under local man, Lieutenant Lusk, was based at the Stockade at St. Brides, with another contingent at the Mauku Landing Stockade. For some months they had been making regular sorties patrolling the district alongside the Forest Rangers under Captain Jackson.

On the morning of the 23rd, shots were heard coming from the Bald Hills area, which proved to be a large party of Māori shooting cattle. Lusk sent instructions to Lieutenant Perceval at the Mauku Stockade to bring half his force to join him at the church, but Perceval struck out towards Titi Hill, hoping to attack the raiders from the rear. This dangerous manoeuvre placed his force in some danger, forcing Lusk to venture out of the church to give support with his company of 50. There followed a fierce, prolonged battle as both sides attempted to outflank their opponents, culminating in desperate close quarters fighting. The Militia lost 8 killed, including

¹³² James Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars, Vol. I: 1845-1864*, 1922, pp. 274ff.

¹³³ Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars*, p. 279.

¹³⁴ Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars*, p. 282.

Perceval, while it was estimated that the Māori lost perhaps three times that number. Eventually, Lusk was able to mount a rearguard action by keeping to the bush cover and retiring to St Bride's.¹³⁵



*After a sketch by G. Norbury, 1863, St. Bride's Church, Mauku, with Stockade, 1863*¹³⁶

Soon after the Mauku engagement, General Cameron decided his preparations were well enough advanced to attack the Kīngitanga defences at Meremere, which he outflanked using river steamers. The Kingites made a strategic withdrawal and repositioned themselves at Rangiriri, where the first major engagement of the war took place on 20 November 1863.¹³⁷ This took the focus of the fighting away from South Auckland. For local chiefs such as Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū, the consequences of their brief involvement would be severe, as the Crown used it to justify the seizure of their remaining lands.

¹³⁵ Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars*, pp. 300-304.

¹³⁶ Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars*, p. 298.

¹³⁷ Belich, James, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict*, Auckland, AUP, 1986, pp. 138-147.

3.2 The Confiscation of South Manukau Lands

3.2.1 The New Zealand Settlements Act 1863

Reporting on the legal context of the Crown's confiscation policy, the Tauranga Moana (Stage I) Tribunal notes that in England, land confiscation was a long-established practice dating back to medieval times, and it was this long history that persuaded the Colonial Office in London that the New Zealand Settlements Act (1863) was valid and not repugnant to English law.¹³⁸ It is clear that Governor Grey had confiscation in mind before the war began, having told John Morgan in June 1863 that "he would confiscate the whole of the Waikato, excepting the lands of the loyal natives".¹³⁹

At the time, however, the policy was not universally endorsed by New Zealand politicians and civic leaders. Critics included Parliamentarians William Swainson, Daniel Pollen and James FitzGerald; former official John Gorst, by this time resident in London, who wrote a highly critical letter to *The Times* in late December 1863; and Sir William Martin, the retired Chief Justice and Supreme Court Judge.¹⁴⁰ According to Waitangi Tribunal historian, Dr Barry Rigby, when the Bill was read a second time in the Legislative Council, Swainson criticised it as one that "set aside a treaty which had been entered into by the Crown...". Rigby continues:

[Swainson] reminded the Council that [the Duke of] Newcastle [the Colonial Secretary] ... had called for a policy consistent with 'the expectations which the Maoris have been allowed to base on the Treaty of Waitangi, and the apprehensions which they have been led to entertain respecting the observance of that treaty'. Swainson also supported sentiments Tamati

¹³⁸ *Te Raupatu o Tauranga Moana*, Waitangi Tribunal Report (Wai 215), Wellington, 2004, pp. 153-154.

¹³⁹ Postscript dated 28 July 1863, in Morgan to Browne, 20 July 1863, Gore Browne Papers, 1/2d, pp. 200-201. ANZW.

¹⁴⁰ Ferguson, Gael, "Ngai Tai ki Tamaki within Hauraki", A research report commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, p. 58.

Ngapora and Mohi Te Ahi-a-te-Ngu expressed in July regarding the pressing need for a commission of inquiry into the causes of the Waikato war.¹⁴¹

Pollen, who later became a Commissioner of Confiscated Lands, was even more explicit in his condemnation of the Bill's violation of the Crown's obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi, stating that it would confirm Māori suspicions that the Crown's object in signing the Treaty was not to protect its Māori subjects but to obtain possession of their lands. FitzGerald echoed these concerns, arguing that confiscation was "contrary to the Treaty of Waitangi, which had distinctly guaranteed...that the lands of the Natives shall not be taken from them except by ordinary process of law...within the meaning of the Treaty."¹⁴²

The legislation authorising the confiscations was drafted by Premier Frederick Whitaker, whose business and political alliance with Thomas Russell represented the interests of Auckland land speculators who stood to gain a great deal from the invasion and the confiscations that followed. Russell, it will be recalled, had purchased Crown land at Pukekohe in partnership with Edwin Fairburn, who had the task of surveying the Pukekohe allotments. Fairburn's survey cut some 580 acres out of the Awa a Takehu Native Reserve, which went instead into the allotment he shared with Russell.

Whitaker and Russell justified the legislation by adopting Governor Grey's claims of a Kingite invasion conspiracy; however, their designs on Māori land far exceeded those of the Governor, who in later years would become their implacable political enemy. R. C. J. Stone states:

[Whitaker and Russell] represented the viewpoint of the 'war party' in Auckland; that in the name of civilisation and progress, settlers must have easier access to Maori lands; that war against Maori 'rebels' must be ruthlessly prosecuted; and that, after unconditional surrender, there must be large confiscations of land, and military settlements to enforce the peace of the Pakeha.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ Rigby, "Hauraki and East Wairoa", 2002, pp. 32-33; citing: New Zealand Settlements Bill, 16 November 1863, NZPD, 1861-1863, pp. 869-870.

¹⁴² Rigby, "Hauraki and East Wairoa", 2002, pp. 32-33; citing: New Zealand Settlements Bill, 16 November 1863, NZPD, 1861-1863, pp. 871-872.

¹⁴³ See: Stone, R. C. J., "Whitaker, Frederick, 1812-1891", DNZB, Vol. 1, pp. 586-587.

The New Zealand Settlements Act, passed on 3 December 1863, provided the statutory authority for the confiscation of large tracts of Māori land from those tribes who were deemed to have been in rebellion against the Crown.¹⁴⁴ Colonisation was seen as the solution to the current ‘rebellion’, as the Preamble to the Act makes clear:

...Whereas it is necessary that some adequate provision should be made for the permanent protection and security of the well-disposed Inhabitants of both races for the prevention of future insurrection or rebellion and for the establishment and maintenance of Her Majesty’s authority and of Law and Order throughout the Colony And Whereas the best and most effectual means of attaining those ends would be by the introduction of a sufficient number of settlers able to protect themselves and to preserve the peace of the Country...¹⁴⁵

Section 2 of the Act provided that if the Governor in Council was “satisfied that any Native Tribe or Section of a Tribe or any considerable number thereof” had since 1 January 1863 “been engaged in rebellion”, the district within which their land was situated was to be declared a district subject to the provisions of the Act.¹⁴⁶

Under section 3, the Governor in Council could “set apart within any such District eligible sites for settlements for colonisation”, while under section 4, for the purposes of those settlements, the Governor in Council could “reserve or take any Land within such District” which land would be deemed to be Crown land free of all encumbrances.

Section 5 of the Act provided for compensation to be paid to anyone with “any title interest or claim” to any land taken, provided they could show they were ‘non-rebels’ whose lands had been included in a district proclaimed under the Act.

Sections 7 to 15 specified how compensation was to be awarded. Importantly, any compensation awarded by the court was to be paid in cash, with the amount based on the claimant’s interest in the land (ss14, 15). In later variations of the legislation, this proviso was relaxed to allow small parcels of land to be returned to loyal Māori who had been rendered landless as a result of having their land confiscated.

¹⁴⁴ This section has made use of the Waitangi Tribunal Report, *Te Raupatu o Tauranga Moana*, which gives a succinct summary of the legislation.

¹⁴⁵ Preamble, New Zealand Settlements Act, 1863, V. No. 8. The Act did not mention the word ‘confiscation’, preferring instead such terms as ‘set apart’ and ‘reserve and take’.

¹⁴⁶ Section 2, New Zealand Settlements Act, 1863, V. No. 8.

Sections 16-20 dealt with the formation of settlements in the confiscation district, providing for the laying out of a number of towns and farms, enabling grants of urban and rural sections to be made to people whose military service was, by contract with the Government, to be repaid in that way. Military people had priority; with remaining land to be assigned for towns and suburban and rural allotments to be sold off to the public. The money so raised would pay the ‘expenses of suppressing the present insurrection’, the formation of settlements, and the compensation awarded to individuals ‘for losses by the said rebellion’ (s19).¹⁴⁷

The confiscation process was not instigated immediately following the passing of the legislation, apparently because Sir George Grey had developed reservations about it. In forwarding Whitaker’s explanation to London in January 1864, Grey wrote that confiscation was necessary because the war had become a ‘war of races’, but went on to state that he thought the Crown should not be too severe, and that he “would not carry the [confiscation] system too far”.¹⁴⁸

3.2.2 The confiscation of Patumāhoe & other reserves

The refusal of many southern Manukau Māori to take the oath of allegiance and surrender their arms when required in July 1863 was sufficient to constitute rebellion and the entire district was duly declared subject to the Act. Thus, by the stroke of a pen, all the land remaining in Māori ownership between the Manukau and the Waikato River, which effectively meant the reserves set aside from the land sales of the previous two decades, was alienated to the Crown. In South Manukau, the Patumāhoe, Pukekohe, Pōkeno, Tuakau, Waiuku North, Waiuku South and Tuhimata Native Reserves were all affected.¹⁴⁹

In 1865-66, a Compensation Court was set up to hear claims by those Māori who had not joined the ‘rebels’, who could be eligible for compensation for land taken. At first,

¹⁴⁷ *Te Raupatu o Tauranga Moana*, 2004, p. 155. Other supporting Acts of Parliament were passed in December 1863, such as The Loan Act, and the Suppression of Rebellion Act, designed to enable the Government to put down rebellion and help fund the wars and confiscation process. The Government also passed legislation to indemnify those engaged in the suppression of rebellion.

¹⁴⁸ Grey to Newcastle, 6 January 1864, AJHR, 1864, D-6, pp. 1-2.

¹⁴⁹ Journal of the Auckland Provincial Government, 1864, A No. 1, p. 9; Raupatu Document Bank (RDB), p. 00519.

compensation was monetary only, but as the terms of reference of the Court were refined, it later became possible for land to be returned. Thus, loyal chiefs like Waata Kukutai and Aihepene Kaihau had their land returned to them under the terms of the “Friendly Natives’ Contracts Confirmation Act 1866,” which validated negotiations carried out by Crown official H. H. Turton with loyal chiefs for the return of lands occupied by them, but confiscated under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863. The chiefs held the returned land under Crown grants as individual owners, not as trustees for their hapū and iwi. In due course, they came under pressure to sell the returned land to the Crown as well.

3.2.3 The Patumāhoe Compensation Court hearing

The Compensation Court began its hearings in the South Manukau district in April 1866, continuing into May, when the Patumāhoe case was heard. The Tuakau case south of Patumāhoe was heard during 13-16 May, while the Patumāhoe and Tuhimata cases were heard on 18-19 May. It would appear that no hearing was held for the large Pukekohe Reserve, presumably because no applications were lodged, or if they were, they were disallowed. The Tītī Reserve had of course been sold by Ngāti Te Ata in the 1850s.

The Pukekohe Reserve had been awarded to Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū and Īhaka Takaanini, both of whom had refused to sign the oath of allegiance, and who would therefore have been ineligible to apply for compensation under the terms of the New Zealand Settlements Act. As already noted, Īhaka had died in custody on Rakino, but he was survived by his widow, Riria, his daughter Erina, and two sons, Te Wirihana and Īhaka. Riria appeared in the Patumāhoe case, claiming on behalf of herself and her children. The Judge, F. D. Fenton, who would later become Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, pre-empted the protests of the Crown, that Riria should be disqualified on account of her husband’s rebellion.

Fenton stated:

The circumstances are these: Isaac and his people had betaken themselves to the skirts of the forest. They were suspected by the Government of being in league with the disloyal part of the natives, and were thought to be about to become insurgents. A Minister of the Crown (Mr. Bell), accompanied by Mr

Gorst (the commissioner of the district), and Mr Fulloon, an interpreter, went to Isaac's encampment and requested him to take the oath of allegiance and surrender his arms – the latter commandment being strictly speaking an illegal one, or one non-compliance with was not an offence at law. Early next morning, before Isaac had given a definite answer, he and his people were surrounded by Her Majesty's troops, under Colonel Murray and apprehended; Mr Bell, at this time, not having returned for the final answer. They were then kept in military custody for several months at Otahuhu. During that time, all the witnesses...were present in Auckland. There were Mr Bell, Mr Gorst, Mr Fulloon and Colonel Murray, and there were the persons then suspected and now alleged to be guilty of treason, or misprision of treason, all in custody. Mr Crawford [the Crown counsel] says they were guilty of treason, or at least misprision of treason, which is (as he knows) a knowledge of treasonable contrivances without an assent thereto and without disclosing them. Treason is the greatest offence and attended with the heaviest punishment known to the laws of any civilised state; and misprision of treason nearly approaches treason in guilt, being punished with perpetual imprisonment and forfeiture of goods and of lands for life. Yet the Crown, having the persons in custody, having all the witnesses to their guilt in readiness, and having the Supreme Court with its doors open, did not bring them to trial.

And they had a simpler form of trial, if they chose it, in the Suppression of Rebellion Act – court-martial. But they [Īhaka and company] had a right, according to the laws of England, to be tried by a jury of their peers. And now, after the principal alleged offender is dead, and the witnesses are not forthcoming, the counsel for the Crown requires this Court in an indirect manner to try them, and find them guilty of these crimes or one of them, and complains that he cannot prove their guilt, because the witnesses are not forthcoming, and this Court will not admit secondary evidence, or rather that which is no evidence at all. We cannot be moved by such an appeal.

Still, the Court is bound to exclude all claimants from compensation if they can be brought within the 5th clause of the [New Zealand Settlements] Act, and they will be excluded if they can be proved by evidence, according to law, to have been guilty of any of the crimes named in that clause.¹⁵⁰

Riria then gave evidence, stating that she and her children laid claim to the Patumāhoe Reserve, and that the other claimants were Pāora Te Iwi, Pāora 'Te Haere' (probably Tūhaere), and Aihepene (Kaihau). She told the Court that she claimed through her husband, Īhaka, and that the family had cultivated the ground (presumably at Patumāhoe) for three years after the death of Poharama. She did not know whether Hakopa had a claim, though he too resided on the land and cultivated there. She

¹⁵⁰ Chief Judge Fenton, Patumāhoe Case, Compensation Court, 17 May 1865, *Daily Southern Cross* (DSC), May 18 1865.

added: “I don’t know when he first came upon the land. When we went there he had been on the land for some time. He is a Ngati Haua, but his wife belongs to our tribe.” Crawford for the Crown asked a question about her relationship to Heta, to which Riria replied that he was her cousin, as he was “the son of old Pepini’s [*sic*] younger brother. Pepini was Ihaka’s father.”¹⁵¹

Pāora Te Haere/Tūhaere told the Court that he claimed through Rangaarua, but as he was a young man he could not trace his genealogy. Waata ‘Tukatai’ (Kukutai) said that all he knew was that Hakopa Te Waharoa occupied the land, but he knew nothing of his title.¹⁵² Edward Davy stated that he had looked at the land and considered that it was worth £2. 10/- per acre, as there was a good deal of cultivated land on the block.

The Crown then made its submission, Crawford stating that right of occupation in Patumāhoe Reserve appeared to have been vested in Poharama and his slaves; that the claims of Īhaka’s children stood in opposition to the claims of Poharama’s children, who were with the rebels. Based on the (unrecorded) evidence of the interpreter John White, Crawford asserted that the right of occupation and the mana were with Poharama, and that the reserve was essentially his private property. He could not acknowledge slaves as having any claim, and he could not comment on whether the slaves who cultivated the block belonged to Īhaka or Poharama. He added,

There had been no piece of ground set aside for Ihaka and the slaves cultivated around Poharama’s piece. Ihaka never resided on the block, but some of his slaves, who had run away from Papahinu, lived upon it, and cultivated a portion of it. Poharama had told Mr White that, after his death, he wished the block to go to his grandchildren. Those children are at present with the [Māori] King.¹⁵³

The Court’s decision in the Patumāhoe case was reported in the *Daily Southern Cross* on 19 May 1865. The Chief Judge thought the only matter that required remarking on was the Crown’s assertion that the reserve had been set apart for Poharama alone. In the opinion of the Chief Judge, however, the evidence showed that the land was not

¹⁵¹ Evidence of Riria, Patumāhoe Case, Compensation Court, 17 May 1865, DSC, May 18 1865.

¹⁵² The newspaper report seems to have made errors in transcribing these names. Waata ‘Tukatai’ is surely Waata Kukutai, the chief of Ngāti Tipa, while Pāora Te Haere is probably the Ngāti Whātua rangatira, Pāora Tūhaere. If it is Tūhaere, it should be noted that he claimed as a descendant of Rangaarua, of Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngā Iwi, not under his Ngāti Whātua affiliation.

¹⁵³ Crown submission, Patumāhoe Case, Compensation Court, 17 May 1865, DSC, May 18 1865.

set apart by the Land Commissioners, nor was there any evidence that Native title had ever been extinguished over it. If such had occurred, then evidence to that effect could have been easily produced. Since the Crown did not offer evidence for the extinguishment of Native title, the Court concluded that it had not occurred.

The Crown had offered other examples where land had been reserved for individuals and their families, but in those cases the reserves were made by the Land Purchase Commissioners, which had not happened in this case. With Patumāhoe, it was the chiefs of the district, Ihaka, Pēpene, Waata Kukutai, Arama Karaka and others, who agreed that the reserve should be made for Poharama. In the view of the Chief Judge, that was a very different matter than if the Commissioners had cut the reserve out from land already alienated. As "...the reserve was left by the natives to Poharama, the Court took it that it still preserved its character of native land. That being so, the Court had to treat it as ordinary native land." The Court found that:

Poharama and all his children, excepting one that had died [Te Ropiha], doubtless representing the most powerful family and having the greatest interest in the land – were all in a state of insurrection or death. Another branch of the family claimed through a second son of Poharama – a man whose name was Waata, and brother of Paul. He also died in rebellion. A younger branch in the female line was tolerably clear – in fact quite clear unless they brought in a lot of collateral branches, but which in fact did not appear in the claim.

Taking off, therefore, a very considerable portion of the value of the land for such persons, and having apportioned the remainder among the loyal ones, the Court had determined to issue certificates for the following sums – to Hakopa Te Waharoa, £20; his wife Hene Ngatutu and her brother Rakena, £100; to Paora Te Iwi, and Ahipene Kaihau, £250; to Riria, in behalf of the children of Ihaka, £350.¹⁵⁴

The total compensation awarded came to £720. As the block contained 701 acres, and Davy's valuation was given as £2-10/- per acre, the value of the block was reckoned at £1,752-10/-. Therefore, the 'very considerable portion' of the value of the land ascribed by the Court to Poharama's family of 'rebels', to be withheld by the Crown, amounted to £1,032 10/-.

¹⁵⁴ Court decision, Patumāhoe Case, Compensation Court, 18 May 1865, DSC, May 19 1865.

After the decision was read out, Crown counsel Crawford raised concerns about the award to Aihepene, who had stated in evidence that he had no personal claim to the block. Crawford asked the Chief Judge if there was any avenue for appeal, to which Fenton replied that there was nothing in the regulations. The Crown's objection turned on the question of whether Aihepene was awarded compensation as an individual, or as a chief on behalf of the wider tribe. Crawford argued that if it was the latter, then it should be clearly stated that Aihepene was given the award as the representative or trustee of a number of people. Fenton CJ responded that he did not think such a course necessary, as "the natives carried out the principle he had alluded to so frequently. As an instance he ... [recalled] that Aihipene had held out his hand and stated – that was the hand which distributed the money, upon the purchase of a block by the Government".¹⁵⁵ Crawford was not convinced and further discussion ensued about whether it would be advisable to set up an appeal mechanism, whereupon the Judge invited him to draw up an appropriate regulation and it would be given consideration.

The Tuhimata Reserve, south of Drury, was heard on the same day as Patumāhoe, and in due course awards were made that were dominated by Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Reko, whose representatives each received £100. One Hōri Te Rangihuera (also known as Hōri Tuhimata), who actually lived on the land, was awarded £10 for his interests. He later wrote to the Governor complaining that he did not wish to uplift the £10 owing to him; he would rather have the land returned, all 640 acres of it. If the Government wished to purchase it, they could have it for its real value of £5 per acre; he said he would accept £3,200 for Tuhimata.¹⁵⁶ There is no indication in the Court records that he received a reply to his letter.

Following the confiscation, the Patumāhoe, Pukekohe and other Native reserves in South Manukau were proclaimed Waste Lands of the Crown and subdivided for settlement. Patumahoe Village occupies the site of the old Patumāhoe Native Reserve, while the town of Pukekohe sits partly on the former Pukekohe Native Reserve. It

¹⁵⁵ Court discussion of legal points, Patumāhoe Case, Compensation Court, 18 May 1865, DSC, May 19 1865. NB: The newspaper spells 'Aihepene' as 'Aihipene', which is how it is spelt here when quoting from the original text. We have not used '*sic*' to indicate the mis-spelling in order to avoid disrupting the flow of the quotation.

¹⁵⁶ Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscation Files, Tuhimata File, BAPP A1721 265, Archives New Zealand, Auckland (ANZ-A).

should be noted that between 1852 and 1876, New Zealand was under a Provincial Government system, so that the disposal of lands in the Auckland district was carried out under the authority of the Auckland Provincial Council. To this end, correspondence between the ‘General Government’ and the Auckland Provincial Council following the confiscation of the South Manukau lands focused on how the settlement of these lands would be managed, with particular reference to managing the costs of surveys, immigration, and the development of infrastructure such as roads and other facilities.¹⁵⁷

While a few loyal chiefs were paid compensation for the losses they suffered as a result of the confiscations, the majority of South Manukau Māori were left without a place to stand; in 25 years, the whole of their turangawaewae had been alienated.

¹⁵⁷ “Correspondence between the General Government and the Superintendent respecting the Settlement of the Confiscated Territory”, *Journal of the Auckland Provincial Council*, 1865, A – No. 1, pp. 4-6. (RDB, pp. 00515-00518).

Part 2

Hapū and Iwi in the Southern Manukau District

4. South Manukau Iwi Traditions Overview

4.1 Introduction

Ancestral interests in the lands between Manukau and the Lower Waikato River derive from the ancient peoples variously known as Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi, Ngārīki, Ngāti Taihaua, Te Uri o Pou, Te Waiohua and related groups, most frequently referred to collectively as Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua. Related descent-groups in the study area include Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata, Te Akitai, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Ngāti Pou, Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei and Ngāti Tipa, while other Waikato-based groups with links to the area include Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa, and Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Hauā.

In essence, all of the aforesaid parties derive some degree of traditional and ancestral connection to the study area through their shared Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua origins. Some, however, including Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei and associated kin groups in the western parts of the area, and Te Akitai, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Te Uri o Pou and their relatives in the east, have developed more specific interests from having established a particular presence and identity in the area in question. These people all represent specific branches of Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua, whose tribal heartlands have extended between the Manukau Harbour and Lower Waikato regions for many generations.

As Pāora Te Iwi of Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngārīki, Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua told the Native Land court in 1868:

I said that Ngaiwi, Ngariki & Waiohua had their lands in common & that there was no division. Ngaiwi had a claim over all the lands of Ngariki. All the Ngaiwi would have a claim over Ngariki land and so would all Waiohua. N. Maho are Ngaiwi & N. Tiata, N. Pari, Akitai. All Waiohua would have a claim over these lands.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁸ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 197. NB: the ‘N. Maho’ referred to in the quote is a frequently used abbreviation for Ngāti Tamaoho. Similarly, ‘N. Tiata’ should read Ngāti Te Ata.

Te Iwi went on to say that divisions and boundaries between groups such as Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Whātua etc. had only been made in later generations. Pāora Te Iwi's younger relative Hōri Tauroa of Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho gave similar statements, saying: "The lands were not divided in those days; they have been since the pakeha came. We held our lands until the pakehas came."¹⁵⁹

It should be noted that the evidence of Te Iwi and Tauroa quoted above was given within the context of the Ōrākei Rehearing, and their comments applied more broadly to Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland) than to the specific Mauku/Patumāhoe study area. Nonetheless, traditional evidence presented at the Ōrākei investigations between 1866 and 1868 contains detailed information about Ngā Iwi, Te Waiohua and related groups, and Pāora Te Iwi and Hōri Tauroa in particular both gave detailed kōrero (oratory) concerning traditional interests in the study area.

This chapter is subdivided as follows: the first section, 'Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua', discusses the traditional origins of the common ancestors of the Manukau/Lower Waikato region. The next two sections, 'Ngā Hekenga mai nō Waikato' and 'Te Patumāhoe' give brief accounts of some of the tūpuna from Waikato who later migrated into the area and, both through raupatu (conquests) and through whakawhanaungatanga (pro-actively establishing kinship between tribal groups), established new hapū and iwi identities of mixed Waikato and Waiohua descent, such as Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata and Te Akitai.

The remainder of the chapter discusses the individual origins and traditions of Ngāti Te Ata; Ngāti Tamaoho; Te Akitai; Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki; Te Uri o Pou; Ngāti Tipa; Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei; Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Hauā; and Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa; emphasising each group's particular associations with the study area.

¹⁵⁹ Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 39.

4.2 Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua

Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua are broad, overarching names that embrace all of the tāngata whenua groups associated with the study area. Ngā Oho refers to the descendants of Ohomairangi, an ancestor from Hawaiki who lived around 4-5 generations before elder members of the crews of *Tainui* and *Te Arawa*. These two celebrated waka made landfall in the eastern Bay of Plenty, going on to also explore and settle the Hauraki, Tāmaki and Waikato regions. The *Tainui* and *Te Arawa* are thought to have reached Aotearoa in or around the early-mid 14th Century.¹⁶⁰

Ohomairangi in turn had at least two namesakes: one who lived before and one who lived during the period of the *Tainui* and *Te Arawa* migration. A fourth ‘Oho’, namely Ohomatakamokamo of Ngā Riukiuta, lived around 2-3 generations after the migration, and established his own branch of Ngā Oho, who “dispersed beyond Manukau to Tauroa, Waikato, Te Akau, Whangaroa [*sic*] and to Aotea”.¹⁶¹ The name Ngā Oho is thus a broad designation of the tribal groups descended from ancestors aboard both waka, and the earlier arrivals from Polynesia with whom they settled and intermarried.¹⁶²

On the lands extending between the Western Hauraki Gulf and across South Auckland to the Manukau Harbour and Lower Waikato Valley, early hapū and iwi included Ngāti Taihaua (later to become Ngāti Tai or Ngāi Tai), Ngā Mārama, Ngāti Hako, Ngā Riukiuta and Ngāti Huarere. As the *Tainui* people in particular spread out and diversified across much of Tāmaki, Manukau and Waikato, the name Ngā Iwi gained

¹⁶⁰ Professor Bruce Biggs citing J. B. W. Robertson dates the arrival of *Tainui* and *Te Arawa* to c.1300 A.D. See Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995, p. 9.

¹⁶¹ Aoterangi, Wirihana, “Fragments of Ancient Maori History” (translated by George Graham), 1923, MS 120/P1, Auckland Institute & Museum, p. 8. Te Aoterangi’s original Māori manuscript (n.d.) is understood to long pre-date its eventual translation in 1923.

¹⁶² Sources for the origins of Ngā Oho include Wirihana Te Aoterangi’s “Fragments of Ancient Maori History”, 1923; Best, Elsdon, “The Burning of Te Arawa”, in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 34, 1925; Graham, George, “A Maori History of the Auckland Isthmus”, (n.d.), MS 120/P2 and “Marutuahu” (n.d.), MS 120/M42, from the Auckland Institute & Museum’s MS 120 George Graham Collection; Sir Māui Pōmare and James Cowan’s, *Legends of the Maori Vol. I*, 1930; Smith, S. Percy, *The Peopling of the North*, 1898; and Stafford, D. M., *Te Arawa*, 1967.

currency as a general term for the “many tribes” of the wider region, and was frequently applied to the people of the Lower Waikato/Manukau study area.¹⁶³

From the descendants of Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi and related groups sprang forth Te Uri o Pou, ‘The Progeny of Poutūkeka (II)’; and from important marriages between Te Uri o Pou, Ngā Iwi and Ngāti Tai arose the tribal confederation Te Waiohua, the name commemorating the passing of Poutūkeka’s great grandson Hua-o-Kaiwaka. From around the early-mid 16th Century onward, Ngā Iwi, Te Uri o Pou and ultimately Te Waiohua held mana over the study area and surrounding districts.¹⁶⁴

4.3 Ngā Hekenga mai nō Waikato

Over a period straddling the late 16th and early 18th Centuries, several itinerant warrior tūpuna migrated into the Manukau/South Auckland, Lower Waikato and Western Hauraki districts. Originating predominantly from the west coast between Taranaki and the Waikato River mouth, these tūpuna were affiliated to Waikato iwi that included Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Hauā, Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa. Hotunui and his son Marutūahu from Kāwhia, Tamaoho from Marokopa, Pāoa from Kaitotehe, and Tapaue from nearby Taupiri were the main examples of these migrants.

Their marriages with rangatira kura (female chiefs) from among the tāngata whenua of Ngā Iwi, Te Uri o Pou and Te Waiohua gave rise to the Marutūahu confederation of Hauraki, and the Manukau tribes of Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata. Of the Marutūahu groups, Ngāti Pāoa, and the related hapū of Ngāti Tipa in particular, were to develop strong ties to the people living between the Lower Waikato River and Manukau Harbour. Across the same area, Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho were to

¹⁶³ Traditions concerning Ngā Iwi origins are sourced primarily from the Native Land Court evidence of Eruera Te Paerimu, Hetaraka Takapuna, Te Hemara Tauhia, Pāora Te Iwi, Pāora Tūhaere, Te Watarauhi Tāwhia and Te Wāka Tuahere (alias Te Wāka Tuaea) among others, in the Ōrākei title investigations of 1866 and the 1868 rehearing. These are contained in Ōrākei Minute Books 1 & 2 from the 1868 case, and in Judge Monro’s Minute Book (MS 366, Auckland Institute & Museum) from 1866.

¹⁶⁴ Sources for the whakapapa of Te Uri o Pou and Te Wai o Hua include Hawira Maki, Tīwai Parāone, Hetaraka Takapuna, Tukumana (Taiwiwi) Te Taniwha and Wiremu Te Wheoro, as stated in various Compensation Court and Native Land Court cases between the 1860s and 1890s. See also Gudgeon, W. E., “Maori Migrations: No. II”, in *Journal of the Polynesian Society* Vol. III, 1894, p. 48; and Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, pp. 181-182.

become intimately related both to each other, and to neighbouring branches of Te Waiohua, including the people who would become known in due course as Te Akitai.

4.4 Te Patumāhoe

Te Ranga-a-rua was a toa rangatira (leading warrior) of Ngāti Tamaoho who lived perhaps in the early-to-mid 1700s. He was also a descendant of the Lower Waikato branches of Ngā Iwi, and the closely related Ngā Riki division of Te Uri o Pou from the Hūnua-Papakura districts. Te Ranga-a-rua married Te Natu; a daughter of the eponymous Ngāti Te Ata ancestress Te Ata-i-rehia of Te Waiohua, and of Te Ata's infamous husband Tapaue from Ngāti Mahuta of Waikato. Te Ranga-a-rua's younger sister Huiawarua in turn married Te Natu's nephew Te Horetā, whilst Te Ranga and Huiawarua's brother Te Roro became the eponymous ancestor of Te Uri Roro hapū of Ngāti Tamaoho. Several other important marriages between these two chiefly families of Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata took place during this period and over the generations to follow, thereby cementing the whakapapa connections between the two iwi.¹⁶⁵

Te Ranga-a-rua and his son Te Hikarereroa consolidated the mana of Ngāti Tamaoho over the Patumāhoe area in particular, during conflicts with Huritini of Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua. An account of the battle, and the origin of the name Patumāhoe, was told to James Cowan by Tohikurī-o-Waikato. A descendant of Te Ranga-a-rua, Tohikurī lived at Pukekohe, and was a leading rangatira and tohunga (cultural expert) of Ngāti Tamaoho during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The chief Huritini, of the Ngaiwi or Waiohua Tribe, of the Tamaki district, came to these parts to make war upon Hiku-rere-roa and Te Ranga-rua, the leaders of the Ngati-Tamaoho Tribe, six generations ago. The *pa* of Ngati-

¹⁶⁵ The whakapapa connections between the descendants of Te Ranga-a-rua and Te Ata-i-rehia are partly delineated in a table appended to Chief Judge F. D. Fenton's Ōrākei Interlocutory Judgment, December 1869, contained in *Important Judgments: Delivered in the Compensation Court and Native Land Court. 1866-1879*, p. 96. However, there are several errors apparent in Fenton's interpretation of the evidence before him in the Ōrākei case, seemingly due to confusion over the endogamous nature of the relationships described. The whakapapa should therefore be carefully crosschecked against the evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Hōri Tauroa and Pāora Tūhaere from whence it is drawn, contained in Ōrākei Minute Books 1 & 2. Related whakapapa evidence given by Pāora Te Iwi, Hawira Maki and several other important tūpuna of the study area is also contained in the Compensation Court's minutes from claims on the Pokeno Reserve, 1865. See also Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, p. 475. Kelly's spelling 'Ranga-a-rua' has been favoured over Fenton's 'Rangaarua' and Cowan's 'Ranga-rua'.

Tamaoho was on the Titi Hill. The battle began on the western side of the present Mauku Railway-station, near the church. Huritini was killed with a blow delivered with a *mahoe* stake or part of a sapling snatched up hurriedly from the ground by a Ngati-Tamaoho chief who had dropped his weapon; and the Ngaiwi men were defeated and driven from the district. Hence the name: *Patu*, to strike or kill; *mahoe*, the whitewood tree (*Melicytus ramiflorus*).¹⁶⁶

Te Ranga-a-rua was also identified as an important ancestor of Compensation Court claimants to the confiscated Patumāhoe and Pokeno Reserve blocks in 1865, from whom members of Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata, Te Akitai and Ngāti Whātua could all claim descent.¹⁶⁷ Conversely, Huritini was also a focal ancestor for Te Akitai and Ngāti Tai/Te Uri o Te Ao claimants on the Karaka Reserve northeast of Patumāhoe, near the Whangamaire Stream on the southern Manukau Harbour.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Cowan, James, *The New Zealand Wars: A History of the Maori Campaigns and the Pioneering Period: Volume I (1845-64)*, 1955, p. 306.

¹⁶⁷ See Evidence of Riria Ratauhinga and ‘Paora Te Haere’ (*sic*) in “Compensations Courts: The Patumahoe Reserve” in *Daily Southern Cross*, 18 May 1865, p. 4; and whakapapa evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Pokeno Block, 25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, p. 24.

¹⁶⁸ Evidence of Te Hapimana Taiāwhio, “Native Lands Court: Karaka, Manukau”, *Daily Southern Cross*, 27 November 1866, p. 5.

5. Brief accounts of South Manukau Hapū & Iwi

5.1 Ngāti Te Ata

5.1.1 Marae

The principal marae for Ngāti Te Ata of the South Manukau area is Tahuna Pā in Waiuku. Ngāti Te Ata, Te Akitai and related hapū of Te Waiohua and Waikato are among the mana whenua of Reretēwhioi Marae, also in Waiuku, although this is principally a local community marae for Taurahere (persons of other hapū and iwi living outside of their customary rohe, or so-called ‘pan-tribal urban Māori’). Manurewa Marae (Matukutūreia) is also a marae of Ngāti Te Ata and Te Akitai of Te Waiohua, which doubles as a marae for Manurewa’s Taurahere community.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Tahuna Pā	Te Waiohua Ngāti Te Ata	<u>Physical</u> : Tahuna Pā Rd, Waiuku <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 128, Waiuku <u>Phone</u> : (09) 235 7513
Reretēwhioi	Ngāti Te Ata Te Akitai Ngāti Pare Te Waiohua Waikato Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : Tahurangatira Road, Waiuku <u>Postal</u> : 10 Shanley Crescent, Waiuku <u>Phone</u> : (09) 235 8605
Manurewa Marae	Te Akitai Ngāti Te Ata Te Waiohua Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : 81 Finlayson Ave, Manurewa, Auckland <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 88-161, Clendon, Manurewa <u>Phone</u> : (09) 267 8768

5.1.2 Traditions

Ngāti Te Ata descend from Hua-o-Kaiwaka and his second wife, Te Rauwhakiwhaki of Ngā Iwi and Ngāti Taihaua (Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki). Their daughter was Huatau, who married Kauwahi of Ngāti Huiiau hapū of Ngā Iwi.¹⁶⁹ Their daughter Te Ata-i-rehia was the eponymous ancestress of Ngāti Te Ata. She and her brothers were born in the

¹⁶⁹ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 200.

vicinity of Ngā Matukurua (Wiri and McLaughlin Mountains) of Manurewa, perhaps around the early eighteenth century, but the principal home of Ngāti Te Ata was Te Pae-o-Kaiwaka; site of the main waka portage between the Waiuku Inlet to the Manukau Harbour, and the Awaroa tributary of the Lower Waikato River.¹⁷⁰ Te Ata-i-rehia married Tapaue, a Waikato chief from Ngāti Mahuta, who at that time resided at Taupiri. Some years after the death of Tapaue at the hands of his and Te Ata-i-rehia's own relatives, Ngāti Te Ata led by their son Pāpaka avenged the killing, thereby strengthening Ngāti Te Ata's influential presence in the Waiuku district.¹⁷¹ Ngāti Te Ata in turn grew to extend their influence from their home at Waiuku across the Awhitu Peninsula to the west and Pokeno to the east.

Leading nineteenth century chiefs of Ngāti Te Ata, such as Katipa Te Awarahi and his nephew Hōri Tauroa, traced their descent from Pāpaka. Pāpaka's daughter Te Ata (not to be confused with her grandmother Te Ata-i-rehia) married Tangataiki of Ngāti Pāoa, and in due course they became the grandparents of Katipa, and Hōri Tauroa's mother Uruhutia.¹⁷² Katipa and his younger half-brother Te Waka Kaihau also traced their descent from Kahukoka, eponymous ancestress of the Ngāti Kahukoka hapū. Kahukoka herself descended from the Ngāti Hinewai hapū of Ngāriki/Ngā Iwi, and married Pāpaka's brother Te Niho.¹⁷³ Kaihau's son, Aihepene Waka Kaihau, became a prominent representative of the tribe during the mid-late nineteenth century, while Aihepene's sister Māta Kaihau was married twice to men of Ngāti Whātua; first to Te Reweti Tāmaki, an elder brother of Pāora Tūhaere, and later to Te Reweti and Tūhaere's cousin Te Hira, son of Āpihai Te Kawau. Te Hira Te Kawau of Te Taou

¹⁷⁰ See Graham, George "Nga Matuku Rua, the Two Bitterns, a Tale of Manurewa", 1937, MS 120/M44, Auckland Institute & Museum; and Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995, p. 286.

¹⁷¹ See Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, pp. 243-248, and Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995, pp. 280-297.

¹⁷² Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 37-38. Hōri Tauroa identifies Uruhutia as "my mother. She married Wi Te Wheau. I am their son." Fenton records Hōri Tauroa's parents as "Uruhutia (m)" and "Rangipewheau" (*sic*).

¹⁷³ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Pokeno Block, 25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, p. 24. See also Fenton's Ōrākei Interlocutory Judgment, December 1869, contained in *Important Judgments: Delivered in the Compensation Court and Native Land Court. 1866-1879*, 1879, p. 96. Both Pāora Te Iwi and Hōri Tauroa (Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 38) identify Te Niho as a son of Te Ata-i-rehia and Tapaue, although Fenton and most subsequent sources do not make the connection.

lived for a number of years at Waiuku with the Ngāti Te Ata people of Māta and Aihepene Kaihau, until Māta's death c.1868, when Te Hira returned to Ōrākei.¹⁷⁴

Close relatives of Katipa Te Awarahi and Te Waka Kaihau, including Poharama, his sister Puaki Te Hau, and their cousin Kopakopa were grandchildren of Ngāhuirangi, a younger sister of Te Ata (II) of Ngāti Te Ata, and Ngāhuirangi's husband Hikarereroa of Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata. The descendants of Ngāhuirangi and Hikarereroa in turn established important kinship relationships to Te Akitai.¹⁷⁵ Poharama and his family had originally been among the principal owners of the confiscated Patumāhoe Reserve.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ Evidence of Pāora Tūhaere, Ōrākei Rehearing, 3 November 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 2, p. 95.

¹⁷⁵ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Pokeno Block, 25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, p. 24.

¹⁷⁶ See "Compensations Courts: The Patumahoe Reserve" in *Daily Southern Cross*, 18 May 1865, p. 4, and "Compensations Court: Patumahoe Reserve", *Daily Southern Cross*, 19 May 1865, p. 5.

5.2 Ngāti Tamaoho

5.2.1 Marae

Whānau and hapū of Ngāti Tamaoho are based between three principal marae in the South Manukau/Lower Waikato districts. These are Mangatangi Marae near Maramarua to the southeast of Pokeno; Ngā Hau e Whā between Pukekohe and Tuakau; and in Whātāpaka Marae to the west of Karaka, Franklin. At Whātāpaka, several households of Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki and the related hapū of Te Koheriki (Ngāriki/Ngāti Pou) make up the hau kāinga/mana whenua. Ngā Hau e Whā, whilst principally administered under mana whenua of Ngāti Tamaoho, also performs a range of wider community and Taurahere services for Pukekohe.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Mangatangi Marae	Ngāti Tamaoho	<u>Physical</u> : 199 Mangatangi Valley, Mangatangi <u>Postal</u> : Main Road, Mangatangi, RD1 Pokeno <u>Phone</u> : (09) 232 7732
Ngā Hau e Whā	Ngāti Tamaoho Taurahere	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 88 Beatty Road, Pukekohe <u>Phone</u> : (09) 238 8808
Whātāpaka Marae	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Te Koheriki	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Whātāpaka Rd, Franklin <u>Phone</u> : (09) 292 7824

5.2.2 Traditions

Tamaoho was a widely travelled chief originating from Ngāi Te Rangi of the Bay of Plenty, and one of several important ancestors descended from *Mataatua* waka to migrate into the Waikato and Tāmaki districts over the course of the seventeenth century.¹⁷⁷ Tamaoho and his relative Rakapare initially settled at Marokopa, to the south of Kāwhia, where they built Heipipi pā. However, conflicts arose with another

¹⁷⁷ See: Robertson, J. B. W., Robertson, J. B. W. "Maori Settlement of the Waikato District", Te Awamutu Historical Society Inc., Bulletin No. 2 (Revised), 1983, p. 14.

local chief, Tūpāhau, and in the ensuing battles Rakapare was killed and Tamaoho was forced northward.¹⁷⁸ His descendants, Ngāti Tamaoho, ultimately became established on lands extending from Mangatangi, Mangatāwhiri and Maramarua to the east, and between the lower Waikato River, Manukau Harbour and Awhitu Peninsula to the west.

Wetere Te Kauae was a leading rangatira of Te Maungaunga hapū of Ngāti Tamaoho, and a first cousin to Āpihai Te Kawau of Ngāti Whātua. He was a grandson of Te Horetā of Ngāti Te Ata by the latter's first wife, Huiawarua of Ngāti Tamaoho. Describing Te Kauae's relationship to Ngāti Tamaoho and Te Maungaunga, Pāora Te Iwi said, "He was the chief of both tribes, they were one people".¹⁷⁹ Wetere's own children having died young, on the death of his elder brother Te Tuhi, then the principal chief of their hapū, Te Kauae took Te Tuhi's son Te Rangiataahua as his tamaiti whāngai (foster child). Te Rangiataahua took the baptismal name of Epiha Putini (Jabez Bunting), and was in his turn the principal chief of Ngāti Tamaoho under his matua (uncle, parent) Wetere's counsel.¹⁸⁰

Pāora Te Iwi belonged principally to Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata. He was probably born near the end of the eighteenth century, and during the 1860s-1870s was among the most elderly of Tāmaki chiefs to give evidence before the Compensation Courts and Native Land Courts concerning the whakapapa, histories and traditions of Ngā Iwi, Ngā Riki, Te Waiohua, Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho. Through his mother Te Kahunuiwi (or 'Kahu-uhiuhi'), he was the grandson of Te Roro, eponymous Ngāti Tamaoho ancestor of Te Uri Roro ('Te Uriroro') hapū. Through his father Te Tonga (of Te Uri-o-Tapa hapū of Ngāti Tamaoho), Te Iwi was the grandson of Te Roro's elder brother Te Ranga-a-rua, and the latter's Ngāti Te Ata wife, Te Natu.¹⁸¹ He was therefore a first cousin to Āpihai Te Kawau's mother, Mokorua, although apparently closer in age to Āpihai than to Mokorua. His whakapapa connected him more strongly to Ngāti Tamaoho than Ngāti Te Ata; however,

¹⁷⁸ Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995, pp. 154-161.

¹⁷⁹ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 32.

¹⁸⁰ "Epiha Putini Te Rangiata Ahua" (Obit.), *Daily Southern Cross*, 11 April 1856, p. 3. See also Pāora Te Iwi, Pokeno Block, 25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, pp. 24-25.

¹⁸¹ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 200-201. Note that Fenton's Ōrākei Judgment sets out Pāora Te Iwi's whakapapa differently from that stated in the case by Te Iwi himself.

according to Āpihai Te Kawau's nephew, Pāora Tūhaere, Pāora Te Iwi had joined with Ngāti Te Ata "at the commencement of the fighting" at Taurangaruru, "and has remained ever since".¹⁸² Nonetheless, by the late 1860s Pāora Te Iwi still described Ngāti Tamaoho as "my tribe".¹⁸³

¹⁸² Evidence of Pāora Tūhaere, Ōrākei Rehearing, 4 November 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 2, p. 122.

¹⁸³ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 31.

5.3 Te Akitai

5.3.1 Marae

The principal marae for Te Akitai in the Manukau area is Pūkaki Marae, Māngere. Te Akitai and the related hapū Ngāti Pare (section 5.4.3) are also represented alongside Te Ahiwaru at nearby Makaurau Marae, Ihumatao. Like Ngāti Te Ata, Te Akitai and Ngāti Pare hold mana whenua status at Reretēwhioi, the Taurahere marae for the Waiuku district. Te Akitai together with other Waiohua groups also represent mana whenua at Manurewa Marae for Taurahere living in Manurewa.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Pūkaki Marae	Te Akitai Te Waiohua Ngā Iwi	<u>Physical</u> : 163 Pūkaki Road, Māngere, Manukau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 59-185 Māngere Bridge, Manukau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 275 7533
Makaurau	Te Ahiwaru Te Akitai Ngāti Pare	<u>Physical</u> : 8 Rauti Road, Ihumatao, Māngere, Manukau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 107-078, Airport Oaks, Māngere, Manukau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 255 5450
Manurewa Marae	Te Akitai Ngāti Te Ata Te Waiohua Waikato Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : 81 Finlayson Ave, Manurewa, Auckland <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 88-161, Clendon, Manurewa <u>Phone</u> : (09) 267 8768
Reretēwhioi	Ngāti Te Ata Te Akitai Ngāti Pare Waikato Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : Tahurangi Road, Waiuku <u>Postal</u> : 10 Shanley Crescent, Waiuku <u>Phone</u> : (09) 235 8605

5.3.2 Traditions

Te Akitai are the descendants and living representatives of Kiwi Tāmaki and his whānau, and thus also trace their origins to Te Waiohua and related groups. Through his father Te Ikamaupoho, Kiwi Tāmaki was the famous grandson of Hua-o-Kaiwaka and Hua's third wife, Te Rangihuamoā of Ngā Iwi and Te Kawerau. Through his mother Te Tahuri (I), Kiwi descended from Ngāi Tai, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, Ngāti

Mahuta, Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa. Once the most powerful chief of Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua on the central Tāmaki Isthmus, Kiwi Tāmaki was killed during the war with Ngāti Whātua from Kaipara. Over the course of the late 18th and early 19th Centuries his children and grandchildren became resettled on lands extending between the Tāmaki River, Ōtāhuhu, the Manukau Harbour, Papakura, Pukekohe and Pokeno. Becoming known as Te Akitai, and sometimes Te Aua, here they revitalised ancient ties to Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho to their west, Ngāi Tai and Te Uri o Pou to the east, and Te Taoū of Ngāti Whātua in the north.

Through his father Rangimatoru, Te Tihi (baptised Pēpene after the CMS Missionary W. T. Fairburn) was a grandson of Kiwi Tāmaki and leading chief of Te Akitai, whilst through his mother Moenoho he was also connected to Ngāti Tai, Ngāti Hinewai (hapū of Ngārīki/Ngā Iwi), Ngāti Tamaterā “and many other tribes”.¹⁸⁴ According to Pāora Te Iwi, Pēpene also belonged to Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Pare.¹⁸⁵ Pēpene Te Tihi married Puaki Te Hau (alias Hera) of Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho. They were the parents of Takaanini Te Tihi, alias Īhaka (Isaac) Takaanini. Hera Puaki Te Hau’s cousin Kopakopa also married a chief of Te Akitai, namely Te Haupātahi, and they were the parents of Te Ahi a Te Ngū, alias Mohi (Moses).¹⁸⁶ Like most prominent chiefs of Te Akitai, Mohi was also said to belong to Ngāti Taihaua.¹⁸⁷ Thus Īhaka Takaanini Te Tihi and Mohi Te Ahi a Te Ngū were counted among the leading rangatira of not only Te Akitai, but also of Ngāi Tai, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata and all of Te Waiohua during the mid-nineteenth century.

Pēpene Te Tihi’s younger brother, Mere, married Muranga of Te Uri o Te Ao-Tāwhirangi, another hapū of Ngāti Taihaua and Te Waiohua, often known by the shortened name Te Uri o Te Ao.¹⁸⁸ Mere and Muranga’s children, Hunia Te Nawe, Hēmi Te Uringohi and their sister Riria Te Ratauhinga were among the leaders of the

¹⁸⁴ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 193; Katikati (alias Tanumeha Te Moananui), 29 January 1844, to ‘*Te Karere Maori o Nui Tireni*’, Vol.3, No. 2, 1 Feb 1844, p. 11.

¹⁸⁵ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 192.

¹⁸⁶ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Pokeno Block, 25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, p. 24.

¹⁸⁷ Evidence of Te Keene Tangaroa, Pukekohe Block, “Native Compensation Court” in *Daily Southern Cross*, 25 April 1865, p. 5.

¹⁸⁸ The traditional Māori meaning of ‘Mere’ should not be confused in this instance with the later transliterated form of ‘Mary’.

Uri o Te Ao hapū during the mid-nineteenth century. Riria in turn married her cousin Īhaka Takaanini, thereby reinforcing Te Uri o Te Ao/Ngāti Tai links to Te Akitai. They were thus connected with Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei, through Toukararai (‘Tokarorae’) the mother of Tuperiri hailing from Te Uri o Te Ao, and through Hakopa Te Paerimu of Te Uringutu having also married two women of Te Uri o Te Ao descent, Tītoki and Kahupare.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁹ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Tuhimata Block, 17 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 1, p. 2 & appendix (c); Hunia Te Nawe, Te Karu, Eruera Te Paerimu, Nutana Taratu and Riria Takaanini (née Te Ratauhinga), Te Kirikiri Block, 16-17 February 1866, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 5, pp. 5-12; and Eruera Te Paerimu, Ōrākei Rehearing, 7 October 1868, Ōrākei MB 2, pp. 199-201.

5.4 Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki (Ngāti Tai)

5.4.1 Marae

The principal marae for Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki is Umupuia, of Maraetai, near Clevedon. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki are also represented among the whānau and hapū of Whātāpaka Marae (Karaka, Franklin), alongside Ngāti Tamaoho and Te Koheriki. Smaller papa kāinga (not listed below) fulfilling Marae functions at a whānau/hapū level in the Mātaitai/Wairoa (Clevedon) district include Ngāti Kōhua Marae, Te Tokotoru Tapu Mātaitai Church and Te Wairoa Marae. Several Taurahere community marae within the Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki rohe, including Ruapōtaka (Maungarei, Glenn Innes), Ngāti Ōtara Marae and Papakura Marae, are administered by mana whenua of Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki and related whānau/hapū of Te Waiohua and Tainui.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Umupuia Marae	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 163 Maraetai Coast Rd, Maraetai, Clevedon <u>Phone</u> : (09) 296 6504
Whātāpaka Marae	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Te Koheriki	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Whātāpaka Rd, Franklin <u>Phone</u> : (09) 292 7824
Papakura Marae	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Tainui Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : 29 Hūnua Road, Papakura <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 72-322 Papakura <u>Phone</u> : (09) 298 3877
Ngāti Ōtara Marae	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Tainui Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : Cnr. Gilbert Road and Ōtara Road, Ōtara <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 61-121, Ōtara <u>Phone</u> : (09) 274 9064
Ruapōtaka Marae	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Te Waiohua Tainui Taurahere	<u>Physical</u> : 106 Line Road, Glen Innes <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 18-347, Glen Innes <u>Phone</u> : (09) 570 5340

5.4.2 Ngāti Taihaua Traditions

Originally known as Ngāti Taihaua or Ngāti Tai, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki trace descent from Taihaua, whose father Tiki-te-auwhatu (often called Te Kete-ana-taua) arrived in the Tāmaki district on the waka *Tainui*, and married Hinematapāua of the earlier

tāngata whenua. The name of *Ngāi Tai* originates from equally ancient ancestors from the Eastern Bay of Plenty, a branch of whom later migrated from Tōrere and settled among their Ngāti Tai and Te Waiohua relatives. As such, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki lay claim to being the oldest extant iwi identity in Tāmaki Makaurau. On the lands between the Manukau Harbour and Lower Waikato River, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki were historically represented during the nineteenth century by the hapū names of Ngāti Taihaua, Te Uri o Te Ao and Ngāti Pare.

While the heartlands of Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki lie predominantly to the east and north of the present study area, members of these three hapū shared ancestral interests alongside Te Akitai and others in the district between Te Kirikiri and Te Aho o Te Rangi (Papakura), Te Karaka and Whātāpaka on the shores of the Manukau Harbour east of the Waiuku Inlet, extending southward from Papakura across the Pukekohe district to Te Awanui o Taikehu and Tirikōhua, just north of Tuakau. Ngāti Tai, Ngāti Pare and Te Uri o Te Ao participated in the events surrounding the Taurangaruru conflicts and the transactions affecting the Whakaupoko, Waiuku, Pukekohe and adjoining land blocks, and in the creation of Native Reserves at Te Kirikiri, Te Aho o Te Rangi and Te Awanui o Taikehu.

According to Hetaraka Takapuna of Ngāti Tai and Te Waiohua, Hua-o-Kaiwaka himself was a descendant of Taihaua through his grandmother Kaiāhua of Ngāti Tai and Ngā Iwi, who married Te Whatutūroto of Te Uri o Pou.¹⁹⁰ Thus all of Te Waiohua, including Ngāti Pou (Te Uri o Pou), Ngāti Te Ata, Te Akitai and Ngāti Tamaoho, are also of Ngāti Tai descent.¹⁹¹ Kiwi Tāmaki's mother Te Tahuri was also descended from Ngāi Tai of Tōrere and his Te Akitai descendants were so closely interrelated with Ngāti Taihaua that the latter were often referred to as hapū of Te Akitai.¹⁹² Te Retimana Te Mania of Ngāti Pou, Ngāti Tamaoho and Te Akitai

¹⁹⁰ Evidence of Hetaraka Takapuna, Ōrākei Title Investigation, Judge Monro Minute Book, Auckland Institute & Museum, MS 366, p. 135; and Ōrākei Rehearing, 27 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 103. Sources vary as to whether Hua-o-Kaiwaka was the son or grandson of Te Whatutūroto and Kaiāhua – some saying that Hua-o-Kaiwaka's father was Hua (son of Whatutūroto), others indicating that they were the same man.

¹⁹¹ See also Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, pp. 181-182.

¹⁹² For instance, refer to the evidence of Te Keene Tangaroa, Pukekohe Block, "Native Compensation Court" in *Daily Southern Cross*, 25 April 1865, p. 5.

considered Ngāti Taihaua to be the “former name” of Te Akitai.¹⁹³ In 1868, Pāora Te Iwi said that Ngāti Taihaua “were recently killed in war by the pakeha, they were a part of Akitai”.¹⁹⁴

5.4.3 Ngāti Pare Traditions

Ngāti Pare have been variously described as a hapū of Ngāti Pāoa, Te Akitai, Ngā Iwi, Te Waiohua and Waikato. Formerly known as Ngāti Parekākā, Ngāti Pare (also called Ngāti Pari) are the descendants of Parekākaho, the daughter of the Waiohua/Ngā Iwi chief Mahitokatoka, and her husband Karoro of Ngāti Tai. Karoro and Parekākaho were also antecedents of Te Patukirikiri and Te Patutātahi, two closely related hapū of the Hauraki region with strong ties to Marutūahu and Ngāti Huarere. As descendants of Ngāti Tai and Te Waiohua, in the South Auckland/Manukau and Lower Waikato regions Ngāti Pare remained closely connected with Te Akitai in particular. On the central Tāmaki Isthmus close ties were also developed with Ngāti Hura hapū of Ngāti Pāoa during the early nineteenth century, when Hinerapu of Ngāti Pare married Te Toki, son of the eponymous hapū ancestor Te Hura.¹⁹⁵ Within the Patumāhoe/Mauku study area, Ngāti Pare were represented in the Waiuku and Whakaupoko transactions, and subsequent Te Akitai/Ngāti Pare Compensation Court claims to Pukekohe, following the Government confiscations.

5.4.4 Te Uri o Te Ao Traditions

Te Uri o Te Ao descend from the Ngāti Taihaua and Ngāti Tai Horokōwhatu branches of Ngāti Tai, and Te Waiohua. The Wairoa Valley/Maraetai branches of the hapū were predominantly the descendants of Tāmaki Te Ao and his son Te Whataatao,

¹⁹³ Evidence of Retimana Te Mania, Ihumatao investigation, 20 April 1866, Waikato Confiscations, Box 1, Folder 7 (LINZ, Hamilton), p. 2 of the Ihumatao evidence. Ngāti Taihaua is recorded in the Court minutes as ‘Ngatitaiaua’.

¹⁹⁴ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 30 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 196-197.

¹⁹⁵ See Evidence of Hetaraka Takapuna, Ōrākei Title Investigation, 29 November 1866, Judge Monro MB 1, p. 36; and evidence of Hetaraka Takapuna, Ōrākei Rehearing, 27 October 1868, Ōrākei MB 1, pp. 102-109.

chiefs of Ngāti Tai and Te Waiohua.¹⁹⁶ According to Heta Te Tihi of Te Akitai and Ngāti Taihaua, Hōri Te Whētuki and Honetana Te Irirangi (leading rangatira of the Wairoa branch of Ngāti Tai/Te Uri o Te Ao) received a share of proceeds when the Pukekohe lands were sold. Heta said that the purchase took place in the time of the first Governor, and was made by Messrs Ligar and Meurant.¹⁹⁷ At this time the Kirikiri and nearby Te Aho o Te Rangī reserves were created at Papakura, and Heta Te Tihi, Te Hapimana Taiāwhio, Hōri Te Whētuki “and others have lived on the land since that time”. Te Tihi recognised the claim of Hunia Te Nawe (Te Uri o Te Ao) to the reserved land at Papakura because “he, Hori Whetuki and Te Watane [*sic*: Watene Te Makuru, of Ngāi Tai] were of one ancestor”. He said that Īhaka Takaanini “got the land through Hori Te Whetuki and those I have named”.¹⁹⁸

Those families of Te Uri o Te Ao based in the districts between Kirikiri (Papakura) and Tirikōhua descended from the chief Te Rata and his wife, Te Paki-o-Rehua, and their three children Te Pō, Te Ao-Tāwhirangi, and Rupeka-o-Tau. These whānau also went by the longer hapū name, Te Uri o Te Ao-Tāwhirangi, after Te Rata and Paki-o-Rehua’s daughter. Te Uri o Te Ao hapū of Ngāti Tai/Te Waiohua were also related by marriages with Te Taoū and Te Uringutu hapū of Ngāti Whātua, and with prominent families of mixed Te Akitai, Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho origin. Te Uri o Te Ao in the Compensation Court hearings for the confiscated Kirikiri Block claimed conjointly with their Akitai relatives over the lands extending from Kirikiri to Tirikōhua.¹⁹⁹

Members of Te Akitai, Ngāti Taihaua, Te Uri o Te Ao and Ngāti Pare, including Riria Te Ratauhinga, Te Keene Tangaroa, Heta Te Tihi, Te Hapimana Taiāwhio and Hunia

¹⁹⁶ See evidence of Honetana Te Irirangi, Wātene Te Makuru and Hōri Te Whētuki, Ōtata Title Investigation, 27 November 1866, Auckland Minute Book 1, pp. 16-24; Honetana Te Irirangi in “Native Lands Court: Otata, Motuhoropapa, Oruapuke”, *Daily Southern Cross*, 28 November 1866, p. 5; and Riria Te Whētuki, Maraetai Partition, 12-13 June 1893, Auckland Minute Book 4, pp. 87-95.

¹⁹⁷ According to Te Hapimana Taiāwhio, the first sale of Pukekohe was to Governor FitzRoy. Pukekohe No. 1 Block was sold by Ngāti Te Ata in 1843. Te Akitai’s sale of Pukekohe No. 2, when the Awanui o Taikahu reserve was created, was not until 1853. It remains unclear precisely which transaction in Pukekohe is being referred to, but the Aho-o-te-rangi (Papakura) Reserve was still in Māori ownership when investigated before the Native Land Court in 1867.

¹⁹⁸ Evidence of Heta Te Tihi, Te Aooterangi (*sic*) Succession to Īhaka Takaanini/Title Investigation, 13 March 1867, Auckland Minute Book 1, pp. 45-48. The Aho o Te Rangī Reserve block is also known as ‘Papakura Reserve’, and Fenton’s judgment thereupon established as a precedent the ‘1840 Rule’.

¹⁹⁹ Evidence of Hunia Te Nawe, Te Karu, Eruera Te Paerimu, Nutana Taratu and Riria Takaanini (née Te Ratauhinga), Te Kirikiri Block, 16-17 February 1866, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 5, pp. 5-12.

Te Nawe, jointly claimed compensation for the confiscation of the Pukekohe Reserve (Te Awanui o Taikehu). Riria Te Ratauhinga, Te Keene Tangaroa and others claimed their interests both as members of Te Akitai and the hapū of Ngāti Taihaua and Ngāti Pare, through their common ancestor Te Marangai.²⁰⁰

²⁰⁰ Evidence of Riria Te Ratauhinga, Te Keene Tangaroa, Te Hapimana Taiāwhio, Pukekohe Block, “Native Compensation Court” in *Daily Southern Cross*, 25 April 1865, p. 5.

5.5 Te Uri o Pou (Ngāti Pou)

5.5.1 Marae

Whānau and hapū of Ngāti Pou are distributed across several marae of the Lower Waikato, predominantly in the Tuakau and Onewhero districts, alongside their relatives Ngāti Naho, Ngāti Tipa and connected hapū. The principal marae for Ngāti Pou is Horahora Marae of Onewhero, near Rangiriri. Ngāti Pou are also represented at nearby Maurea Marae; at Te Awamārihi and Ngā Tai e Rua Marae between Tuakau and Onewhero; and at Waikare Marae, Te Kauwhata.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Horahora Marae	Ngāti Pou Ngāti Naho Ngāti Hine	<u>Physical</u> : 172 Horahora Road, RD1, Rangiriri <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 233, Huntly <u>Phone</u> : (07) 828 8765
Maurea Marae	Ngāti Naho Ngāti Pou Ngāti Hine	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 1198 Te Ōhākī Road, Huntly <u>Phone</u> : (07) 826 3175/(07) 826 3341
Ngā Tai e Rua	Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Pou Ngāti Āmaru	<u>Physical</u> : 16 Carr Street, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 217, Tuakau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 236 8106
Te Awamārihi	Ngāti Āmaru Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Pou	<u>Physical</u> : 529 Tuakau Bridge-Port Waikato Road, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : c/- Marae Secretary, 22 George St, Ngāruawāhia
Waikare Marae	Ngāti Naho Ngāti Pou Ngāti Hine Ngāti Taratikitiki	<u>Physical</u> : Waerenga Road, Te Kauwhata <u>Phone</u> : (09) 296 0907

5.5.2 Traditions

Poutūkeka II descended from the Ngā Iwi/Ngā Oho people of Tainui and Te Arawa, from the Lower Waikato, Manukau and western Hauraki districts. About the early sixteenth century, Poutūkeka's principal territories extended between Maketū (Peach Hill, Drury) and Tirikōhua near Tuakau. With the marriage of his eldest son Te Whatutūroto to the Ngāti Tai chieftainess Kaiāhua, the interests of Te Uri o Pou

expanded into the Hūnua, Papakura and Manukau districts. Te Whatutūroto and Kaiāhua's son was Hua, who was the father of Hua-o-Kaiwaka, and their descendants in the central Tāmaki area became known as Te Waiohua. Between Ōrere and Pūkorokoro to the east, and Onewhero and Manukau to the west, they retained the older name of Te Uri o Pou, and were also known later as Ngāti Pou.

As descendants of Hua-o-Kaiwaka, most of the Manukau hapū and iwi were of course descendants of Hua's ancestor Poutūkeka, but also traced a specific relationship to the hapū ancestor Ngāriki, whose descendants were intermarried with Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata and Te Taoū. As such, descent from Ngāriki was at the root of a number of Ngāti Tamaoho/Ngāti Te Ata ancestral claims to the confiscated Pokeno Reserve in 1865. Ngāti Pou represented by Hawira Maki were also claimants in the Pokeno Block, by descent from Ngāriki's brother Te Whatu, and the latter's descendant Noia.²⁰¹

Hawira Maki also claimed rights at Te Kirikiri on behalf of his whānau both through their ancestor Te Ikamaupoho of Te Wai o Hua (father of Kiwi Tāmaki, among others), and through another line of descent from the Ngāriki/Ngāti Pou ancestor Noia. Hawira also claimed the land in part through a deed of gift from the late Aperahama Te Rou – one of the original Te Uri o Te Ao participants in several early Crown and pre-emption waiver transactions in the district, including the Mangapū, Mangaripa and Takapautōtara blocks. Maki also acknowledged the claims of several other hapū affiliated to Te Akitai and Te Uri o Te Ao, including Ngāti Pare and Te Uriika.²⁰²

Members of Ngāti Tai and Te Akitai also acknowledged Hawira Maki and his father Karaka Maki (or Maki Karaka) as holding rights in the Papakura, Pukekohe and Tuakau districts. In addition to Hawira Maki's evidence in the Kirikiri case, during the Native Land Court's 1868 rehearing of the Ōrākei title investigation, Eruera Te Paerimu (Te Uri o Te Ao and Te Uringutu) identified the lands between Papakura and Tirikōhua as being those of Maki of Ngāti Pou.²⁰³ Te Hapimana Taiāwhio, whose

²⁰¹ Evidence of multiple witnesses, Pokeno Block, 22-25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, pp. 1-25.

²⁰² Evidence of Hawira Maki, Kirikiri investigation, 16 February 1866, Waikato Confiscations Box 1, Folder 5 (LINZ, Hamilton), pp. 1-5 of the evidence.

²⁰³ Evidence of Eruera Te Paerimu, Ōrākei rehearing, 7 October 1868, Ōrākei MB 2, p. 218.

links included Te Akitai/Te Aua, Ngāti Pare, Ngāti Taihaua and Ngāti Pou, among others, also considered that the lands southward of Papakura between Te Maketū (Peach Hill) and Tirikōhua were the domains of Maki Karaka of Ngāti Pou.²⁰⁴

Following the confiscation of all of their lands north and east of the Waikato River, however, Ngāti Pou led by Hawira Maki moved south to live among their Ngāti Naho and Ngāti Tipa relatives in the Tuakau, Onewhero and Port Waikato districts.

²⁰⁴ Evidence of Hapimana Taiāwhio, Ōrākei rehearing, 9 October 1868, Ōrākei MB 2, p. 223.

5.6 Ngāti Tipa

5.6.1 Marae

Ngāti Tipa are based around several marae and papa kāinga between the Tuakau, Te Kōhanga, Onewhero and Te Pūaha o Waikato (Port Waikato) districts. The principal marae of Ngāti Tipa is Ngā Tai e Rua, Tuakau, whilst they are also represented at Te Awamārihi, Tauranganui, Pakau and Tikirahi alongside closely related hapū including Ngāti Pou, Ngāti Reko, Ngāti Kaiāua, Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Kārewa and Ngāti Āmaru.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Ngā Tai e Rua	Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Pou Ngāti Āmaru	<u>Physical</u> : 16 Carr Street, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 217, Tuakau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 236 8106
Te Awamārihi	Ngāti Āmaru Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Pou	<u>Physical</u> : 529 Tuakau Bridge-Port Waikato Road, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : c/- Marae Secretary, 22 George St, Ngāruawāhia
Tauranganui	Ngāti Āmaru Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Kaiāua	<u>Physical</u> : 1334 Tuakau Bridge Road, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : RD2 Te Kōhanga, Pukekohe <u>Phone</u> : (09) 232 9662
Pakau Marae	Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Reko Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical</u> : 1648 Port Waikato Road, RD1, Tuakau
Te Kotahitanga	Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa Ngāti Tipa	<u>Physical</u> : 94 Muir Road, Te Kōhanga, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 147, Tuakau
Tikirahi	Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical</u> : RD3 Te Kōhanga Main Road, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : 68 Jellicoe Avenue, Tuakau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 296 0268

5.6.2 Traditions

Tipa was the son of Pāoa, eponymous ancestor of Ngāti Pāoa. While Tipa himself lived and died in the Wharekawa/Whakatīwai districts of the Western Hauraki Gulf, his children and descendants remained closely attached to the Lower Waikato

relatives of their ancestor Pāoa. Along with Te Ata-i-rehia, Tipa's daughters Te Kura and Te Naho were among the four wives of Tapaue of Ngāti Mahuta. The descendants of Te Kura and Tapaue retained the name of Ngāti Tipa, whilst Te Naho became the eponymous ancestress of Ngāti Naho. Following Tapaue's death, both Te Naho and her younger sister Kopa married Te Putu and Porokitua, respectively, sons of Tapaue by an elder wife, Te Rauwhārangī. Ngāti Tipa occupied lands on both sides of the Lower Waikato, based principally between Taupiri, Te Awaroa and Tuakau. Although closely related to Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Pou, during the Taurangaruru conflicts Ngāti Tipa under the chief Te Waata Kukutai were aligned with Ngāti Tamaoho, Te Akitai and Ngāti Whātua in their opposition to Katipa Te Awarahi's alienation of shared ancestral land interests.

Te Keene Tangaroa of Te Akitai, Ngāti Whātua, Te Kawerau and Ngāti Taihaua said that Kukutai, along with Pohipohi and several members of Ngāti Hauā, had participated in the sale of Pukekohe lands, receiving part of the proceeds, and that it was Pohipohi and Kukutai who suggested the creation of the Pukekohe (Awanui o Taikehu) Reserve, because ancestors from Te Akitai were buried on that piece.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁵ Evidence of Te Keene Tangaroa, Pukekohe Block, "Native Compensation Court" in *Daily Southern Cross*, 25 April 1865, p. 5.

5.7 Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei

5.7.1 Marae

There are numerous hapū and marae of Ngāti Whātua extending between Kaihū (Northern Wairoa) and Whangarei to the north, in the Kaipara district including Reweti (formerly Ongarahu) south of Helensville, and Tāmaki in the south. However, in the Tāmaki Makaurau district, Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei, including the constituent hapū of Te Taoū, Ngāoho and Te Uringutu are based at Ōrākei Marae.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Ōrākei Marae	Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei Te Taoū Ngāoho Te Uringutu	<u>Physical</u> : Kitemoana Street, Ōrākei, Auckland <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 42-203, Ōrākei, Auckland <u>Phone</u> : (09) 521 4291

5.7.2 Traditions

Te Taoū arose as a hapū of Ngāti Whātua during conflicts between Te Uri o Hau and Ngā Ririki of the Kaipara districts. The ancestress Toutara was killed when a spear (Tao) pierced her breast (ū), hence the name.²⁰⁶ During the mid-late 18th Century, a branch of Te Taoū led by the half-brothers Tuperiri, Waitāheke and their father’s cousin, Wahaakiaki, fought against Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua, killing the chief Kiwi Tāmaki and taking possession of certain Tāmaki and Manukau lands. Tuperiri was related to the tāngata whenua through his mother Toukararai (or ‘Tokarorae’) of Te Uri o Te Ao-Tāwhirangi hapū of Ngāti Tai and Te Waiohua.²⁰⁷ As Otene Pāora of Ngāti Whātua said in 1912:

Now I should like to deal with the question of the hapu named Te Urioteaotawhirangi. It was through this hapu that Toukararai and other

²⁰⁶ Pāora Tūhaere, “An historical narrative concerning the conquest of Kaipara and Tamaki by Ngati-whātua” (translated by George Graham), *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 32, 1923, p. 230.

²⁰⁷ Evidence of Eruera Te Paerimu, Ōrākei Rehearing, 7 October 1868, Ōrākei MB 2, pp. 199-201.

ancestors obtained their right to this land [i.e. Auckland] – through this hapu-name.²⁰⁸

Otene Pāora then went on to give detailed whakapapa evidence explaining how not only Tuperiri's descendants, but those of Uruamo, Hakopa Te Paerimu and other chiefs of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei also descended from Te Uri o Te Ao-Tāwhirangi.²⁰⁹

Tuperiri's sons Tarahawaiki and Tomoauere in turn married women of Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho, securing the whakapapa between Te Taoū and the earlier Ngā Oho, Ngā Iwi and Te Waiohua peoples of the Manukau and Lower Waikato districts. Te Awarua and Āpihai Te Kawau became the leading rangatira of Te Taoū and Ngāoho of the Tāmaki and Manukau districts throughout the early-mid nineteenth century, and in turn banded together with a hapū of Ngā Iwi, Te Uri o Pou and Te Waiohua from the Papakura, Manukau and Māngere districts known as Te Uringutu, led by Hakopa Te Paerimu, collectively forging a new iwi identity known as Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei.

These intermarriages continued over several generations. As noted earlier, Māta Kaihau, daughter of the Ngāti Te Ata/Ngāti Tamaoho chief Te Waka Kaihau, was twice married to men from Ngāti Whātua – first to Āpiha Te Kawau's nephew Te Reweti Tāmaki, and subsequent to Te Reweti's death, to Āpihai's son Te Hira.²¹⁰ Te Reweti's younger brother Pāora Tūhaere also married Paramena Ngānihi, a sister of Arama Karaka Te Matuku of Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Whātua.²¹¹

Hōri Tauroa said that Te Taoū, Ngāti Whatua, Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāoho were “one people and took up the land [Tāmaki] together”, going on to say that Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Whātua claimed lands at Awhitu and Waiuku through the same ancestor. Pāora Tūhaere, Āpihai Te Kawau and others had received proceeds from sales in the district, Tauroa said, because of their descent from Mokorua of Ngāti

²⁰⁸ Evidence of Otene Pāora, 11 September 1912, Native Affairs Committee: “Report on Petition of Otene Paora and thirteen others”, AJHR, 1912, I-3A, pp. 5-6.

²⁰⁹ Evidence of Otene Pāora, 11 September 1912, Native Affairs Committee: “Report on Petition of Otene Paora and thirteen others”, AJHR, 1912, I-3A, p. 6. In common with Pāora Tūhaere, Otene Pāora skips the generation of Te Ao-Tāwhirangi herself, as given by various other members of Te Uri o Te Ao in the Ōrākei and Te Kirikiri evidence.

²¹⁰ Evidence of Pāora Tūhaere, Ōrākei Rehearing, 3 November 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 2, p. 95.

²¹¹ Chief Judge F. D. Fenton's Ōrākei Interlocutory Judgment, December 1869, contained in *Important Judgments: Delivered in the Compensation Court and Native Land Court. 1866-1879*, p. 96.

Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho.²¹² Pāora Te Iwi made similar statements, saying that Ngāti Te Ata gave Te Hira Te Kawau, Pāora Tūhaere and others of Ngāti Whātua a share of proceeds from lands sold at Pehiakura, and compensation money for lands confiscated in the Waiuku district, because Pāora Tūhaere descended from their ancestors.²¹³

Thus Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei interests in the study area derive from their close relationships to Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāoho, Te Uringutu and Te Uri o Te Ao-Tāwhirangi.

²¹² Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 42-44.

²¹³ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 28-29.

5.8 Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa

5.8.1 Marae

Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa are based between marae from Te Pūaha o Waikato and Waikāretū to Tuakau. The principal marae of Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa are Ōraeroa (Port Waikato), Weraroa and Pukerewa (Waikāretū), and Te Ākau (Aotea Harbour). Ngāti Tahinga/Ngāti Kārewa are also represented at Pakau Marae, Te Kotahitanga and Tikirahi (Te Tiki o Rahi) in the Te Kōhanga/Tuakau region, alongside Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Reko, Ngāti Āmaru and related whānau/hapū.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Ōraeroa	Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Stack Road, Port Waikato, RD5 Tuakau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 232 9800
Weraroa	Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Kokanga East Road, Waikāretū, RD5 Tuakau
Pukerewa	Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 470 Pukerewa Road, Waikāretū Road, RD5 Tuakau
Te Ākau Marae	Ngāti Tahinga	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 577 Te Ākau Road, Te Ākau, Aotea South
Pakau Marae	Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Reko Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical</u> : 1648 Port Waikato Road, RD1, Tuakau
Te Kotahitanga	Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa Ngāti Tipa	<u>Physical</u> : 94 Muir Road, Te Kōhanga, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 147, Tuakau
Tikirahi	Ngāti Tipa Ngāti Tahinga Ngāti Kārewa	<u>Physical</u> : RD3 Te Kōhanga Main Road, Tuakau <u>Postal</u> : 68 Jellicoe Avenue, Tuakau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 296 0268

5.8.2 Traditions

Ngāti Tahinga appear to originate from an ancient branch of Ngā Oho and Ngā Riukiuta, from the ancestor Riukiuta of *Tainui* and his son Tahinga. Tahinga married Maheu of the earlier ‘pre-Tainui’ Hamoamoa hapū, and by Maheu he was the father of Rākei-ora (or Rākei-iri-ora), after whom Ōrākei on the Tāmaki Isthmus is named.

Rākei-ora's sons were Ruarangi and Ohomatakamokamo; the latter being the ancestor of a branch of Ngā Oho mentioned earlier.²¹⁴ According to Wirihana Te Aoterangi of Ngāti Tahinga, in the time of Ohomatakamokamo's grandson Te Hihi-o-te-ra, this branch of Ngā Oho "dispersed beyond Manukau to Tauroa, Waikato, Te Akau, Whangaroa [*sic*], and to Aotea."²¹⁵ Although not entirely clear, the hapū name of Ngāti Tahinga appears to arise from a later ancestor by that name.

Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa trace links to both Te Arawa and Tainui, and like both Ngāti Hauā and Ngāti Tamaoho, they are also related to Ngāi Te Rangi and the Mataatua people of the Bay of Plenty. The ancestor Tahinga (II)'s mother Parepounamu was a great-granddaughter of Tūwharetoa of Te Arawa and his Ngāi Tai wife Hinemōtū, from Tōrerere.²¹⁶ His father Hikahaere was the son of Tūpāhau, whose forces had driven Tamaoho from the Marokopa district. Tahinga married his cousin Potete, the daughter of Kārewarewa (alias Kārewa-kai-ora), who was also a son of Tūpāhau.²¹⁷ Tahinga and Potete's grandson was Kārewa, who married Huapiri, a daughter of Mahuta.²¹⁸ The granddaughters of Kārewa and Huapiri were Te Tahuri I (one of several important female ancestors by that name – see also 'Te Akitai'), and Puakirangi. Te Tahuri married Te Ikamaupoho of Te Waiohua by whom she was the mother of Kiwi Tāmaki and thus an ancestress of Te Akitai, whilst Puakirangi married her great uncle Uerātā (brother of Huapiri) by whom she became the mother of Tapaue, among others.²¹⁹ Thus Te Akitai, Ngāti Te Ata, and several branches of Ngāti Tamaoho, Te Taoū, Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Naho, Ngāti Hauā and Ngāti Mahuta are all descended from Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa.

In Te Hapimana Taiāwhio's evidence to the Compensation Court for the Pukekohe Reserve, he referred to "Ngatikerewa" (*sic*) as a "sub division of the Akitai", and

²¹⁴ Graham, Geo., "The Account of Kupe and Tainui", *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 28, 1919, p. 116.

²¹⁵ Aoterangi, Wirihana, "Fragments of Ancient Maori History" (translated by George Graham), 1923, MS 120/P1, Auckland Institute & Museum, p. 8.

²¹⁶ Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, p. 477.

²¹⁷ Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995, p. 227; citing Wahanui 1888.

²¹⁸ Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, pp. 465.

²¹⁹ Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, p. 253-254, 471, 475.

referred to relatives from that hapū being buried on the block.²²⁰ This coupled with Kiwi Tāmaki’s own descent from Ngāti Tahinga/Ngāti Kārewa tends to suggest that a branch of Ngāti Kārewa had been living in the Tuakau/Pukekohe region among Te Akitai relatives for some generations, or at least maintained ongoing whanaungatanga. Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Kārewa became embroiled in the Taurangaruru conflicts of the 1840s, and subsequently took part in the Waiuku No. 1 transaction.

²²⁰ Evidence of Te Hapimana Taiāwhio, Pukekohe Block, “Native Compensation Court” in *Daily Southern Cross*, 25 April 1865, p. 5.

5.9 Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Hauā

5.9.1 Marae

The many households of Ngāti Mahuta are represented by marae spread between Taharoa (Kāwhia), Aotea Harbour and Pōkuru (between Pirongia and Te Awamutu) in the south, and Waerenga near Te Kauwhata to the north. They are too numerous to list here, however, several of the principal marae of Ngāti Mahuta are situated between Ngāruawāhia and Rākaumanga near present-day Huntly, including Waahi Pā. In Manukau, the legacy of a Ngāti Mahuta presence in the district is represented by Te Puea Memorial Marae in Māngere.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Waahi Pā	Ngāti Mahuta	<u>Physical</u> : Te Ōhākī Road, Rākaumanga, Huntly <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 32 Huntly <u>Phone</u> : (07) 828 8038
Te Ōhākī	Ngāti Mahuta Waikato-Tainui	<u>Physical</u> : 212 Te Ōhākī Road, Rākaumanga, Huntly <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 137 Huntly <u>Phone</u> : (07) 828 7670
Te Puea Marae	Ngāti Mahuta Waikato-Tainui	<u>Physical</u> : 41 Miro Street, Māngere Bridge, Manukau <u>Postal</u> : P.O. Box 59-060 Māngere Bridge, Manukau <u>Phone</u> : (09) 636 7017
Tūrangawaewae	Ngāti Mahuta Waikato-Tainui	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 29 River Road, Ngāruawāhia <u>Phone</u> : (07) 824 5189

East of the central Ngāti Mahuta heartlands, the principal marae of Ngāti Hauā are located between Maungatautari south of present-day Cambridge; Te Iti o Hauā (Tauwhare Marae) and Waimakariri Marae of Tauwhare/Pukemoremore between Cambridge and Hamilton; Kai a Te Mata and Rukumoana Marae of the Kiwitahi/Morrinsville district; and Raungaiti Marae of Waharoa, Matamata.

Marae	Hapū/Iwi	Contact information
Maungatautari	Ngāti Koroki Ngāti Hauā Ngāti Wairere Ngāti Raukawa	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Maungatautari Road, Maungatautari
Te Iti o Hauā (Tauwhare Marae)	Ngāti Hauā	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : 780 Tauwhare Road, Pukemoremore, Hamilton
Waimakariri	Ngāti Hauā	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Victoria Road, Pukemoremore, Hamilton
Kai a Te Mata	Ngāti Hauā	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Kereone Road, RD1 Morrinsville
Rukumoana Marae	Ngāti Hauā Ngāti Werewere	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Morrinsville-Kiwitahi Road, Morrinsville
Raungaiti	Ngāti Hauā Ngāti Te Oro	<u>Physical/Postal</u> : Tāmihana, State Highway 27, Waharoa, Matamata

5.9.2 Traditions

The eponymous ancestors Mahuta and Hauā are said to have been either the brothers, or brothers-in-law, of Pāoa.²²¹ Tapaue, whose various marriages produced important ancestors of Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Pāoa, Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Naho and Ngāti Te Ata, was himself a grandson of Mahuta. Te Rauangaanga, father of Te Wherowhero, was in turn a grandson of Tapaue's son Te Putu, who with his half-brother Pāpaka was among the leading warriors to avenge the death of their father, and to firmly establish Ngāti Te Ata and their relatives at Waiuku.²²² According to Pāora Te Iwi, Te Wherowhero also descended from Te Ata-i-rehia.²²³ Te Rauangaanga and Te Wherowhero also descended from Ngāti Hauā. Hauā's youngest son Pūkauae married Hourua, a sister of Tapaue and the eponymous ancestress of Ngāti Hourua. Their son, Te Aho-o-te-rangi, was the grandfather of Te Kāhurangi, Te Rauangaanga's mother.²²⁴

²²¹ Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995, pp. 162 (f.n.), 171-172.

²²² Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, pp. 243-248, 471, 480.

²²³ Evidence of Pāora Te Iwi, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 31.

²²⁴ Whakapapa is shown in Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949, pp. 242, 262, 452 & 472. See also Robertson, J. B. W., "Genealogies as a basis for Maori chronology", *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 65, 1956, p. 54: xiii.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, both Te Rauangaanga and his son Te Wherowhero had fought as allies of Āpihai Te Kawau. Following Hongi Hika's devastating musket raids on the Tāmaki, Hauraki and Waikato districts, between the 1820s and 1830s the exiled Manukau tribes took shelter at Maungatautari in Waikato under Ngāti Hauā, whilst under Te Wherowhero and Ngāti Mahuta's protection they returned to the Manukau from 1835. According to Hōri Tauroa, Te Wherowhero and Te Waka Kaihau of Ngāti Te Ata were the chiefs who led the peacemaking at Tāmaki with Ngāti Pāoa following the return from Waikato.²²⁵

Te Wherowhero, his brother Kati and the Ngāti Mahuta people were installed as peacekeepers at Awhitu, which they occupied alternately with Ihumatao and Pukekawa (Auckland Domain) for several years. As Hōri Tauroa said: "When Hongi returned home the Waikatos brought us back to live upon our land. By us I mean N. Tiata, N. Maho. We lived at Awitu. We kept our lands until the pakehas came."²²⁶

In the battle of Taurangaruru, says Hōri Tauroa, Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Tamaoho fought against Ngāti Te Ata, and afterwards went to live at Ihumatao "and the settlements around about".²²⁷ He further states that Ngāti Te Ata "and Waikatos" (presumably Ngāti Pou and allied hapū/iwi) were beaten by Ngāti Tamaoho, and that they too left Awhitu after Taurangaruru, to live with Ngāti Whātua at Ōrākei.²²⁸ Ngāti Te Ata however were "also going to and fro between those places".²²⁹

Hakopa Te Waharoa of Ngāti Hauā married Hēni Ngātutu of Ngāti Te Ata/Te Akitai, and was a co-claimant before the Compensation Court with his wife in both the Pokeno and Patumāhoe confiscation blocks, although witnesses in the Patumāhoe case were unable to state for certain whether he may have had traditional claims to the land in his own right.²³⁰ Tāmati Wīremu Tāmihana of Ngāti Hauā also claimed on the

²²⁵ Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 40-41.

²²⁶ Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 39. NB: 'Tamaoho' in the Ōrākei evidence is variously rendered by the minute taker as Tamaho, Te Maho, Maho, Tamahoho etc. Similarly, Tiata is Ngāti Te Ata; and Awitu is Awhitu.

²²⁷ Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 22 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 44.

²²⁸ Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 23 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, p. 55.

²²⁹ Evidence of Hōri Tauroa, Ōrākei Rehearing, 23 October 1868, Ōrākei Minute Book 1, pp. 49-50.

²³⁰ See "Compensations Courts: The Patumahoe Reserve" in *Daily Southern Cross*, 18 May 1865, p. 4, and "Compensations Court: Patumahoe Reserve", *Daily Southern Cross*, 19 May 1865, p. 5.

Pokeno block, as a descendant of the Ngāti Rewha hapū of Te Uri o Pou/Ngā Iwi.²³¹ As noted earlier (see ‘Ngāti Tipa’), Te Keene Tangaroa also identified several members of Ngāti Hauā – namely Pohipohi, Wiremu Naylor and Muriwhenua – as participants in the Pukekohe transactions and the creation of the Pukekohe (Te Awanui o Taikehu) Reserve.²³²

²³¹ Evidence of Tāmāti Wīremu Tāmihana, Pokeno Block, 25 May 1865, Proceedings of the Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, University of Waikato Library, Box 1/Folder 2, p. 17.

²³² Evidence of Te Keene Tangaroa, Pukekohe Block, “Native Compensation Court” in *Daily Southern Cross*, 25 April 1865, p. 5.

6. Conclusions

This account of the tribal landscape in the study area and across the wider region may appear rather daunting to readers unfamiliar with the complexities of Māori traditional history. The South Manukau district is as challenging as any around the country, not only because the traditions and inter-iwi relationships are inherently complex, but also the manner in which these have been affected by historical factors, which include:

- The re-occupation of the region following the Musket Wars, and the associated kinship obligations to reciprocate the manaakitanga extended by Waikato during the years of exile;
- The fact that the latter part of the return coincided with the onset of colonisation and the foundation of Auckland, which almost immediately led to large-scale land sales across the district;
- Those land sales caused serious rifts between closely related iwi, leading to violent altercations, and even when these were resolved, a legacy of bitterness remained.
- South Manukau iwi remained divided up until the 1860s and the Crown's invasion of the Waikato. Those who joined their Waikato kin in opposing the British forces had their remaining land confiscated, leaving them completely landless. This in turn led to a number of iwi vacating the district for good; a large cohort of Ngāti Pou, for example, going to live with kin at Onewhero.

In more recent times, the wider Tāmaki Makaurau district has proved to be a difficult nut to crack for the Office of Treaty Settlements in its attempts to settle historical Treaty claims. Writing in 1993, at an early stage of the Waitangi Tribunal's inquiry process, eminent historian Alan Ward discusses the "intermingling of groups" across the many pā and kāinga of South Auckland, along with what he describes as the close interspersing of land rights resulting from political alliances that allowed, for example, Ngāti Mahuta and Ngāti Tamaoho to acquire rights in the Remuera/Mt. St. John area of central Auckland, "where Ngati Whatua were the principal tangata

whenua.”²³³ From this, he concluded: “It is a matter of serious consideration whether these complex inter-relationships and complex land rights should have been, in the 19th century, or should be now, separated out into distinct iwi and distinct boundaries.”²³⁴ In other words, these people were all so closely related that they should be treated as a unified political grouping under a single leadership structure.

At the time, this fitted well with the Crown’s policy of settling Treaty claims with Māori polities who could be seen as constituting ‘Large Natural Groupings’, and on the advice of Professor Ward and indeed the Tribunal itself, Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei was recognised by the Crown as having undisputed mana whenua across the wider Tāmaki Makaurau district. By the same token, Waikato-Tainui were seen as the Large Natural Grouping to the south, whose rights possibly extended to the southern shore of the Manukau. Lobbying by representatives of Te Kawerau a Maki, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, the Hauraki Māori Trust Board and others, to have their ancestral rights in the district considered, initially fell on deaf ears. Eventually, in 2006, with Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei and the Crown about to sign a Deed of Settlement that would settle the historical Tāmaki claims once and for all, the Waitangi Tribunal held an urgent hearing into the Tāmaki Makaurau settlement process. The resulting report found that with respect to numerous tāngata whenua groups in Tāmaki Makaurau other than Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei, the Crown’s policy and practice was unfair, in terms of both process and outcome.²³⁵

As a result of this finding, the Crown changed to a more inclusive approach whereby iwi who could show that they represented both longstanding ancestral rights within the Tāmaki district, as well as a substantial cohort of current members, qualified to join a Tāmaki Collective of Claimants. A similar approach was taken in Hauraki, where a Hauraki Collective of claimant iwi was formed to participate in the Treaty settlement negotiation process.

A sub-cluster of the Tāmaki Collective representing the lands south of the Manukau has emerged entitled Te Waiohua Collective, with membership made up of Te Akitai, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki. Te Kawerau a Maki have

²³³ Ward, Alan, “Historical Report on South Auckland Lands”, CCJWP, Draft, 1992, p. 6.

²³⁴ Ward, “South Auckland Lands”, p. 6.

²³⁵ Waitangi Tribunal, *The Tamaki Makaurau Settlement Process Report*, (Wai 1362), 2007, p. x.

recently joined on a strictly conditional basis. It may be reasonable to assume that the members of Te Waiohua Collective best represent the interests of current iwi equivalent to those iwi from whom the land was originally acquired. Even so, this would exclude Ngāti Pou, Ngāti Tipa, Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Karewa of Lower Waikato, and Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei, who might legitimately claim ancestral connections to the district.

We have included schedules of current marae for each of these groups in order to show where they are based today, which in some cases is some distance from the South Manukau district.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL)

Maunsell Papers Micro-MS-Coll-004-035. ATL.

Buddle Papers Micro-MS-0778. ATL.

Ashwell Papers Micro-MS-Coll-004-036. ATL.

Archives New Zealand, Auckland (ANZ-A)

Waikato Confiscation Files

BAPP A1721 (various records)

Auckland Crown Grant Register Books

BAJZ A1660 23663 Box 976a. Crown Grants 14G

Auckland Deeds Register Books

BAJZ A1660 23641 Box 51. Deeds Register Book R28

Archives New Zealand, Wellington (ANZ-W)

Gore-Brown

Gore-Brown 1/2d Classified Letters-Letters from Missionaries – John Morgan 1864

Auckland Institute and Museum, (AIM)

Aoterangi, Wirihihana, “Fragments of Ancient Maori History” (translated by George Graham), 1923, MS 120/P1

Graham, George, “A Maori History of the Auckland Isthmus”, (n.d.), MS 120/P2

Graham, George, “Marutuahu” (n.d.), MS 120/M42

Graham, George “Nga Matuku Rua, the Two Bitterns, a Tale of Manurewa”, 1937, MS 120/M44

Judge Monro’s Minute Book 1866, MS 366

University of Waikato Library (UWL)

The Compensation Court, Waikato Confiscations, Box 1/Folders 1, 2 & 5

Land Information New Zealand (LINZ)

Linz National Office Plans

LINZ Plan A79, "Plan of 115 Country Allotments in the Waipipi Block, Waiuku West" n.d.

LINZ Plan A33 (F3)

LINZ Plan A83 (F4) Confiscated Blocks North of the Waikato, July 1871

LINZ Plan A144 Waikato Tribal Lands 1866

LINZ Cadastral Plans, Drury Survey District, 1931

Maori Land Court Minute Books (MB)

Auckland Minute Book 1

Auckland Minute Book 4

Ōrākei Minute Book 1

Ōrākei Minute Book 2

Raupatu Document Bank (RDB)

Raupatu Document Bank, vol. 55

Secondary Sources

Books and Articles

Best, Elsdon, "The Burning of Te Arawa", in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 34, 1925

Buddle, Reverend Thomas, *The Maori King Movement in New Zealand*, (Pamphlett), Auckland, *New-Zealander Office*, 1860

Cowan, James, *The New Zealand Wars: A History of the Maori Campaigns and the Pioneering Period: Volume I (1845-64)*, 1955

Davis, Norman, *The Isles: A History*. London, Papermac, 2000

Fenton, F. D. *Important Judgements delivered in the Compensation Court and Native Land Court*, Auckland 1879

Ferguson, Gael, "Ngai Tai ki Tamaki within the Hauraki Inquiry," Waitangi Tribunal, 2002

Gorst, J. E., *The Maori King*, London, 1864

Graham, George, "The Account of Kupe and Tainui", *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 28, 1919

Gudgeon, W. E., "Maori Migrations: No. II", in *Journal of the Polynesian Society* Vol. III, 1894

Jones, Pei Te Hurinui & Biggs, Bruce, *Nga Iwi o Tainui*, 1995

Kelly, Leslie G., *Tainui*, 1949

Lennard, Maurice, *The Road to War: The 1863 Redoubts of South Auckland*, 1986

Marshall, Charles, "Waikato Forty Years Ago", in, Lieut.-Colonel J.H.A. St. John, *Pakeha Rambles through Maori Lands*, Wellington, 1873

Martyn, John, "Peace and War", *Journal of the Auckland Historical Society*, No. 7, October 1965

McLintock, A. H., *Crown Colony Government in New Zealand*. Wellington, R. E. Owen, Government Printer, 1958

Monin, Paul, *Hauraki Contested 1769-1875* Bridget Williams Wellington, 2006

Morrell, W. P., *The Provincial System in New Zealand, 1852-76*. Christchurch, Whitcomb & Tombs Ltd, (reprint 1964)

Mould, Thomas R., *Sketch of Military Proceedings in New Zealand*, London, 1869

O'Malley, V., "Te Rohe Potae Political Engagement, 1840-1863", Wellington, CFRT, 2010

Pomare, Maui and James Cowan, *Legends of the Maori Vol. I*, 1930

Rigby, Barry, "Hauraki and East Wairoa," Waitangi Tribunal, 2002

- Robertson, J. B. W. "Maori Settlement of the Waikato District", Te Awamutu Historical Society Inc., Bulletin No. 2 (Revised), 1983
- Smith, S. Percy, *The Peopling of the North*, 1898
- Stafford, D. M., *Te Arawa*, 1967
- Stone, R.C.J., *From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland*, Auckland, AUP, 2001
- Stone, R. C. J., "Whitaker, Frederick, 1812-1891", in: DNZB
- Sullivan Agnes (draft in prep) "Maaori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840", Part 1, Traditional, Ethnographic and Other Historic Documentary Sources, n.d.
- Taua, Te Warena "A History of The Maori People" in Alan La Roche, *The History of Howick and Pakuranga* 1991
- Tonson, A. E. *Old Manukau*, Tonson Publishing House, Onehunga, 1966
- Tūhaere, Pāora, "An historical narrative concerning the conquest of Kaipara and Tamaki by Ngati-whatua" (translated by George Graham), *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 32, 1923
- Turton, H. H. *Maori Deeds of Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand, Vol 1-2, Province of Auckland* (Wellington, 1877)
- Turton, H. H. *Epitome of Official Documents Relative to Native Affairs and Land Purchases in the North Island of New Zealand*, Wellington, 1883
- Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Whanganui-a-Orotu* (Wai 45), Wellington, 1995
- Waitangi Tribunal, *Muriwhenua Land Report*, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 1997
- Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Raupatu o Tauranga Moana*, Wellington, Govt. Printer, 2004
- Waitangi Tribunal, *The Tamaki Makaurau Settlement Process Report*, (Wai 1362) Wellington, Legislation Direct, 2007
- Ward, Alan, *A Show of Justice: racial amalgamation in nineteenth century New Zealand*, (First Edition) Auckland, AUP/OUP 1973
- Ward, Alan, "Historical Report on South Auckland Lands", Preliminary Discussion Draft, Crown Congress Joint Working Party, 1992
- Williams, David V., *Te Kooti Tango Whenua*. Wellington, Huia Publishers, 1999

Government Publications

Appendices to Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR)

Auckland Provincial Papers (AP)

Journals of the Auckland Provincial Council (JAPC)

New Zealand Gazette (NZG)

New Zealand Parliamentary Debates (NZPD)

Newspapers

Daily Southern Cross

New-Zealander

New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian

Te Karere Maori o Nui Tireni