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Abstract

Between 1860 and 1940 Aotearoa New Zealand’s economy and economic base was transformed in a number of significant ways, following similar patterns in earlier-established British colonies. The influx of European immigrants drastically altered the demography and contested land – the economic base. Money became increasingly important as medium of exchange and unit of account. Whereas the economy was unregulated or lightly-regulated before 1860, regulation increasingly formalised economic relations and institutions, and work organisation became more impersonal. In urban areas these transformations were substantially complete by 1940. However, in rural areas, where most Māori and fewer Pākehā lived, economic transformation was more of a hybrid than a complete change from one form to another. The informal economy (unmeasured and unregulated), and particularly the rural informal economy, contributed (and still contributes) quantitatively to the national economy. Whether within Māori communities, within Pākehā communities or between the two, the more informal rural economy depended on social relations to a large extent.

Māori had choices about how they related to the introduced economic system, ranging from full engagement to rejection and non-involvement, with numerous negotiated positions in between. With the conviction that they could satisfactorily negotiate terms of participation, Māori had invited Europeans to the far north. The extent of Māori involvement in all the dominant (formal) economic activities of the far north, 1860-1940, clearly indicates their efforts were integral rather than peripheral to the Pākehā economy. But Māori economic activity has been relegated to the shadows of economic history. The relationship between the two systems is better understood by recognising the interplay between formal and informal (shadow) economies.

The social organisation of work, the kaupapa of the informal economy, the diversity of strategies and tactics, and relationship building (both bonding and bridging), were the strengths from which far northern Māori relentlessly engaged with the Pākehā economy, while maintaining a degree of autonomy until World War One. In effect they played an invisible hand of cards, invisible, that is, to studies of the formal economy.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Auckland Central Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJHR</td>
<td><em>Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZA</td>
<td>Archives New Zealand Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZW</td>
<td>Archives New Zealand Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATL</td>
<td>Alexander Turnbull Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUL</td>
<td>The University of Auckland Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNZB</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of New Zealand Biography</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNRM</td>
<td>Far North Regional Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS</td>
<td><em>Journal of the Polynesian Society</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHR</td>
<td>Member of the House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament (from 1950s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZJH</td>
<td><em>New Zealand Journal of History</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZPD</td>
<td><em>New Zealand Parliamentary Debates</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WGP, L&J     | Puckey, William Gilbert, Journals and Letters, 1831-1868
Typed transcript, qMS-1665-1666, and microfilm MS-Copy-Micro-0019, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington |
Glossary

Words written in the Māori language have long vowels marked with an umlaut rather than a macron, because the thesis has been written in a Macintosh environment, which does not support macrons. The exception to the general rule of long-vowel marking is where quotations have been inserted, in which cases original marking has been retained. Guidance on the use of long vowels has been taken from H. W. Williams’ *A Dictionary of the Maori Language*,\(^1\) with the exception that for local usage, reference has been made to McCully Matiu’s and Margaret Mutu’s *Te Whānau Moana*.\(^2\) This latter has been the primary reference for spelling of local people and place names. If vowel length is uncertain it is unmarked. On first reference to words in the Māori language, a short-form, closest translation is added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atawhai</td>
<td>Show kindness, be liberal, foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākari</td>
<td>Feast or ritual gift-giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāpai</td>
<td>Uplift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Kin-based social, political and economic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoko</td>
<td>Buy, sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui</td>
<td>Gathering, meeting or assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Tribe, large kin-based social and political unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai-karakia</td>
<td>Lay-reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaimoana</td>
<td>Seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāinga</td>
<td>Home, village, settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanohi-ki-te</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanohi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karere</td>
<td>Messenger, policeman, constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa</td>
<td>Rule, policy, basic idea, topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kete</td>
<td>Kit, woven flax bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingitanga</td>
<td>The King movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koha</td>
<td>Gift, donation, parting message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komiti</th>
<th>Committee(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kotahitanga</td>
<td>Tribal unity, or the unity movement of northern tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana</td>
<td>Power, authority, prestige,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua</td>
<td>Authority over access to, and use of land in a particular geographic location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki</td>
<td>Sharing and caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuhiri</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>A person or people of Aotearoa New Zealand indigenous descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Traditional meeting place, community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moana, moananui</td>
<td>Sea, ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muru</td>
<td>Ritual plunder, confiscation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pā</td>
<td>Fortified settlement or temporary war base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>A person or people of British descent (in the 1860-1940 time period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakāinga</td>
<td>Original home, village lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepeha</td>
<td>Set form of words, proverb, tribal saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pono</td>
<td>True, truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatira</td>
<td>Chief, leader, person of noble birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūnanga</td>
<td>Assembly, council, debate (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take</td>
<td>Cause, reason, issue, or origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>Indigenous people, people of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangi</td>
<td>Funeral, lamentation, ceremony of mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td>Under religious or spiritual restriction, sacred state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarara</td>
<td>Dalmatian(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauiwi</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taumau</td>
<td>Arranged marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Oneroa-a-Tohe</td>
<td>Tohe’s long beach, commonly known as Ninety Mile Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo</td>
<td>The Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tika</td>
<td>Straight, direct; right, correct; just, fair; integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Correct procedures, cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohunga</td>
<td>Skilled person, especially in religious ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turangawaewae</td>
<td>Land, place of one’s tribal ancestry, a place to stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuku</td>
<td>Allow, let, give up (and a wide range of other meanings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuku whenua</td>
<td>Allocation of land for habitation and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utu</td>
<td>Reciprocity, satisfaction, price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>Canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapono</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Immediate or extended family group (whanau whanui may be used for the wider family setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Kinship, social interaction, being connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharekai</td>
<td>Dining hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharenui</td>
<td>Meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharetangata</td>
<td>Womb, child-bearer, connection by marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whare wānanga</td>
<td>School of higher learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 – Introduction

The shadow of the land goes to the Queen, the substance remains to us.¹

Panakareao, 16 April 1840

In a moment of considered confidence and optimism, Ngakuku Panakareao, an assertive Te Rarawa chief, first proclaimed the substance and shadow terms that have rung down through Aotearoa New Zealand’s colonial history, more sour than sweet. His oratory has been attributed with having swung the debate on the day the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in Kaitaia. The assertion reflected more trust than ‘due diligence’, more attitude than outcome. As Raymond Firth wrote:

As has been well said “When the Treaty was signed, sovereignty was the shadow; the substance was the land”. But with the passing years the shadow grew great, and bade fair to cast its gloom over the hearts of the Maori people. … the Treaty represents the first overt acknowledgement of the interest of external authority in the foundation stone of the native economic system.²

There is another sense in which the shadow played on economic relationships.

So long as Sado-monetarism holds sway, it will be difficult to focus attention on the vast majority of transactions in the past and in the present, which take place outside the glare of the market place. And it is in those shadowy domains that most of us – past and present – form our values and live our lives.³

¹ John Johnston, Journal kept by John Johnston (M.D.) Colonial Surgeon from his arrival at the Bay of Islands, 17 March 1840 to 28 April 1840, NZMS 27, Auckland City Libraries Special Collections, Auckland; Anne Salmond, Submission for the Waitangi Tribunal Muriwhenua Land Claim Wai 45 Doc F19: Maori Language Records of the Treaty Transactions at Waitangi, Mangungu and Kaitaia, Auckland, 1993, p.55. The transcript quoted in Manuka Henare’s thesis uses the words ‘What have we to say against the governor the shadow of the land will go to him but the substance will remain with us’.
Both senses of *shadow* are foci for this thesis. Firth and Denoon refer to two different determining aspects of the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy. Land was ‘the foundation stone of the native economic system’, and recognition of the interest of an external authority in it highlighted the inherent tension, for the Māori social system and their laws were directed not so much to property but to relationships between people. Māori primarily saw a social compact in land transactions where Europeans saw property conveyance. Therefore, in allocating land to Europeans in the early days of contact, the rangatira were not alienating their authority over the land but, rather, asserting it. If land was the foundation stone of the economic system the kinship network of social capital was its mortar. Social capital not only assumed greater prominence in the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy, but also underpinned the informal or shadow economy to which Denoon referred.

This thesis examines the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy in the far north of Aotearoa New Zealand 1860-1940 – the period when ‘real Empire’ started to bite, during and following the New Zealand Wars of 1860-1872, and when New Zealand’s ‘industrial revolution’ accelerated. Once the government had effected a victory in the wars, by sheer weight of numbers, it was emboldened to enact a raft of legislation and regulation to bring about ‘real Empire’, which had a direct impact on economic relations between the two races. Politics at the national, local and hapū levels are treated.

4 Throughout this thesis, the term ‘Māori’ refers to individuals or people of Māori descent, and does not distinguish between degrees of ‘bloodedness’ or attempt to make judgements about the customs by which people lived. In the time period 1860-1940, the term ‘Pākehā’ referred to the colonial settler community of predominantly British descent.


6 ibid., p.108.

7 Social capital is a notion, the economic importance of which has only received recent prominence. The concept and theory is explained later in this Introduction.

8 James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Auckland, 1996, p.187. The terms real empire and false empire were used to distinguish between levels of control Europeans exercised over Māori from central government.
here as being inseparable from economics, thus political aspects of the economic relations (the political economy) are given early prominence.

Inevitably a focus on changes in the economic relationship can give the impression that economic determinism is assumed. However, social relationships reveal a dynamic that is equally culturally determined; it would be difficult to argue that one was more dominant. Māori were socially, culturally and economically responsive to apparently favourable opportunities, and resistive to a direction of change that was not in their collective interests. This thesis therefore pays more attention than might otherwise be expected of economic history, to social relationships with Pākehā that were linked to the economic relationships. In this respect it agrees with economic historians who have argued that ‘Institutions matter, but not for everything’,⁹ and that new institutional economics does not adequately address relational-structures and social capital.¹⁰

Tribal boundary zones of Te Aupōuri, Ngāti Kurī, Ngāi Takoto, Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu, and Te Paatū – roughly Mangonui County and the northern half of Hokianga County – encompass the geographic region of the case study.¹¹ The large institutions and big stories of national level economic change will not take centre stage; the spotlight will fall instead on people in the remote, rural, slower-moving sector. Demographically, for the most part of the period Māori were in the majority in the region, which could have allowed more evenly weighted negotiations. Up to 1940 most Māori in New Zealand lived rurally. Their first encounters with the Pākehā economy
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¹¹ Although Te Rarawa and Ngāti Kahu are also closely related to Ngāpuhi on the west and east coasts respectively, I will not venture into this iwi, as they are so numerous and cover such a large geographic area that their influence would overwhelm the others.
were in the rural and littoral settings. As the far north was not highly urbanised marginalisation of, and the need for adaptation by, Māori was less than in centres of higher Pākehā concentration.

This thesis is not so much concerned with the economic impact of Pākehā contact on Māori; that has been written in tomes, most voluminously for the Waitangi Tribunal hearings. Nor is it directed at ‘the Māori economy’ as a separate economic entity; that approach would be fraught with definitional and boundary problems.¹² I want instead to find in the historical records the variety of ways in which Māori reacted, responded and related to introduction of a differently based economic system – different in type of activity, scale and ideology. Remaining cognisant of the two historiographical trajectories, of ‘fatal impact’ (Harrison Wright) and agency (James Belich, Richard Hill, Vincent O’Malley and others), I seek to evade the swings and consider the dialectic as it played out ‘on the ground’. Although the study is at first a local history, specific to the far north, it contains elements of generality as well as specificity. Thus, the research draws on micro-histories to represent the regional view, which will be set within the wider New Zealand context.

From local-level and micro-histories, the thesis argues that the manner in which Māori related to the Pākehā economy was shaped not only by customary, imitative and innovative responses to new activities, but also by the particular Pākehā with whom they socially related and shared geographic space. Additionally, the thesis will argue that while engagement with the Pākehā economy was influenced by regulations, these

¹² NZIER, Māori Economic Development: Te Öhana Whanaketanga Māori, Wellington, 2003, p.1. ‘In considering the Māori economy, we obviously cannot ignore the fact that Māori are highly integrated into the New Zealand economy. … Most economies around the world are becoming increasingly integrated through the rapidly growing movements of goods, people and capital. It is no longer easy to characterise businesses in national terms. … It is even harder to draw a boundary between Māori and New Zealand economies than between economies of different countries. Our description of the Māori economy will inevitably be approximate, and there is considerable judgement involved in deciding how economic activity should be split between the two’.
influences resulted not just in conformity to regulation, but also in alternatives; there
were choices and incentives to remain in, or revert to, the informal or shadow economy.
The contention (espoused by Keith Rankin\textsuperscript{13}) that Māori were not integrated into the
Pākehā economy until after 1940 will be challenged. Their contribution to, and
participation in, the far northern economy were integral, rather than peripheral, to the
path the Pākehā economy took there. I will also question claims of a Māori renaissance
accompanying population recovery from 1900.

By choosing the remote northern rural community I have considered a different range of
relationships from those in the largely impersonal businesses, industries and institutions
in the urban setting. By focusing on social capital as an explanation of the relationships
of people to an economy, and by expanding the definition of \textit{The Economy} to include
the informal economy, I seek to address two historiographical omissions: indigenous
economies and solidarity. By explaining the interplay between social capital and the
informal economy I hope to elucidate an ethnic basis of distinction to add to the
recognised class basis. By incorporating other theoretical concepts I expect to broaden
and deepen understanding of the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy through
the dynamic changes over 1860-1940.

\textbf{Methodology}

This is a history thesis that uses economic interactions as a window into social history.
The methodology remains substantially that of the historian’s craft, but the research
deliberately engages with other relevant disciplines to inform its subject matter.
Whereas the economist, focussed on production, would formulate a quantitative model,
I seek to expand perception of the economy to include the unmeasured production and

consumption of the informal economy, and the economy’s societal dimension. As such, the approach follows Stephen Gudeman’s definition of an economy’s base as:

the social and material space that a community or association of people make in the world. Comprising shared material interests, it connects members of a group to one another, and is part of all economies. The base of a community changes over time and assumes many forms that vary by history and context. But it is not represented in economic theories, and our ordinary language often does not bring it to everyday awareness.14

Alongside the disciplines of economics, economic history and social sciences, those of anthropology, economic anthropology and Māori studies, also contribute valuable insights. This is a local study, but not purely local. Being informed by global-level studies in multiple disciplines, it seeks, in turn, to inform theory for the larger geographic areas, because ‘an inability to understand local systems will lead to poor characterizations of larger ones’.15

Economies of countries are conventionally described in terms of an international standard measurement system, the United Nations System of National Accounts,16 which evolved slowly over two and a half centuries.17 While many Western countries, including Australia, were preparing estimates by the end of World War One, New Zealand first introduced National Accounts in 1940.18 But elements of a formal economy were recognisable decades earlier.

16 Terms such as GDP, GNP (gross domestic and national products), GDP per capita, national income and balance of payments.
17 Dating from Sir William Petty’s 1665 preparation of guesstimates of the income of the English nation.
18 The foundation of peacetime work to develop the uniform accounting system, subsequently adopted by the United Nations, was Sir Richard Stone’s and John Maynard Keynes’ paper, ‘The National Income and Expenditure of the United Kingdom and How to Pay for the War’, written in London in 1939. This paper
National Accounts were a market concept and the measurement system dependent on use of money as the standard medium of exchange.\textsuperscript{19} Use of money in New Zealand evolved without specific provision in the early stages of colonisation, English currency being adopted from 1840. The Bank of New Zealand was established by the New Zealand Bank Act, 1861, and authorised to issue notes, which became legal tender when Britain temporarily suspended the gold standard as a result of World War One.\textsuperscript{20} By 1870 New Zealand’s agriculture was very much part of a monetised economy, and trading banks were even then pre-eminent in monetary transactions.\textsuperscript{21} King Tawhiao established a Māori bank in the Waikato, which existed in the 20 years between 1886 and 1905. Although its operations were small and localised, his actions were an attempt to establish a parallel or alternative Māori system, because Māori were excluded from bank credit.\textsuperscript{22} When New Zealand became a British colony, along with English currency, English law became part of its institutional organisation, with little regard for Māori custom ‘law’. Although amongst British officials there was little argument with the principle that bringing Māori within English law was desirable, it was also recognised by many that full acceptance of English law, especially in regions where there were few Pākehā settlers, would take time.\textsuperscript{23} Britain conceded representative and responsible government to New Zealand in 1856, and by 1870 the country had a Legislative Council, House of Representatives and nine provincial governments.

\textsuperscript{19} British economist Arthur C. Pigou set criteria in 1928 that National Accounts would include the values of the production of goods and services that ‘can be brought directly or indirectly into relation with the measuring rod of money’; Marilyn Waring, \textit{If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics}, San Francisco, 1990, pp.47-55.


Monetisation, institutionalisation, measurement and market differentiation are indicators that components of a formal economy were recognisable at a national level by 1870. Such an economy was less recognisable in the remote and roadless far north. There, the immediate application of English law had been less practical, and money was not the principal means of exchange for a large part of the population, even into the twentieth century. The Mangonui and Hokianga County Councils were decreed to hold their first meetings at midday on 9 January 1877, but the tribal rūnanga remained the dominant institutions for decision-making and maintaining order in Māori communities.

Prior to introduction of the National Accounts, some data that reflected then current perceptions of the economy had been collected and aggregated. From these data series, economists calculated retrospective estimates of GDP/GNP, representing a formal, market and money-based New Zealand economy or, more precisely, Pākehā economy, because it excluded Māori. However, the National Accounts system does not reflect all economic activity. What it does measure is the official or formal economy; it does not measure the informal economy. That the formal economy, thus defined, came to be referred to as The Economy of a country rendered perceptions of other economic activities, including the Māori economy, as being inconsequential, insubstantial, and peripheral, and those involved in them marginalised – of no value or account. Just as

---


25 ‘Fixing Places and Dates of First Meeting of Certain County Councils’, Supplement to the New Zealand Gazette, 76, 29 December, 1876. Their function at that time was somewhat confused, but tended towards centralising local administration, establishing and administering a rating system, arranging provision of roading and other transport, and issuing licences for local services; Jeanette R. Richardson, Time and Tide: Local Government in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries in Mangonui, Kaitaia and Adjacent Areas, Waikanae, 1990, pp.38-40.

certain members of society have been written out of history, so too were participants in the informal economy written out of The Economy.

The concept of a shadow or informal economy is rarely referred to in historic terms, as though it were some recent phenomenon. The short perspective – that ‘the consequence of a growing acceptance of the shadow economy is a complete repudiation of a long-established and firmly-rooted economic order’27 – is deceptive. The formal economic system has been constructed over an extremely short period of human history and despite its ‘global’ scope, does not involve direct participation by a majority of the world’s population. The formal economy could well be an anomaly, while the mass of economic activities outside the formal (the informal) could be the norm.28

In 1985, Christian Rogerson bemoaned the dearth of historical research into the informal sector over the previous decade, during which it had enjoyed popularity from a broad range of academic perspectives, because historical research could greatly enrich contemporary understanding, not least by denying ‘the validity of descriptions of the informal sector as a ‘novel’ segment of the labour market’.29 One 1980s paper examined the formal/informal dichotomy in the historical urban setting of Tunis.30 It concluded that there was a direct correlation with class (indicated by access to knowledge and capital), and that the class correlation with economic strata could be traced back centuries. The lack of depth of this case study (based on 21 interviews) limits its explanatory value but suggests useful questions. Is class a determinant of

---

28 'Editors' Foreword', *Journal of International Affairs*, 53, 2, 2000, p.i. This perspective is consistent with that of Denoon, quoted in the introduction to this thesis.
informal/formal participation, or does the economic definition create or perpetuate classes? Was class, or perceived economic value of the sector, a factor in formulating the formal/informal distinction? Did class, or access to knowledge and capital, determine strata?

Although it is possible to recognise components of a formal economy in Aotearoa New Zealand around 1870, it is not possible to pinpoint a moment in history when the formal economy came into being. How a segment of the economy came to be formalised and official was a process of changing perception, differentiation of scale, and introduction of regulations. The process of differentiation is described at the end of Chapter 5 after the elements have emerged from the evidence.

Such a model is useful for describing the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy for several reasons. First, the formal/informal dichotomy exposes Western preconceptions and permits different perspectives on other cultures’ economies. Second, the model expands discussion of the economy beyond the formal; how Māori related to the Pākehā economy might conceivably have been to remain outside it. Finally, the formal economy, as defined by National Accounts, was a Pākehā introduction or imposition, as were parts of the informal economy that were proscribed by regulation and legislation. The management systems for collecting data and reporting National Accounts, and their use for formulating government policy, were the exclusive domain of Pākehā. The formal/informal dichotomy and management systems define the Pākehā economy.
While standardised National Accounts had been adopted by the United Nations decades earlier, the terminology of an informal economy dates only from the 1960s-70s. A flurry of academic research ensued, but a generally agreed definition of the informal economy did not emerge. One writer stated that the shadow economy is a ‘(pre)concept in search of a theory’, the definitions differing according to the research objectives. What does appear to be agreed is that it represents some form of unofficial economy. Alternative names used to describe the informal economy (or aspects of it) include parallel, secondary, hidden, shadow, grey, black, clandestine, illegal and underground economy.

Generally, definitions fall into two categories, the descriptive approach and the behavioural approach. The descriptive approach considers shadow economic activity as simply unrecorded, whereas the behavioural approach defines in terms of behavioural characteristics and provides underpinning of a theoretical explanation for shadow economic activity. Edgar Feige distinguished between behaviour in official and informal (shadow) activity as:

whether the activity adheres to the established, prevailing institutional rules of the game... Adherence to the established rules constitutes participation in the formal economy ... whereas noncompliance or circumvention of the established rules constitutes participation in the informal economy.

31 The term dates to its first use by social scientists around 1960; ibid., p.161. The International Labour Organization (ILO) introduced the term in a report on employment in Kenya, in 1972, which referred to urban migrant enterprises that were established in the absence of sufficient employment opportunities in the formal economy; ‘Editors’ Foreword’.
Importantly, Feige added the caveat that ‘The characteristics of each distinct informal economy are determined by the particular set of institutional rules that its members circumvent’, and noted that transaction costs differ for participants in formal and informal economies because of institutional rules.\(^{35}\)

As the formal economy in Aotearoa New Zealand only came to be measured mid-twentieth century, prior to official measurement it is/was not clear what comprised the formal and informal according to the descriptive approach definitions. Furthermore, as the ‘institutional rules of the game’ were contested and in transition during the study period, until they became ‘established’ and ‘prevailing’, a definition under the behavioural approach is equally unclear. For these reasons, the study period is ideal for tracing the history of formation of what was later labelled informal and shadow, with its sometimes-pejorative connotations that cast a shadow over what had earlier been positively regarded as frugal and/or self-reliant. One evident difficulty in studying the informal economy is that, by the descriptive definition, it is not recorded. However, absence of evidence should not be taken as evidence of absence. Alternative indicators or proxies need to be sought. Otherwise we tell ourselves the wrong story; colonial history represents the perspective of those who created the most accessible documents.\(^{36}\) Even occupational data for Māori that would have been formal economy activity was not recorded in censuses until 1951. Māori were written out of economic history.


Informal economic activities can be differentiated into four sectors (household, informal, irregular and criminal) according to two criteria: market transactions and legality, as summarised in Table 1.

### Table 1 - Classification of informal economic activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Market Transactions</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Production/Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREGULAR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Thomas, *Informal Economic Activity* 37

The household sector produces goods and services within the home, which are also distributed and consumed within the household sector. Output is not traded. It includes unpaid work of family members. In isolated communities subsistence depends on a high degree of self-sufficiency within the household, and relations between households are often based on the exchange of goods and services rather than market transactions. In a market-based economy the sector substitutes for purchases.

The informal sector comprises self-employed, small-scale producers and their employees, working in the production of goods, in commerce, transport and provision of services. They often work at or from home. It also includes not-for-profit ventures, volunteer workers, neighbour-help, honorary activities and self-help organisations. The distinction from the household sector is that output is distributed beyond the household and may be sold, bartered or exchanged on a ‘koha’ basis. Goods and services produced are legal, and generally no laws are broken in their production and distribution. Market transactions could be excluded from National Accounts because of the difficulty and expense of collecting data; for example, from small street or road-side

---

barrows. Regulations and licensing laws might be broken, but in developing countries authorities make little effort to enforce, compared with the irregular sector.\textsuperscript{38}

The irregular sector activities involve some illegality such as tax evasion, avoidance of regulations and social security fraud. While the goods and services that form the output are perfectly legal, the production and/or distribution involves some illegality. Measurement problems arise because those involved in lawbreaking conceal the information from those collecting statistics for National Accounts. The focus of authorities is on the evasive and fraudulent activities rather than on the legal output.

The criminal sector output consists of goods and services that are illegal such as theft, extortion, drugs, smuggling, and prostitution in some countries. The price of the end-product affects the incomes of the original producers, sometimes peasant crop-growers, and the opportunity cost of land use, and there could be implications for regional employment. Criminals are also likely to be tax evaders, so as not to draw attention to criminal activities, and to further reduce transaction costs. Authorities are more interested in stopping the illegal activities than collecting taxes.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{38} Some argue that a breach of regulations automatically puts this category into the irregular sector. Boundaries are blurred but his paper takes the position that the distinction lies in whether or not the non-payment of ‘taxes’ is due to lack of collection procedures or deliberate evasion, i.e. if the reason for non-payment lies more with the authorities than with the non-payer. There is disagreement too about how the formal economy is distinguished from the informal sector of the informal economy. On the one hand the view of economists associated with the World Bank is that the formal sector involves modern technology, capital-intensive methods of production with labour and product markets subject to protection, whereas the informal sector involves traditional labour-intensive methods of production and both labour and final output markets are highly competitive. An alternative view, which has been the approach of researchers at the International Labour Organization (ILO), defines the informal sector of the informal economy in terms of small-scale, self-employed (excluding professionals) and certain kinds of homeworkers; ibid., p.333. Yet another view is that any distinction is a fiction; that the formal/informal dichotomy needs to be re-conceptualized as a continuum; Philip Harding and Richard Jenkins, The Myth of the Hidden Economy, Milton Keynes and Philadelphia, 1989.

\textsuperscript{39} Descriptions of the four sectors follow those set out in Thomas, Informal Economic Activity, pp.3-5. While the logical distinctions between the sectors may be clear, some problems in classification can arise in applying the distinctions. It is also apparent that the descriptions apply to economies of the late twentieth century and into the twenty-first century. A reinterpretation is required in order to apply the distinctions to the pre-contact and pre-colonial Aotearoa New Zealand contexts, and up until the time when the National Accounts’ measurement was introduced.
I adopt a liberal interpretation of what comprises a shadow economy in the New Zealand context between 1860 and 1940. The terms ‘shadow’ and ‘informal’ economies will be used interchangeably and their meanings will be treated as equivalent to parallel, secondary, grey and hidden economies. Black, clandestine, illegal and underground economies will refer to a restricted group, within the informal economy, which comprises illegal or evasive activities.

While it might seem to be beneficial to distinguish between the legal and illegal aspects of the informal economy, the reality is not certain. Legal activities can become illegal by a change to regulations, or introduction of new regulations. Furthermore, ‘crime is not behaviour universally given in human nature and history, but a moral-political concept with culturally and historically varying form and content’.40 C. Sumner argued that the orthodox approach to understanding criminal behaviour ignores the role of criminal law in colonialism, and Jim Thomas illustrated ways colonial authorities passed laws that created crimes, the subsequent control of which was in the economic interest of the ruling power.41 Critically, the colonial law that made leasing of land by Māori illegal created a crime that served the economic purposes of the government.42

In the far north, traditional gift exchange dominated economic transactions both amongst Māori and, to a large extent, between Māori and Pākehā settlers, up to the late nineteenth century (and beyond).

Gift exchange, the method of trade between hapū, typifies the Māori system. Māori traded widely and Muriwhenua were no exception.

41 Thomas, Informal Economic Activity, p.296.
Large distances were covered to secure commodities scarce in the home area. … [But] trade was not the sole purpose of gift exchange. … the underlying purpose of gift exchange … was not to obtain goods but to secure lasting relationships with other hapū, consistent with Māori views of reciprocity and to secure an ongoing supply. Central to this system was the expectation that relationships would be maintained as necessary for trade and mutual advancement. The conceptual regulator to ensure reciprocity was mana.43

Joan Metge described 200 years’ history of intergroup relations between Te Aupōuri and Te Rarawa in terms of exchanges of gifts of all kinds linked into a single system.44 Māori laws of values and contracts that pre-existed European contact, and persisted following contact, were based on: whanaungatanga (primacy of kinship), arohatanga (compassion), manaakitanga (hospitality, acts of kindness and caring) and utu (maintenance of harmony, balance, mana). Being value-based rather than codified, laws could be readily changed, provided the underlying principles were maintained. Māori valued not only Europeans’ goods but also a personal and continuing trading relationship with them.45 At the core of tikanga Māori, and the cultural approach to economics, were relationships. Those relationships were the social capital. Social science research into social capital offers potential to illuminate how Māori related to the Pākehā economy both before and during the transitions that occurred over the rapidly changing period after 1860.

The concept of capital is one of the more penetrative explanatory devices in contemporary economics and sociology. To understand how social capital contributes
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43 Muriwhenua Land, pp.27-8.
44 Joan Metge, ‘Returning the Gift – Utu in Intergroup Relations’, The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 111, 4, 2002. Metge elaborated further the principles of reciprocity explaining that ‘the intertwined story of Te Aupōuri and Te Rarawa builds on and extends Firth’s presentation in at least three ways. First, it demonstrates how and why friendly relations were turned into hostile ones and back again through the operation of the principle of utu. Secondly, it suggests that the category of “good” gifts was wide enough in the people’s thinking to include acts of magnanimity and acts recognised as conferring mana on actor and/or recipient. Finally it demonstrates that as well as forging and reinforcing bonds between social groups, gift exchange also marked and reinforced their existence as separate entities, and was – and is – deliberately used for that purpose’, Metge, p.334.
45 Muriwhenua Land, pp.26-8.
to economic relationships, it is necessary to delve lightly into capital theory. In so doing, it is important to be continuously aware that *capitalism*, *markets* and *profits* deriving from Western theories of economics could be counter-cultural to a Māori economic perspective, and might need to be modified.

A sociologist, Nan Lin, has delineated two streams of capital theory – classic and neo-capital – differentiated on the basis of prominence given to variable characteristics of individual humans, which disallow or allow choice in the market place respectively. Common to all forms of capital, and definitive of it (by Lin), is that capital is *investment in resources with expected returns in the marketplace*. Lin traced the notion of capital to Marx, from 1849, in his analysis of how capital emerged from social relations between the bourgeoisie (capitalists) and labourers in processes of commodity production and consumption – capital was part of the surplus value that created further profit. In the Marxian scheme, both investment and profit are vested in the capitalists; labour does not generate or accumulate capital for the labourers. The theory is based on the explanatory argument that class differentiation is fundamental in capitalist societies. The evolution of capital theory into what Lin calls neo-capital theory modifies or eliminates the class explanation as a necessary theoretical orientation.46 Marxian theory, with its two-class basis (capitalist and labourers), focuses on the production and exchange of commodities; human, cultural and social capitals focus on processes associated with the labourer. Under the classic Marxian capital theory, labour is manpower with no added value, a head count without added knowledge and skills, and labourers can be treated as replaceable commodities.
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46 Nan Lin, *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, Cambridge, 2001, pp.3, 8. Capital is resources twice processed – first as resources produced or altered as investment, and second, the investment is used to generate profit in the market place; capital is both outcome of a production process and causal factor in production.
Human capital theory can be traced to Adam Smith, who included all the acquired and useful abilities of the population as part of capital. Human capital is the value added to a labourer by acquiring knowledge, skills and other assets useful to an employer in production and exchange. Importantly the added value is embedded in the labourer. It is operationalised and measured by education, training and experience, although Schultz argued that the effect of human capital should be estimated by yield rather than cost. Because part of this value can be negotiated and retained by the labourer as wages and benefits beyond the minimal amount required for subsistence needs, it can be seen as an investment on the part of the labourer, which increases his or her market value. Human capital development generates economic value allowing labourers to become capitalists. Thus, while human capital theory does not deviate substantively from the classic theory in the definition of capital, it challenges the classic theory regarding who can or cannot acquire capital. The social structure is seen as a hierarchy of many grades of capitalists, with extensive cross-grade mobility possible, rather than a rigid two-class system. The labourer has choices.

Neo-capitalist theorists do not universally accept this element of choice on the part of the labourer. Cultural capital is an alternative explanation of human capital. As articulated primarily by Pierre Bourdieu, from 1977, its theory defines culture as a system of symbolism and meaning, and argues that a society’s dominant class imposes its culture by engaging in pedagogic action, which internalises the dominant symbols
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48 Schultz, p.8; Lin, pp.9-12. The added value is the net benefit over and above the cost invested.
and meanings in the next generation, thus reproducing the salience of the dominant culture. This social reproduction is achieved by legitimating the culture and values of the dominant class as the objective culture. Because they pass unnoticed as the culture and values that support and sustain the dominant class, they are ‘misrecognised’ as those of the entire society. The pedagogic action occurs in many informal settings, and most importantly through institutionalised education, where students are rewarded for the reproduction of the dominant culture. The training becomes internalised, and carries over to the labour market, where students who have adopted the dominant culture are employed by organisations controlled by the dominant class. Cultural capital is the acquisition and misrecognition of the dominant culture and its values (legitimised knowledge).50

Thus, to Bourdieu, education or training that can be seen as human capital can alternatively be regarded as cultural capital. Further, he considered that a wide range of capitals – economic, social (relationships with significant others), cultural and symbolic (prestige and honour) – is largely in the hands of the dominant class, who occupy top positions in society, although he did not assume perfect correspondence between accumulation of economic and cultural capital. While he challenged the notion of free will on the part of the labourer, he did not rule out purposive action or behavioural choices. Thus, social mobility and agency are still possible, which is characteristic of both neo-capital theories.51 Cultural capital theory is an instinctively attractive explanation of colonisation processes, but this thesis is more concerned with how Māori reacted, responded and related to the introduced economy, rather than with how it was imposed. Therefore, cultural capital will only be discussed to the extent that one of the

51 ibid., pp.15-17.
responses could have been to adopt the dominant culture in a manner consistent with cultural capital theory.

As with the informal economy, recent theorising about social capital has not produced a generally agreed definition. The underlying premise of Lin’s definition is investment in social relations with *expected* returns in the market place.52 One of the definitions the Institute of Policy Studies of Victoria University of Wellington used was ‘the collection of resources that an individual or a group has access to through their membership of an ongoing network of mutual acquaintance’,53 whereas the definition used for a Māori perspective was ‘Social capital is relationships among actors that create a capacity to act for mutual benefit or a common purpose’.54 Notably, the terms *mutual benefit* and *common purpose* are used rather than *profit*. Tu Williams and David Robinson also claimed that the distinction between cultural and social capital disappeared in the Māori context, because ‘social capital is based on and grows from the norms, values, networks and ways of operating that are the core of cultural capital’.55 If they used *cultural capital* as Bourdieu explained, they were implying either that there are no dominant and dominated classes in Māori society, or that the culture of both classes is the same. Social capital works through four channels. It facilitates the flow of information, reducing imperfections in the market place, and reducing transaction costs. Secondly, social ties may exert valuable influence, particularly where they are strategically located, creating an asymmetry in dependence on agents. Thirdly, social ties may be conceived as social credentials that enhance and expedite an individual’s access to

52 The market place may be an economic, political, labour or community market. Lin defines social capital simply as *the capital captured through social relations*; ibid., p.19.
55 ibid., p.15.
resources. Fourth, social relations reinforce identity and recognition and entitlement to
resources. These four elements imply a level of control over the membership of the
association, which contributes to its functionality.\textsuperscript{56}

Robert Putnam,\textsuperscript{57} a political scientist, focused on associational membership, social trust
and acceptance and adherence to social norms that can be transported, in order to
analyse ways the variables at the individual level affect social, political and economic
outcomes. Sociologists following James Coleman’s focus (on the structural variable
that exists only between and among unique individuals within specific relationships)\textsuperscript{58}
criticised aggregated individual level characteristics as being a poor reflection of the
property of collectives. Both Coleman and Bourdieu considered dense or closed
networks as the means by which collective capital could be maintained, and
reproduction of the group achieved. Lin stressed that Putnam’s work on participation in
voluntary organisations in democratic societies reflected Coleman’s and Bourdieu’s
perspective. However, he further argued that these social associations and the degree of
participation indicated the extent of social capital in a society.\textsuperscript{59} I consider this logic to
be flawed.

Take the example of Northern Ireland, where there is a high degree of association by
individuals with opposing Catholic and Protestant churches. The national level of
social capital cannot be taken as the mean of the aggregate because the social capital
embedded in these conflicting associations cancels out, or nets off. Rather, the mean
would represent latent social capital; it would take a national culture of tolerance and a

\textsuperscript{56} Lin, p.20.
\textsuperscript{58} James S. Coleman, ‘Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital’, \textit{American Journal of Sociology},
\textsuperscript{59} Lin, p.23.
mechanism of bridging to activate the latent capital. Where there are dominant and
dominated cultures within a nation, there is potential for diminution in social capital at a
national level. If the process of legitimisation and support of political and economic
systems does not accommodate the dominated culture, a counter-culture could be
induced, which would expand the irregular and illegal sectors of the informal economy.

While each of the definitions stresses the asset, social capital is not necessarily good or
bad in itself. It can be used for purposes of either kind: for instance, association for
making war, personal or institutional financial gain, or building community facilities.
Social capital can be built up within counter-cultural associations such as mafia and
gang membership, and among the ‘old boy’ network of contemporaneous prison
inmates who, after release, continue their association ‘on the outside’. These too have
the characteristics of associational membership, social trust and acceptance, reciprocity
and adherence to social norms within their own social group.

If context does matter, it is also possible that there could be multiple contexts where an
individual might encounter others with the same associations, which could be tapped
into advantageously. Māori relationships are not geographically bound, but tribally
based, so that the association exists regardless of location. However, for these
associations to carry capital value, the context would need to be one within which that
particular association made a difference. Henk Flap considered social capital to include
mobilised social resources, for which he specified three elements: the number of
persons in an individual’s social network who are prepared or obliged to help when
called upon, strength of relationship indicating readiness to help, and the resources of

---

60 For instance, the ‘old boy’ Oxbridge network, Masons, Catholics, Jews, and such like, which are
international associations.
61 Williams and Robinson, 'A Maori Perspective', p.15.
those people, 62 characteristics that resonate with the role of the rangatira in Māori society. Lin made the further point that only when the individual is aware of the presence of relationships and the resources they possess or can access, can he or she capitalise on them.63 In these respects, context matters but an individual is not limited to one context.

Lin identified four key controversies and their associated problems, one of which is particularly pertinent to this thesis.64 Some theorists assumed or expected that there should be closure or density in social relations and networks. Lin believed this requirement was neither necessary nor realistic, and pointed to research that stressed the importance of bridges in facilitating information and influence flows outside the network. Bridging is the link between two individuals who each participate in different social circles for mutual benefit or to enhance or expand access to resources and/or markets. Research by Svendsen and Svendsen, and Anirudh Krishna demonstrated that excessive bonding to the exclusion of others can destroy social capital, and that the group is enhanced economically by effective bridging,65 a perspective that is paramount in an analysis of the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy.

Controversies and lack of agreement on definitions, as well as the recent nature of the research, have resulted in some confusion. Relevant to this research, the Muriwhenua Land Report attempted to explain the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy.

63 Lin, p.25.
64 ibid., pp.25-8.
Under the Western economy by which future development could be measured, Māori had two of the prerequisites for growth...: the people or human capital, and the resource of the land. However, they also lacked two of the essentials: the technology, and knowledge of the necessary infrastructure... It was for lack of that knowledge, and because they understood an alternative economic regime, that Māori lost most of the land, the essential resource base. It was also for lack of knowledge and technology that they were unable to develop such land as they retained for pastoral farming, or they were unable to manage the gum industry themselves.66

This explanation is inadequate for at least three reasons. Firstly, it does not take into account the essential component of financial capital that was available to European settlers, but not to Māori. Secondly, it confuses people with human capital67 although it then correctly recognises that the knowledge and skill base did not match the introduced economic regime. Thirdly, the report did not refer to the essential relationships component of economic participation, the social capital.

With respect to the first, the importance of settler financial capital was explained by Denoon in 1983,68 who later recognised his failure to take into account effects of indigenous economies and solidarity.69 In particular he stressed that pre-colonial economic systems were based on different principles from the dominant style of economic analysis, and solidarity of indigenous communities was invoked to protect themselves against market competition. Pre-colonial Māori economic principles did differ, as the Tribunal noted; they also underpinned social cohesion or solidarity.

The principles of whanaungatanga, arohatanga, manaakitanga and utu underlying the Māori economy correlate with Māori concepts of social capital identified by Tu Williams and David Robinson, namely: whakapono (trust), tika (integrity), pono (truth),

66 Muriwhenua Land, pp.357-8.
67 A headcount of people, or a labour force, is different from human capital, which requires knowledge and a skill base.
68 Donald Denoon, Settler Capitalism: The Dynamics of Dependent Development in the Southern Hemisphere, New York, 1983.
69 Denoon, 'Settler Capitalism Unsettled'.
manaaki (sharing and caring), tautoki (support), hapai (uplift), whanaungatanga (social interaction and connectedness), kotahitanga (unity) and mana motuhake (autonomy and authority). While it might be expected that the two sets of principles (Māori economic and Māori social capital) would be consistent, the extent of congruence with generic social capital definitions is sufficient to argue that the Māori economic system was based on social capital, with high value attached to human capital comprising the knowledge and skills required to sustain the community. By contrast, the Pākehā economic system was based on financial and cultural capital, with human and social capital vying for relative importance for enhancing the economic position of the individual.

Because Māori emphasise the principle of whanaungatanga the relationship to the Pākehā economy is considered from this perspective. Engagement in various economic activities has been analysed by constructing a number of ‘horizontal whakapapa’, which demonstrate the social interaction and connectedness of Māori and Pākehā in contemporaneous and successive generations.

Reference sources and literature review

At the local level, databases have been compiled from primary sourced statistics for Mangonui and Hokianga counties. These sources include census returns, nominal rolls for Māori war volunteers, import/export statistics for Mangonui and Hokianga ports, sheep ownership returns, fishing boat registrations, surveys of river and harbour vessels, and dairy companies’ shareholder lists. For clarity of presentation, much of the
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70 Williams and Robinson, ‘A Maori Perspective’, pp.15-16. Williams’ and Robinson’s list omitted the component of utu mentioned in the Muriwhenua Land report, which is surprising because consistent, understood and accepted protocols of reciprocity are fundamental to building and maintaining social capital, and they refer to reciprocity when comparing Māori social capital with the generic concept of social capital on p.26. Both gifts and monetary transactions involve reciprocity, but the protocols of reciprocity differ. Conversion to a monetary economy required negotiation of these fundamentals.
extensive data has been condensed into tables. Trends or correlations in data sets are expressed more succinctly as graphs. Marae profiles were derived from tribal websites, local histories, Native Schools’ reports, Resident Magistrates’ reports in the *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives* (AJHR), and schools’ and churches’ centennial publications. Whakapapa, genealogies, and networks, together with their associated commercial activities, were charted from Waitangi Tribunal reports, local and family histories, reunion publications, the Kinder Library Directory of Anglican clergy, and the online *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* (DNZB). Other primary sources include archives of various government departments, official publications, and English and Māori language newspapers. Permission was obtained to peruse restricted police and court records for indicators of informal economic activity.

Literature that establishes issues and gaps in historical study is reviewed in this introduction; that which addresses a particular aspect of the thesis will be reviewed in the relevant section. The first issue arises from the generality of national level explanations that are not supported by a range of local level studies. Several authors have identified phases in the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy over the time since first contact. Their periodicities to some extent depend on, and vary according to, the chronological perspective and the historiographical moments of their writing.

Raymond Firth outlined four broad phases: initial impact, 1769-1840; enthusiastic adoption, before friction over land led to the 1845/6 and 1860-1872 wars; reaction against Pākehā ways; and finally a turning point, 1880, to revival of interest and hope, when younger Māori saw their economic future in the conscious adoption of European methods and culture. This stadial and assimilationist view, a product of its time, has been refuted by New Zealand and overseas historians and is not accepted here.
Steven Webster challenged Firth’s approach, particularly the dichotomies of tribalism and capitalism and the progressive move from one to the other – an approach he saw perpetuated by subsequent writers. ‘Implicit in their analyses is a teleology of modernisation from tribe through peasantry to proletariat, in which a relatively undifferentiated capitalism assimilates a relatively undifferentiated tribalism.’ Instead he argued differentiation of capitalism, that concurrent (and even reversible) processes of proletarianisation, peasantisation or tribalisation began much earlier, and continue.71

The tribe-peasant-proletariat path refers to a model first proposed by Colin Bundy in his study of Africans and the colonising economy in South Africa. Bundy was dissatisfied with then prevalent explanations. The liberal tradition (which posited the disadvantages that the fundamental and inherent weaknesses of the tribal economy imposed on Africans when they encountered money and market relations, and the inability of Africans to adapt or forsake that economy) ignored or underestimated an initial period of prosperity. Concepts of the dual economy and dualism theory (uneven economic development within national boundaries, or an economy divided into two sharply distinguished and largely independent sectors) contrasted capitalist and pre-capitalist sectors inaccurately. The capitalist (industrial) was held to be highly productive, market oriented, receptive to change and pursuing rational and maximising aims; whereas the pre-capitalist (primitive/traditional) was stagnant, displayed little market awareness, high leisure preferences, and dominance of tradition over rationality. There was no acknowledgement of different kinds of rationality. The link between the two sectors

was the flow of unemployed labour from the traditional to the modern sector. Bundy was also reluctant to project underdevelopment into the past.\textsuperscript{72}

Mason Durie’s analysis of twentieth-century events distinguished four phases,\textsuperscript{73} the first phase being congruent with Firth’s fourth phase in its emphasis on increasing adoption of Western ways. Durie’s second phase, although not inconsistent with Firth’s extension of his fourth phase, argued that government control rather than Māori-initiated response led to dependency. The first two phases, which overlap this thesis’ study period, were Te Whakamāuitanga: Recovery 1900-1925, and Tūpunga Ahuwhenua: Rural Development 1925-1950. These were followed by the third, after the Second World War, Te Hekenga-Mai-Kainga: Urbanisation 1950-1975. The recovery stage referred to positive demographic growth and the emergence of two Māori plans for development. One, associated with the Young Māori Party, advocated adaptation to Western society and law, along with retention of a strong Māori cultural identity. The other, promoted by sovereigntists such as Rua Kenana, supported acquisition of Western knowledge and skills, but emphasised Māori control and autonomy, with less dependence on government goodwill. Durie argued that because government sympathies were with the Young Māori Party’s approach, ‘legislation was introduced to bring Māori within the orbit of what was then mainstream New Zealand’;\textsuperscript{74} survival and recovery were achieved at the price of imposition of a paternalistic relationship between Māori and the Crown. Durie further argued that this bond was strengthened in the second phase, following the great depression of the 1930s (which impacted disproportionately on Māori) and World War Two, which enforced Māori links with the Crown. At the start

\textsuperscript{73} Mason Durie, ‘Māori Development: Reflections and Strategic Directions’, \textit{He Pukenga Kōrero}, 5, 1, 1999, pp.4-5. The paper was an adaptation of a Keynote Address presented to Senior Māori Public Servants held in Wellington on 19 August 1999.
\textsuperscript{74} ibid., p.4.
of the second phase Ngata’s dream of a flourishing rural economy and Māori farmers looked promising before the two intervening events. But following World War Two the Māori Affairs Department’s brief encroached further into Māori life and economic activity in ‘a deal which softened the harshness of poverty but brought with it an unshakable image of Māori as dependent, hewers of wood and toilers of soil and all too ready to taste the fruits of State benevolence’.75

Durie’s comment echoed the protestations of the eminent civil engineer William Blair, in his address to the newly formed New Zealand Manufacturers’ Association, back in 1884. ‘The manufacturers of England deny us the right of developing our industrial instincts. We are to be the “hewers of wood and drawers of water” “routhing it” in the far distant Lebanon, while they, the skilled workmen, abide at home in Jerusalem earning higher wages in ease and comfort … why should we stifle our natural instincts, and accept an inferior position?’76 The way Māori felt English colonists in New Zealand were treating them was the same as the colonists felt they were being treated by England’s manufacturers.

An advisory committee to the Department of Social Welfare had enunciated the link between dependency and government control, in 1988. It argued that if ‘one chooses to interpret government action, and to an extent justice and exploitation are both accurate, Māori participation in the Pakeha economic, legal and political life was regulated’.77 The committee stressed the interplay between economy and money. From 1895 to 1940, as their options for participation were limited, Māori were increasingly integrated into a cash economy. Where previously they had bartered for commodities, they were

75 ibid., p.5.
increasingly expected to pay cash. And even where the traditional base was maintained, cash was needed for health services, land rates and surveys, schools, and tax, all of which, the report argued, forced them into the Pākehā economy.78

In direct contrast to Firth’s and Durie’s analyses, Keith Rankin explained that he did not include the Māori population in his retrospective construction of New Zealand’s GNP from 1859 to 1939, because ‘from the Land Wars in the 1860s until the 1940s, there was little integration between the indigenous and settler economies.’79 His methodological approach implied that Māori were irrelevant to the country’s economy, and made no contribution to GNP over the 80 years to 1940. Rankin’s approach mirrored the multiplicity of nationally oriented and progressive pioneer histories of that and earlier eras.80

John Martin’s contra-argument that Māori, amongst rural wage earners, were the forgotten workers, points to Māori being of great importance from the beginning of the settler rural economy, in that they provided a parallel source of labour to the itinerant Pākehā workforce. Based on a government survey of 1891, Martin estimated that there would have been a pool of 60,000 Pākehā and 15,000 Māori seasonal workers. Because most Māori lived rurally before 1940 they were employed in the rural economy. In Sir Apirana Ngata’s opinion, ‘[w]e owe to his labour much of the pioneer work’.81

The foregoing literature provides long-run, national-level contexts, but is too generalised for the shorter 80-year period of this study and a specific local-level explanation. Shorter time periods and/or smaller regions come under scrutiny in other

78 ibid.
79 Rankin, p.65.
80 Examples of these are given in Hazel Petrie, ‘"for a Season Quite the Rage"?: Ships and Flourmills in the Māori Economy, 1840-1860s’, PhD thesis, University of Auckland, 2004, p.16.
literature. Graham Butterworth challenged interpretations of Māori history, such as those of Firth\textsuperscript{82} and Sorrenson,\textsuperscript{83} that a revival occurred in the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{84} He contended that a revival in the form of a renaissance was later, from 1920 onwards, and more short-lived. His argument is based not only on demographic recovery and improvement in standards of living, but also on revival in Māori artistic forms, carved meeting houses being the most tangible. In a footnote, Butterworth pointed to the North Auckland experience as having differed, which is of interest here.

Pre-dating Steven Webster’s argument for the specificity of history, Lesley Andrews’ comparison of individual responses, and constantly changing patterns of behaviour of groups of people, indicated regional differentiation over the short 1870-1890 timeframe.\textsuperscript{85} While the regional comparison itself is useful, within-region peculiarities could not be drawn in the fourteen pages of her thesis devoted to North of Auckland.

Paul Monin’s focus on Hauraki tribes’ economic interaction with Pākehā is restricted to the nineteenth century, and Hauraki’s relationship to the large urban Auckland region has different trade characteristics from those of the north.\textsuperscript{86} Hazel Petrie’s thesis on Māori-owned flourmills and ships, 1840-1860, is also confined to an earlier time period than this study. Although hers is a national study, the commercial activities were concentrated in the Hauraki, Waikato and Wanganui areas – Hauraki and Waikato serving Auckland. Her central argument – that the capital investments did not arise out

\textsuperscript{82} Raymond Firth, \textit{Economics of the New Zealand Maori}, 2nd edn, Wellington, 1959 (first published 1929).
of neophilia or striving for mana, with its attendant competition, but were ‘generally well-considered enterprises, appropriate to contemporary conditions’ – is borne out, to some extent, by my research. None of these regional studies extends into the twentieth century, which has suffered a lack of attention.

Narrowing the focus to the far north, the most valuable secondary sources have been the reports of, and submissions to, the Waitangi Tribunal for the Muriwhenua Fishing and Land Claims. But history emanating from the Waitangi Tribunal process needs to be considered in the light of its purposes. The process seeks to determine past acts and omissions of government that have adversely affected Māori, in contravention of Treaty principles. ‘They are juridical histories; that is, histories written for the purpose of enabling a judge to examine acts and omissions in the past … to find [what went wrong], and … to restore the parties to [right] relationship’. Historians outside that process need to consider a broader set of parameters for their different purposes.

Criticism has been levelled at Tribunal history for presentism, over concern to create counterfactual history, and breach of basic analytical rules. In particular, there has been academic unease with the Tribunal’s findings in the Muriwhenua Land Report (used in this thesis) based on linguistic argument. Nevertheless, the thorough anthropological and historical analyses of the Tribunal’s sources draw together social, political and economic information relevant to far northern Māori that is not available elsewhere, and
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87 Petrie, p.ii.
89 W. H. Oliver, ‘The Future Behind Us: The Waitangi Tribunal's Retrospective Utopia’, in Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh, eds, Histories Power and Loss: Uses of the Past - a New Zealand Commentary, Wellington, 2001; Michael Belgrave, ‘The Tribunal and the Past: Taking a Roundabout Path to a New History’, in Michael Belgrave, et al., eds, Waitangi Revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi, Melbourne, Australia, 2005, p.35. While this study will re-state but not re-visit this issue, because it is out of period, to the extent that I have examined the arguments, generally I do not disagree with the Tribunal report’s conclusions.
provide balance to the overwhelmingly European versions of local history. This thesis seeks to draw the Tribunal material further into mainstream historiography.

Subsequent history writing by local Māori groups, such as Te Rarawa Historical Overview Report\(^90\) and *Te Whānau Moana*,\(^91\) draw on the large bodies of evidence collated for the Tribunal. Te Rarawa’s report tends to follow the Tribunal report pattern, emphasising land issues, government relationships and responsibilities. *Te Whānau Moana* deliberately emulates the format of oral tradition. Directed at those who no longer live near ancestral lands and who have not retained Ngāti Kahu cultural and language fluency, its central purpose is strengthening kinship ties and tribal knowledge. Te Rarawa’s report extends its ambit beyond the Muriwhenua claim area to encompass Te Rarawa’s Hokianga rohe. *Te Whānau Moana* includes government relationships but relegates them to the last chapter, giving greater prominence to tribal matters. A common product of both of these efforts is a local Māori perspective on relationships with the Pākehā economy. While much is said about relations with government, how Māori reacted and responded to the introduced economic system remains largely unaddressed.

Moving attention from the regional to the international focus (from the particular to the general), neo-European settler societies have received attention in two waves – the 1960s to 1980s and from 1997. Seminal works from the first wave included that of Donald Denoon, who first argued in 1983 that settler capital enabled rapid growth of colonial economies,\(^92\) and then in 1990 realised he had overlooked, indigenous
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\(^91\) Matiu and Mutu.

\(^92\) Denoon, Settler Capitalism. The six countries were Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. Other seminal works were contributed by Louis Hartz (*The Founding of New Societies*, 1964) and D. C. M. Platt and G. Di Tella (*Argentina, Australia and Canada*, 1985). Denoon critiqued five general approaches to the subject of development that had been taken by earlier writers – ‘pigment
economies and solidarity,\textsuperscript{93} which are dealt with here as the informal economy, social capital (solidarity), and the relationship between the two.

In the second wave, four main theoretical approaches have emerged to help explain comparative histories,\textsuperscript{94} but while combinations of these approaches have been synthesised, Christopher Lloyd argues that none ‘articulate a radical historical approach of the evolutionary and regulationist kind’ that he defends.\textsuperscript{95} Lloyd draws on concepts of path-dependency and punctuated equilibrium – ‘the unstable and changing balance between forces of equilibrium or path dependency and of innovation or change’ – explaining that evolving systems follow a chaotic path marked by large shifts between stable states.\textsuperscript{96}

Two such major discontinuities in population/resource rates in Western economic history allowed for continuing population growth without a consequent reduction in consumption per capita.\textsuperscript{97} The First Economic Revolution occurred when humans began to develop a settled agriculture, herding and breeding animals and cultivating plants,

\textsuperscript{93} Denoon, ‘Settler Capitalism Unsettled’.


\textsuperscript{95} Lloyd, p.18.

\textsuperscript{96} ibid., p.6. Simply stated, theories of path dependence claim that ‘the dynamic features of [a path dependent] process give persistence to the effects of specific contingent events, so that the sequence of equilibria depends on the history or “path” of the process’, Douglas J. Puffert, \textit{Path Dependence in Economic History}, Institute for Economic History, University of Munich, 1999, available at: http://www.wvl.uni-muenchen.de/is_komlos/pathe.pdf (May 2004). The state of a society in the present depends on the path it has taken in the past. Within macro and microeconomics, the direction, amount and rate of change is limited by the degree of structural and/or social inertia.

thus leveraging the productive capability of land, labour, physical and natural resources. This also involved organisational change, leading to a rapid increase in the rate of learning, knowledge acquisition and consequent technological development and population increase. The Second Economic Revolution occurred with these technology changes leading first to industrialisation and the rural/urban shift of populations within a country, and then to the shift of populations from one country to another, with accompanying expansion in the land, labour and material resources available for production, and substantial institutional reorganisation. This second leveraging of production potential involved basic restructuring of property rights, and tension between technology and political-economic organisation. The two revolutions’ concept is Western oriented, and needs to be reinterpreted for the Aotearoa New Zealand context. With the shift of Polynesian populations from one country to another, arguably a version of first (excepting animal herding and breeding) and second revolutions (minus urban shift) had occurred pre-contact. Post-contact, Māori were caught up in the Western version of the second revolution in the study period.

In its focus on Māori responses to the introduced economic system, this thesis develops two particular points Christopher Lloyd suggested. First, ‘while the institutional and cultural conditions of foundation were fundamental to subsequent history, so too were the indigenous ethnic, cultural, political, economic, and geographical conditions. Settler societies and economies were hybrids’. Second, extractive settler capitalism was structured and regulated in ways that were variations on a theme: ‘The combination of (a) metropolitan culture, social, relations, and institutional forms of the colonists, (b) local geographical conditions, (c) indigenous culture and economic systems, (d) global
economic and geopolitical networks and institutions’, interconnected to produce socio-economic systems peculiar to each settler society.98

The literature reviewed to this point sets up the central issues and omissions addressed by this thesis – gaps in analysis of the history of relationships of Māori to the Pākehā economy over 1860-1940, in the rural context; neglect of the informal economy as part of the total economy; and the part social capital played in facilitating or excluding Māori from various types of economic activity. The thesis is structured to address themes and phases of the relationship.

The main analytical chapters refer to four sequential time periods. The first, 1860-1890, starts with the tightening of regulations associated with the New Zealand wars, and the initial impact of the Native Land Court in the north, through to an escalation point in the gum industry. During 1890 to the early-1900s the gum industry peaked and the 1898 Dog-Tax war signalled culmination of Māori resistance to economic impositions. From 1901 to 1918, dairy factories were built, 1908 produced the crucial state activities of the Liberals, and a foreign war intervened. Finally, 1918-1940, dairying began to replace gum as the local economy base, gum sales fell precipitously, Te Kao’s communal dairy scheme started, the interwar depression struck, and the 1935 Labour government started to make its impact.

For each of these time periods a dominant theme has been isolated. The chapters then follow the themes rather than strictly adhering to the time periods. An overview (Chapter 2) sets the economic contexts of people and place, and the relationship of Māori to government leading up to the study period. The dominant theme for the 1860-90 period is negotiation of authority and access to land; Chapter 3, Contested kaupapa,

98 Lloyd, p.19.
covers national and local politics, the connection between religion, politics and economics, and land transactions. During 1890 to the early-1900s the need for, and use of, money became more pressing; Chapter 4, Contested economies, analyses Māori responses to the connections between taxes, money and the kauri gum industry, highlighting Māori commercial enterprises. After 1900, Pākehā centres transformed from settler to established communities, as itinerants deserted the declining gumfields; Chapter 5, Blessing or curse, follows the replacement of extractive industries by pastoral farming, Māori participation in World War One and limits to Māori participation in the formal economy. The fourth and final theme – Chapter 6, Rural renaissance revisited – deals with dairy farming and new forms of commercial arrangements, the hypothetical rural Māori renaissance, depression and unemployment. The roles of social capital and the informal economy, in the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy, are woven throughout the themes.
Chapter 2 – The tail of Maui’s fish

The northernmost region of Aotearoa New Zealand, north of the Maungataniwha range, is known by local Māori as Te Hiku o te Ika a Maui, the tail of Maui’s fish. The area can be divided into three broad geographical types: the Aupōuri and Karikari peninsulas of sand and swampy clay pans; the fertile river valleys and flats of Kaitaia, Oruru, Ahipara, and Hokianga; and the wooded foothills rising from these valleys to the Maungataniwha range of mountains lying east-west between the two harbours of Whangaroa and Hokianga.

Figure 1 - Place names of the far north

Three types of flora follow the same geographic divisions. By the time of first contact between Māori and foreigners, the two peninsulas had failed to regenerate their naturally destroyed kauri forests and were sparsely covered with stunted scrubby
growth. River valleys and flats supported swamp forests of kahikatea, nikau and cabbage trees. The higher ground was densely covered in kauri and other timber trees. Lying north of 35.3 degrees latitude, with a high proportion of coastline, the region’s climate was generally milder than in other parts of the country. High rainfall in winter accumulated in several large swamps. The climate supported the endemic temperate rain forests and introduced agricultural crops; the swamp-forests occupying lowland plains were the key to life-support systems of the whenua.1 Although they had hunting rights to forests, the sea was more important to Te Aupōuri, Ngāti Kurī and Ngāti Kahu people, who were more distant from forests. By 1860, the landscape had been considerably modified by 40 years of felling.

Māori communities

Even before first recollection of landfall by the Kurahaupo waka, there is evidence of prior communal human settlement from the early fourteenth century AD.2 At the hearings for the Muriwhenua fishing claim, Ngāti Kurī elders recited 23 generations of the ancient tangata whenua, Te Ngaki, ancestors prior to the Kurahaupo voyagers’ arrival.3 Within Te Hiku o te Ika, Muriwhenua, the land beyond, is the northernmost region.4 The spirits of Māori dead are said to depart from its most northern tip, Te Rerenga Wairua, for their ancient homeland, Hawaiiki. Surrounded to the north, east and west by moananui, sea and ocean, tribal borders on these three sides are clear, but
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3 Through intermarriage between Ngāti Kurī and Te Ngaki, no purely Te Ngaki descendants remained.
4 The geographical region of Muriwhenua is confined to the northern parts of Te Hiku o Te Ika, roughly north of the township of Kaitaia, but without definite boundaries that can be drawn easily on a map. The whole region of study is the area north of Hokianga Harbour on the west coast, along the Maungataniwha ranges and through to Whangaroa Harbour on the east coast. Muriwhenua is marked on Tuki’s map of 1793, clearly showing that the name existed at the time of first contact. Malcolm McKinnon, ed., New Zealand Historical Atlas; Ko Papatuanuku E Takoto Nei: Visualising New Zealand, Auckland, 1997, p.Plate 9.
boundaries between iwi are disputed. Hapū of Ngāti Kurī and Te Aupōuri inhabit this desolate peninsula.

**Ngāti Kurī**

Ko Maunga Piko te maunga  
Ko Parengarenga te moana  
Ko Te Reo Mihi te marae  
Ko Ngāti Kurī te iwi

Ngāti Kurī is considered to be the most ancient of the northern iwi. During the study period (1860-1940), the name of Ngāti Kurī became subsumed into the general nomenclature of Te Aupōuri (with whom many Ngāti Kurī had intermarried), but resurfaced in the 1980s when its members reasserted their independent identity in the Waitangi Tribunal claims’ process. Te Reo Mihi marae is located at Te Hapua, which has been a wholly or predominantly Ratana community since Taupotiki Wiremu Ratana’s visit to the north in the 1920s. In the late 1930s, a large portion of the younger members of the community relocated further south to a farm development scheme, at Ngataki, set up by the Māori Affairs Department.
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7 Ngataki Farm, BAAI 1030 361e 21/13, Archives NZ, Auckland.
The three canoes from whose occupants Te Aupōuri descend are Kurahaupo, Kahu-ki-te-rangi and Mamari. Referred to in the 1830s as the vanquished tribe, some Te Aupōuri still live in former habitations further south, most notably at Whangape, on the west coast between Herekino and Hokianga Harbours. Successive generations migrated north along the bold stretch of Te Oneroa-a-Tohe (Ninety Mile Beach) under pressure from Te Rarawa. At the last major battle between the two groups, the respected Te Rarawa rangatira, Poroa, drew a line in the sand at Hukatere intending to establish Te Aupōuri’s west coast southern boundary, but this was not accepted by Te Aupōuri. As a consequence, both Te Aupōuri and Te Rarawa claim mana whenua (authority over land) over Te Oneroa. The principal base of Te Aupōuri is the Potahi marae at Te Kao; its meetinghouse is Waimirirangi, after a Ngāpuhi ancestress. Te Aupōuri meet Ngāti Kahu at Rangaunu Harbour, where Ngāi Takoto are based.

Ngāi Takoto

Ko Tuwhakatere te tangata
Ko Kurahaupo te waka
Ko Rangaunu te moana
Ko Ngāi Takoto te iwi

8 Muriwhenua Fishing, p.257.
9 These families are mainly descended from five of the children of Whēru and Taimania: Te Horinga, Te Awa, Taiki, Mauhara and Ngaruhe. Matire Kereama (Hoeft), The Tail of the Fish: Maori Memories of the Far North, Auckland, 1967, p.xii.
10 ibid., p.43.
11 Muriwhenua Fishing, p.258.
The people of Ngäi Takoto descend from the voyagers of the Kurahaupo waka.

Following the battle which gave rise to their name, Ngäi Takoto people lived in the Hokianga region for five generations, before returning in the time of the chief Whēru to live in the Kaitaia, Awanui and Te Kao areas. Their two main bases are Waimanoni marae and the Maimaru marae at Awanui.

**Te Paatü**

The origins of Te Paatü are indistinct. One tradition is that Te Paatü is a sub-tribe of Ngäi Takoto deriving from Popata. Other traditions suggest such close linkages and shared territory with Ngäti Kahu that their origins are indistinguishable from that group, notwithstanding that they have maintained a separate identity and leadership.

Their main marae are now just south of Kaitaia at Pamapuria, Patukoraha at Kareponia, and Te Kauhanga marae at Peria. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Te Paatü (led by Popata Te Waha in 1855) were responsible for the annual, multi-community shark fishing in Rangaunu harbour.

**Te Rarawa**

Tinana, Kurahaupo, Ngatokimatawhaorua me Maamari ngā waka
Tumoana, Puhi, Nukutawhiti me Ruanui ngā tangata
Panguru, Whakakoro me Whangatauatia ngā maunga,
Hokianga, Whangape me Karirikura ngā moana
Te Rarawa te iwi

---

12 Derived from the rangatira Tuwhakatere lying down and pining to death over the loss of his favourite son, Hoka.
13 *Muriwhenua Fishing*, p.258. In his statement in support of a claim to the Native Land Court, in the late 1800s, Timoti Popata said that Pātukoraha (a hapū of Te Paatü) and Ngāi Takoto are one and the same people. Te Wera Rui Nopera, *Te Pukapuka Whanaungatanga a Nga Uri O Popata Waha Raua Ko Riripeti Tokituhi Tuohu*, c. 1994, p.62. Bases are in Taipa, Peria, Parapara, Toaotao (all in the Oruru valley) and Kareponia, Oturu and Pamapuria.
15 R. H. Matthews quoted in *Muriwhenua Fishing*, p.69. Popata te Waha was of Ngāti Kurī with strong Ngāi Takoto and Ngāti Kahu links. Through these lines he derived his fishing stations from Tuwhakatere. Popata’s wife was Riripeti Tuohu of Te Paatü, with links to Pātukoraha and Kareponia marae. Nopera, p.77.
The name Te Rarawa is some 15-18 generations old and was given to a collective of hapū sometimes referred to as Te Aewa. Unlike most other iwi in Aotearoa, Te Rarawa do not descend from one eponymous ancestor or one major migratory waka, but originate from three: Nga-toki-mata-whao-rua (which links them to Ngāpuhi); Kurahaupo (which links them to Te Aupōuri, Ngāi Takoto and Ngāti Kurī); and Tinana (which links them to Ngāti Kahu). From the early nineteenth century, Te Rarawa were dominant in population, strength and leadership in the region. Under the leadership of Tarutaru his family spread geographically through the region, marrying selectively, with the consequent ability to muster an irresistible fighting force with which to exert mana over the most cultivable land in a region characterised generally by low soil fertility. Their territory extends down the west coast from Te Oneroa-a-Tohe to Hokianga Harbour, and also inland to Pupepoto, Kaitaia and through Victoria Valley. There are numerous marae with particularly strong bases in Pupepoto, Ahipara and Hokianga.

Ngāti Kahu

Ko Maungataniwha te maunga  
Ko Tokerau te moana  
Ko Kahutianui te tupuna  
Ko Te Parata te tangata  
Ko Māmaru te waka  
Ko Ngāti Kahu te iwi  

Ngāti Kahu are closely linked with Te Rarawa through their founding ancestress, Kahutianui, the daughter of Tūmoana the rangatira of the Tinana waka. Kahutianui married Te Parata, nephew of Tūmoana and rangatira of the Māmaru waka. The Tinana is said to have been re-adzed and re-named Māmaru on its second voyage to

---

19 Matiu and Mutu, p.20.
20 Note: Māmaru waka of Ngāti Kahu is different from Māmari of Te Aupōuri and Te Rarawa pepeha.
Aotearoa. Although the Māmaru, carrying three hapū, joined the first voyagers of the Tinana in Te Rarawa territory at Te Tauroa and Te Kōhanga, a dispute between Kahutianui and her brother led her and Te Parata to relocate their hapū (Te Whānau Moana) and Te Rorohuri hapū to the east coast at Karikari and Maitai, respectively, with smaller groups scattered between Rangiāwhiao and Whatuwhiwhi. Over time, members of the two hapū spread further afield to Oruru, Taipa, Mangonui and Taemaro, but remained affiliated under the iwi name of Ngāti Kahu. The main base of Ngāti Kahu is the Whatuwhiwhi marae; Haiti-tai-marangai is their meetinghouse.

The iwi (tribal groups) of the far north relate to one another through multiple linkages. Examples of iwi and waka (migratory canoe) descent lines are mapped in Figure 3, and Figure 4, respectively. The name Muriwhenua, adopted by the elders of the five claimant groups of the Muriwhenua Fisheries Claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, refers to the common ancestress, Muriwhenua, rather than a geographical territory. The northernmost tip of Te Hiku o te Ika is said to have been named Muriwhenua (the land of the beyond) by Pohurihanga, the captain of the canoe Kurahaupo, who gave the same name to his daughter. She became the progenitor of the inter-related tribes of the far north.

---

21 Matiu and Mutu, pp.30-36. Government devolution in the 1980s led one hapū to establish an independent group, Ngāti Kahu ki Whangaroa, with settlements reaching as far south, on the east coast, as Te Ti in the Bay of Islands. The Whangaroa group chose Kahukura-ariki, the mother of Kahutianui, as their eponymous ancestor.

22 The chart is illustrative only. It is compiled from multiple sources and does not purport to represent a whakapapa that would be put forward by any one iwi. Sources include: *Muriwhenua Fishing*, pp.255-63; Dorothy Urlich Cloher, *The Tribes of Muriwhenua; Their Origins and Stories*, trans. Merimeri Penfold, Auckland, 2002, p.1 Figure 3; Matiu and Mutu.

23 Figure 4 has been drawn primarily from Kereama (Hoeft). There are some apparent anomalies, but as Matire Kereama (Hoeft) claims descent from each of the named canoes, I have taken her recitation as the primary representation.

24 Te Rarawa, Te Aupōuri, Ngāti Kurī, Ngāti Kahu, Ngāi Takoto. Te Paatū was not separately named in the claim.

25 The geographical region of Muriwhenua is confined to the northern parts of the area north of the Maungataniwha ranges, bounded in the south by Ahipara through Pukepoto, Kaitaia, the southern end of Raunganu Harbour and out to the east coast; in general terms, Te Aupōuri peninsula.

26 Cloher, pp.2, 4.
Figure 3 - Te Kupenga o ngā Tupuna – The network of ancestry

Sources: Te Whänau Moana; Muriwhenua Fishing Report; Popata Family book, Tribes of Muriwhenua

---

27 Muriwhenua Fishing: Cloher, Matiu and Mutu; Nopera.
There are many examples in pre-contact history, legend and myth of outstanding leadership displayed by Māori women.\textsuperscript{28} Women are also prominent in far northern Māori history and oral tradition. Kahutianui was the founding ancestress of Ngāti Kahu.\textsuperscript{29} Waimirirangi, known as ‘Queen of Ngāpuhi’, had seven children, from whom the northern Māori tribes descended. From two of her male descendants, Whēru and Te Ikanui, and their two daughters Kupe and Uruhainga, Aupōuri of the north descended.\textsuperscript{30} Her place in tribal history is commemorated in the naming of the wharenui at the main Aupōuri marae.

The territories of two far northern iwi are contiguous on their southern boundary with those of the confederation of Ngāpuhi tribes, with whom it was important to maintain viable relationships, often through intermarriage. Boundaries followed natural geographical features, although not slavishly.\textsuperscript{31} To sea-going people, water was a thoroughfare rather than a barrier. Groups of Te Rarawa and Ngāti Kahu relocated, in about the 1850s, to the Northern Wairoa to lands gifted to them by Te Uri o Hau hapū of Ngāti Whātua to work forests, but they have retained their Te Rarawa/Ngāti Kahu identity and relationships.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{28} For example, Muri-Rangi-Whenua, the inspirer; Rona, representing control and self-determination; Mahuika, defining women’s roles as leaders; Wairaka, challenging gender roles.

\textsuperscript{29} Matiu and Mutu, p.163.

\textsuperscript{30} Kereama (Hoeft), p.43.

\textsuperscript{31} For example, along the Maungataniwha mountain range between the two harbours, Whangaroa and Hokianga.

\textsuperscript{32} Land was gifted, at an unspecified date, specifically to the descendants of Nēpia Te Morenga of Te Rarawa, and Honi Te Koni of Ngāti Kahu. Matiu and Mutu, p.103. Honi Te Koni was also maternal grandfather of Ngawini Mare (Murray/Yates).
Figure 4 - Some migratory waka descent lines

Figure 5 - Ngāpuhi, Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu connections

Although linkages between inhabitant groups offered potential for co-operation, the groups maintained distinctly separate identities and autonomous decision-making and administration. Nevertheless, a high level of innate social capital was based on these linkages. There was also potential for non-co-operation arising out of intra-group rivalries and differences. To counter this, conscious cementing of relationships underpinned economic viability of all groups within the region.

One difference was manifested in religious affiliations. Christianity, once introduced, was quickly adopted in the 1830s, but became incorporated into Māori spirituality rather than replacing it entirely. The form of Christianity incorporated differed between groups depending on first contact, and later, on political as well as doctrinal persuasions. Māori prophetic movements attracted attention in the Hokianga area, but their influence does not appear to have extended further into the region. Religious differences did introduce tensions within groups, as might be evidenced by separate cemeteries or divisions within the same cemetery. The most extreme action was cutting in two the Te Kao meetinghouse in 1927. Religious tensions represented differences in ideology and political affiliations, which in turn affected choices about relationship to the introduced Pākehā economy. However, in the long run, religious differences were not as terminal for iwi as has been the case in Ireland or where Muslims competed with Jews or Christians. Ultimately, just as Christianity became incorporated into Māori spirituality, religious differences were generally subordinated

33 Houhora Criminal Record, June 1927, BCAI 10820 2a, ANZA: 11 men were charged with ‘wilfully damag[ing] Maori meeting House at Te Kao by cutting it in two’, on 11 April 1927. Symbolically this follows the example of the division of a body, such as is written about King Solomon’s wisdom; 1 Kings 3 v 24-25.
to iwi interests. The role of religion in economic choices for Māori has been under-acknowledged in historiography – a gap this thesis will address.

**Pākehā settlement**

Pākehā settled in the far north in successive waves, each with its own distinctive character. First, up to 1820, were lone whalers, sailors and flax traders who left their ships and joined Māori communities; second, from 1820, in the building stage of the establishment of Sydney, were groups of sawyers, felling and hauling logs to the ports of Hokianga and Mangonui for export to New South Wales, most of whom eventually merged into Māori communities. Around these activities grew modest trading settlements servicing ships and onshore workers. After 1830, the third settlements were the mission stations, established at Kaitaia and in the Hokianga, peopled either by the single male Catholic missionaries or married couples of the Protestant societies – the Church Missionary Society (CMS) and the Wesleyan Mission – and their ever-expanding number of offspring. The CMS missionaries to the far north were a second generation from the Kerikeri, Waimate and Paihia stations founded in the Bay of Islands. Hokianga’s Wesleyan station followed the failed earlier Whangaroa mission. By the 1860s the first generations of missionary children had matured, the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840, brought a governor and government, and government-encouraged settlements, based on timber, flax and agriculture, were promoted in the eastern and central Oruru and Victoria valleys, Houhora and Awanui. The Oruru Valley area was populated in 1859-60 by ‘The Ball Party’ – a group of about 80 mainly staunch Wesleyan agricultural workers, general labourers and tradesmen.

---

34 Division within a cemetery could equally be indicative of accommodation of a range of religious affiliations, and maintaining social cohesion within hapū, despite religious differences. This is evidenced at Te Kao, where the Ratana temple was built on the hill on the opposite side of the valley from the established Anglican church. Families continued to use the cemetery that surrounds the Anglican church, with a section to the west of the church set aside for Ratana adherents. Thus all are included in the hapū’s wahi tapu, regardless of religious affiliation.
persuaded by Thomas Ball, a chemist from Lincolnshire, that the working classes could make better lives for themselves in the colony than by remaining in England.\textsuperscript{35}

The 1870s were a demographic turning point for the far northern region as large-scale immigration accelerated. No combination of census regions corresponds precisely with the study region, which includes the area of the Hokianga County north of the Hokianga Harbour. The Hokianga census region includes both north and south. Generally statistics for each census region are referred to separately to distinguish regional differences. To indicate an overall trend for the study region, without undue weighting of Hokianga’s data, I have taken figures for the Mangonui County and half of the Hokianga County. For this combination, the number of Europeans more than doubled from about 550 in 1871, to 1250 by 1878; and by 1881 the census showed about 1600, an almost threefold increase in ten years.

\textbf{Figure 6 - Population change, census years 1871-1945}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{Population change, census years 1871-1945.}
\end{figure}

Source: Censuses for enumerated years, Department of Statistics.

Increases were earlier and faster in Mangonui County than in Hokianga, which was less accessible and hospitable. Just as Mangonui had become a safer port than the Bay of Islands during the Northern Wars of 1845-46, so the county became safer than

\textsuperscript{35} Neva Clarke Mckenna, \textit{Mangonui: Gateway to the Far North}, Kerikeri, 1990, pp.120-1.
other parts of the country during the New Zealand Wars of 1860-72 further south.

The later European influx to the Hokianga resulted from government sponsorship of five special settlements, of which Motukaraka was the most successful, encouraging a further 800 settlers to pour in during the 1880s. Judge Maning, the Pākehā-Māori, who died in 1883, lamented that ‘the good old times – before governors were invented, and law, and justice, and all that’, had gone. The resident magistrate, Spencer von Sturmer, complained in 1886, ‘You almost feel a stranger there seems such a crowd of new faces’. But large as this increase was, its effect was less overpowering than in the rest of the country. From the 1890s, the new faces included a distinct group, the Dalmatians, or ‘Tarara’ in local parlance.

The non-Māori population aggregated in settlements based on new economic activities, whereas Māori settlements were based on pre-European economic resources. The two sets of activities were not mutually exclusive. Where they conflicted, particularly over fertile land, competition was most intense.

---

Figure 7 - Distribution of European population 1881 - 1911

![Graph showing distribution of European population from 1881 to 1911 across various settlements in Hokianga.]

Source: Censuses for enumerated years, Department of Statistics.

---

The combined effect of the Pākehā influx and Māori decline over the 1870s reduced the proportion of Māori in the region from 88.4% to 68%. The Māori population started to recover after 1890 in the Mangonui County and about five years later in the Hokianga. Sorrenson attributed earlier recovery in Northland to earlier processing of land claims through the Land Court. But the proportion of Māori to Pākehā continued to decline to its lowest point of 45.5% immediately after World War One. Unlike most New Zealand settlements (with the exception of the East Cape and Urewera), where Pākehā numbers rapidly swamped the dwindling and relocated Māori population, Māori and Pākehā populations in the far north had equalised numerically by the end of World War Two. Here, as in the eastern areas, Māori majority or parity admitted the possibility that more effective agency could be achieved in the economic relationship with Pākehā than was the case for iwi in areas with a vast Pākehā majority.

**Figure 8 - Far north population by ethnicity 1870-1940**

![Graph showing the population of Māori, Dalmatian, and Other Euro by ethnicity from 1870 to 1940.]

Sources: Māori and non-Māori Censuses

---

Interrmarriage and interdependence

Marriage between Māori and Pākehā was a source of significant change in the economic relationship. In most cases a Māori woman married a Pākehā man, and their children usually retained close links with their Māori families. The nature of the economic exchange between Māori and Pākehā remained fully consistent with the Māori traditions for members of a self-sustaining community, within which a small number of Pākehā then lived. Land was allocated, according to the practice of tuku whenua, for habitation and use by the individuals and their descendants as long as they stayed on the land and met the expectations of the Māori community. But the land remained under the authority of the local chief who held mana whenua for the territory. The allocation did not include a right of disposition. Consequently the land was not alienated from Māori when allocated.

At least three other types of childbearing Māori/Pākehā unions had economic implications. The relationships of Dalmatian men and Māori women who met on the gumfields from the 1890s were similar to those of the earlier Pākehā-Māori, for whom birth of children signified marriage in customary form. The second type of relationship, which occurred throughout the country, was the liaisons between prominent European men and Māori women, which did not result in marriage, but the man might have provided continuing economic support to the woman and child(ren). Instances of this type of arrangement included men such as Robert Wynyard, from

---

38 The tradition of tuku whenua is discussed in Margaret Mutu, 'Cultural Misunderstanding or Deliberate Mistranslation? Deeds in Maori of Pre-Treaty Land Transactions in Muriwhenua and Their English Translations', Te Reo, 35, 1992. Mana whenua is a broad concept of power associated with the possession of lands; it is also the power associated with the ability of the land to produce for the sustenance of the people. It extends to inherited rights, the establishment of fortresses, the power to control and protect, land confiscation, conservation of chiefly status and sacred burial grounds. See Cleve Barlow, Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture, Auckland, 1999, pp.61-2.
whom Tau Henare (Wynyard), MHR for Northern Māori 1914-38, and Sir James Henare descend, 39 Gordon Coates, and the brothers William and Gilbert Mair. 40 The last had at least three childbearing relationships with Māori women of Tuwharetoa, the chiefly family of Ngāti Hokou hapū of Ngāti Awa, and Waikato hapū, whom he supported financially. 41 In the Hokianga, Wiremu Hopihana was born to Parekuratahi of Panguru, according to family oral tradition, fathered by Captain William Hobson, colonial governor 1840-42. 42 In her contributing essay to Ko Tawa, Jade Baker states ‘In the view of many iwi, women are potent beings because it is through a woman’s body that whakapapa and lineages are created and perpetuated. It is also through women, especially in a taumau (arranged marriage) relationship, that a tatu pounamu (a permanent treaty of peace) seals a pact between iwi’. 43 It is not unreasonable to suggest, as Baker does, that there might have been a similar intention in these relationships between Māori women and men of rank in the Ngāti Pākehā iwi. The third type of childbearing relationship was where the Pākehā man did not live with his


40 For a comprehensive discussion of this type of relationship, see Judith Binney, 'In-between' Lives: Studies from within a Colonial Society', in Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, eds, Disputed Histories, Dunedin, 2006.

41 One of Gilbert’s daughters (Elizabeth) worked in his brother William’s household, when she was a young woman, and another, Violet, cared for her father at the end of his life. Personal communication, Jade Baker; Paul Tapsell, Māori Treasures of New Zealand: Ko Tawa: The Gilbert Mair Collection, Auckland War Memorial Museum Tamaki Paenga Hira, Auckland, 2006, pp.74, 80-81. Notably, the two daughters, Elizabeth, by then Mrs Crapp, and Violet, are mentioned (but not identified) in the record of Gilbert Mair’s tangi in J. C. Andersen and G. C. Petersen, The Mair Family, Wellington, 1956, p.294.

42 Personal communication, Ross Gregory, June 2005; Olwyn Ramsey, In the Shadow of Maungataniwha: A History of Victoria Valley, Mangatoetoetoe and Te Puhi Districts, Kaitaia, 2001, pp.35-6. Hopihana’s birth date was not recorded; his wife was born 1842, died 1912. Wiremu died 1928. Four of their six children were baptised in Oruru between 1870 and 1874. Wiremu and Mere lie in Te Rewa wahi tapu, Paparore.

43 Tapsell, p.74.
children or their mother, but was required by law to pay maintenance for their support.\textsuperscript{44}

Patterns and forms of marriage and interdependence varied through time and between social groups. On the basis of statistical analysis of Māori/Pākehā intermarriage, over the long period 1800-1980, G. V. Butterworth proposed a chronological sequence through which the pendulum swung between approval and disapproval by governments and society, with the caveat that, whatever official or societal rhetoric and imperatives were, intermarriage remained a personal choice throughout.\textsuperscript{45} James Belich, in discussing the social dimension of swamping through the distinct phenomena of intermarriage and gene mixing, argued against fatal impact and biological assimilation through the reduction in the number of ‘pure-blooded’ Māori. Rather, he analysed the ties between the Māori population and Pākehā communities by intermarriage as they affected the economic relationships, concluding that ‘by 1900, marriage alliance had worked too well in a few regions, and was in need of revival in most.’\textsuperscript{46} Both situations applied in the far north.

Marriage and childbearing relationships were not the only basis for close economic bonds. The ‘adoption’ of missionaries by northern Māori led to interdependence, which integrated their two economies. Pākehā trading families also relied more on local Māori than Pākehā settlers in their establishment years. A third group to form close bonds of interdependence were the Native School teachers, who lived in Māori communities on land donated by Māori for the specific purpose of serving those

\textsuperscript{44} References to these payments are numerous in the court and police records. For instance Houhora Criminal Record, BCAI 10820 2a, ANZA (restricted access). Names of cases in Police and Criminal records are omitted under the terms of restriction on access to records.


\textsuperscript{46} Belich, \textit{Making Peoples}, pp.251-4.
communities; their children usually became fluent speakers of te reo (the Māori language) by association.

**The colonial economy and Māori reaction**

Europeans first approached New Zealand from the late eighteenth century as though it were an open mine, albeit with Māori gatekeepers. Market activity was concentrated in extractive industries well into the nineteenth century, the outputs of which were predominantly exported. How the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy unfolded over the period 1860-1940 was conditioned (but not determined) by preceding periods of the contact economy prior to 1840, struggle over access to and ownership of land 1840s-70s, and systematic colonisation from 1840 to the 1890s.

The contact economy was typified by exchanging timber, flax, vegetables and pork (for increasing numbers of European and American ships’ maintenance and provisions) with Western products including guns, tobacco, alcohol and sugar that would ultimately draw Māori dependently into an international capitalist system. In the far north, crops were planned to meet expected seasonal visits of ships. Far northern Māori valued these opportunities sufficiently to seek trade protection. They perceived the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840, based on the 1835 Declaration of Independence that several of the far northern chiefs signed, to be the formalising instrument, which, among other purposes, buttressed trade between British and those Māori who had declared their sovereign constitution as the Confederation of Tribes.

The Pākehā economy of the early decades following the Treaty was unstable and prone to booms and busts, due to its exposure to external markets and its lack of internal depth and breadth. Export trade exposed the economy’s participants to the

---

47 Whaling and sealing, timber, gold, gum. An industry is extractive if the rate at which a resource is removed exceeds the rate of replacement of the same resource.
vagaries of international market events. The Bay of Islands region experienced a ‘depression’ in the 1840s, in common with other parts of the country and the world but exacerbated by the government’s relocation to Auckland. The shift reduced local demand for production, which had been geared to a higher population, and simultaneously a customs duty was introduced. The end of Australia’s gold rush in the 1850s, further reduced demand from that quarter, badly affecting New Zealand wheat producers, many of whom were Māori.

In the far north, Māori anticipated increases in their trade with Europeans, and they expected to, and did, participate in new forms of agricultural economic activity. From the 1860s, however, this participation declined in favour of gum, which became a readily traded commodity. Before 1860, the scale of timber felling and flax processing had come to greatly exceed pre-contact levels. Expansion of agriculture by Māori, in order to trade with itinerant and colonising Pākehā, had involved modest change, but pastoral farming and gum extraction represented a paradigm shift. Alongside, and probably financed by, timber, flax and gum, far northern Māori acquired increasing numbers of cattle and sheep. By 1879 (when statistics were collected) some Māori owned commercial-sized flocks of sheep and participated in the wool trade. Through the period of expansive colonisation, after 1874, Māori met competition from needy (and sometimes greedy) Pākehā in the labour and land markets, and unexpected and unwelcome restrictions as the government sought to impose its sovereignty by legislation and regulation. Expansion of the Pākehā economy depended on transfer of resources from Māori by gift, allocation, confiscation or trade – fair or foul.48

48 Noel Butlin reached a similar conclusion for Australia in N. G. Butlin, Economics and the Dreamtime: A Hypothetical History, Cambridge, New York and Melbourne, 1993, p.viii. However,
The wars of 1860-72 were not the long-term economic turning point for far northern Māori; they were not involved. Rather, it was the 1862 legislation that created the Land Court; legislation that purported to protect their interests, but which Māori came to see as ‘te kooti tango whenua’ – the land taking court. Together with precedents set by the Old Land Claims’ process, the court’s processes determined the rules of the market in Māori land in the far north from 1865. Ultimately, the British had the power (military, technological, numerical, financial and organisational) to design the market structure and rebuff Māori efforts to sustain a different structure.49

There was a time lag between legal alienation and its practical effect on the Māori population. Although title to 43% of their land had passed from far northern Māori in the Muriwhenua claim area by 1865 (before the operation of the Land Court), they were not necessarily alienated from these lands immediately, as traditional use of some portions continued for an extended time.50 However, over the course of the study period, ownership and access to land diminished relentlessly, and true alienation was effected. Land loss was less noticeable during the period of population decline up to the mid-1890s. Once recovery was well underway, loss of acreage per capita inhibited the enlarged families’ abilities to subsist. In the second decade of the twentieth century, leases to Pākehā alienated further large areas of land, even where it remained in Māori ownership.

Furthermore, far northern Māori acquired little wealth from land sales or leases. Historiographical explanations of what happened to sales proceeds tend to blame

the conditions of transfer differ according to the comparative propensities to trade of Māori and Australian Aboriginals.
50 By alienation I mean loss of property rights over land – control of access to, use and disposition, rather than paper title.
either the imprudence of the sellers or the duplicity of government and other buyers. Stuart Banner argued that the cause was not individuals acting within the market, but rather the way the British structured the land market, to favour their position as buyers (and onsellers) to transfer wealth from Māori to themselves. 51 This thesis will argue that the joint actions of individuals, facilitated by Pākehā social networks comprising social capital, had a greater impact than he allows. The thesis will also challenge imprudence on the part of sellers as an explanation, on the basis that they anticipated benefits and were prepared to offer land under conditions that would attract European settlement.

By 1871, two significant occupations had emerged: mining, and coastal shipping for the growing number of coastal settlements. In 1874, mining and farming accounted for 55% of all working Pākehā males. 52 Coastal shipping provided access to external markets for far northern products, particularly flax and gum, of which Māori were the dominant contributors, but not coastal transporters. After 1870 development of rail lessened dependence on shipping for much of Aotearoa New Zealand, but rail never reached the far north, nor did roads that could support commercial traffic until well into the twentieth century. Between 1879 and 1896, New Zealand experienced its version of the international ‘long depression’. 53 The worst depression years of 1879 and 1887 fell during a period of increasing demand for gum, which sustained the far northern economy, but also attracted intensified competition by unemployed Pākehā for the resource that hitherto Māori had dominated. At the same time, Māori needed to participate in the Pākehā economy more as the need for money increased and the diminished homelands were less able to support them. The advent of refrigeration, at

51 Banner, p.47.
52 McKinnon, ed., p.Plate 56.
53 This and the earlier depressions were experienced as price- and volume-induced money contraction, rather than the current meaning of successive quarterly reductions in national income.
the end of the century, enabled scale and diversity increases for mutton, beef and
dairy products. By 1890, New Zealand’s economic tie with Australia had declined in
favour of the UK’s demand for agricultural products, which New Zealand served.

Choices Māori had about how to respond to economic opportunities were not
necessarily the same as those available to Pākehā, because of potential conflicts of
ideologies, variable acceptability of regulations and participation in their formulation.
Regulations would be more acceptable to people who stood to benefit from them;
those that encouraged and supported Pākehā settlement would probably be more
acceptable to Pākehā, if there were no corresponding benefit to Māori. Along a
continuum between engagement and disengagement were negotiated positions –
formulating terms of engagement and attempts to convert unacceptable practices into
acceptable (Figure 9).

**Figure 9 - Behavioural options for individuals, households and firms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engage</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Refrain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unequivocal acceptance</td>
<td>Equivocal acceptance</td>
<td>Maintain legitimate parallel system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully engage without adaptation</td>
<td>Path of least resistance</td>
<td>Person relocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt old activities to new opportunities</td>
<td>Adapt activity suboptimally</td>
<td>Activity relocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate new activities into traditional system</td>
<td>Person adapts suboptimally</td>
<td>Shadow Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swing &amp; part participation</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Enste, *The Shadow Economy and Institutional Change.*

---

Relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy to 1865

In the past, historians have depicted ‘Maori society as succumbing to a stronger civilisation. Subsequent writers have seen Maori society as autonomous but with areas of merger … showing a basic continuity … or as incorporating change into a traditional value scale. … Similarly, most Europeans before 1840 were incorporated, however loosely, into a tribal structure. … However, they remained European’. 55

In the pre-Treaty period of early contact, some Māori were seeing advantages in having a non-Māori, or Pākehā-Māori, living with them to facilitate trade, and thereby to enhance the wellbeing and mana of their hapū. Interestingly, the earliest recorded example in the far north was that of a Tahitian, Jem, who, in 1809, deserted the ship on which he had been returning to Tahiti at the Bay of Islands, and settled with Ngāti Kurī at the North Cape, marrying a high-born woman and acquiring rangatira status himself, and access to land. Jem had been taken as a youth from Tahiti to Sydney, where he received formal English education. His mother tongue helped accelerate his fluency in te reo Māori, which facilitated communication and trade between Pākehā and Māori. In 1814 he boarded the mission ship Active with his son and several Ngāti Kurī chiefs to visit Port Jackson, having arranged for his people to deliver a cargo of flax to the ship.56

55 http://rru.worldbank.org/Discussions/Topics/Topic37.aspx (7 February 2006), p.100 (printed version). Enste described the ‘change’ and ‘refrain’ options as ‘voice’ and ‘exit’. These categories derive from the ‘opt out’ paradigm of the informal economy, with which I disagree. The paradigm assumes that the formal economy is the norm and participants in the informal economy opt out of the formal. This paradigm is challenged in Chapter 5.
In 1831, trade in kauri started in the far north, with Captain Ranulph Dacre
establishing a number of sawyers on land Dacre had agreed with the eastern Ngāpuhi
chief Pororua they could occupy. Each of the sawyers took a Māori wife, and they
were allocated land according to the customs of the hapū with whom they were
associated. James Berghan and Thomas Flavell married daughters of the Whangaroa
chief Ururoa, thus reinforcing the Ngāpuhi connection. In the following year, Te
Paatū/ Te Rarawa chief Panakareao negotiated with the Church Missionary Society to
establish missionaries in the west, on the former Te Ahu pa overlooking present-day
Kaitaia township. Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa in Hokianga hosted the Wesleyan Mission
from 1827, a large number of sawyers and traders from the 1830s, and the Marist
mission from 1839. Earliest traders were encouraged to settle in villages, where they
invariably married daughters of local chiefs. Wesleyan missionaries were forbidden
to speculate in land, although one, William White, did involve himself in land and
trading and was consequently dismissed from the mission in 1838.57

Pre-Treaty transactions occurred in the Muriwhenua claim area 1834-40, the first
being with sawyers and missionaries. Traders and land speculators were among the
later ‘purchasers’, and the last transaction, in January 1840, by an out-of-area
missionary (Rev. Richard Taylor) was, and remains, particularly contentious.
Because English law was not introduced until the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, and
arguably was not effective for sometime thereafter, these early land transactions
clearly fell within the ambit of the Māori law and customs of the time and area, even
though they were evidenced by written documents. The basis of the transaction was
the verbal arrangements of the oral culture; the documents were symbolic to Māori
and of contractual significance only to the European parties to the transactions.

Access to land by the sawyers was through their marriage to Māori women, while the missionaries’ access was through their incorporation into the tribe of their Te Paatū/Te Rarawa hosts. Whether or not missionaries saw themselves as being ‘incorporated’ is less clear. There are several indications that the Kaitaia missionaries had a greater sense of incorporation into their host tribe than was generally the case for mission stations. Kaitaia was the first ‘second generation’ station. Three of the four founding missionaries (two newly-wed couples) arrived in New Zealand in their childhood, had been in the country for 12-15 years by the time the station was established, were fluent speakers of te reo Māori, and had some understanding of tikanga. The households and station appear to have operated monolingually in Māori, with the exception of early, infrequent visits from Europeans, and until an increase in the European population warranted English services, at least into the mid-1840s. They identified closely with their tribe, as one of them expressed in 1845: ‘although near Ngapuhi, yet we are quite distinct from them’. Deeds dated July 1835 indicate land was allocated to missionaries as individuals at the time of the births of their first children, both sons, within a week of one another. The wording of successive deeds, written in Māori by one of them, indicates a progressively clearer understanding of the Māori meaning of land allocation. Use of mission land, and that allocated to them individually, was consistent with tuku whenua during their lifetimes.

Although land documents were of symbolic rather than contractual significance to Māori, the western transactions with Panakareao, recorded in Māori, used the word tuku, meaning approximately to allocate, rather than hoko, which conveyed a meaning

58 The case is stated in my research essay: Adrienne Puckey, 'What Were the Missionaries' Understandings of Their Roles and Relationships in and to the Tribes of Muriwhenua, in the 1830s-1850s?' History research paper, unpublished, 2002.
more closely akin to buying and selling of commodities. The eastern transactions, with Pororua and others, were recorded in English, and used the words buy and sell. Although these latter deeds purported to convey land, the main attraction for the sawyers was the timber and cutting rights. Transactions in the central area around Mangonui were entered into with both Pororua and Panakareao, setting the stage for warlike conflict in 1843. Panakareao appears to have attempted to exert mana whenua over Pororua’s claim by giving the whole of the Oruru Valley to the CMS surgeon, Dr Samuel Ford, to hold on trust for local Māori according to such criteria as Panakareao approved, principal among which being that occupiers must be Christian, which Pororua was not.

Equally contentious was Panakareao’s transaction with Richard Taylor, a non-resident CMS missionary, to hold 50,000 acres of Te Aupōuri and Ngāti Kurī land at the northernmost tip of the peninsula, for the protection of certain hapū at risk. Taylor was received coolly at Parengarenga, when he finally visited a year later, as its inhabitants considered that Panakareao had no authority to deal with their land. Boundaries allegedly agreed were unclear and the transaction became confused, not the least because it was signed on 20 January 1840, after NSW Governor Gipps’ proclamation of 14 January 1840 that no private land transaction with Māori after that

60 The language distinctions of tuku and hoko have been explained in Anne Salmond, Submission for the Waitangi Tribunal Muriwhenua Land Claim Wai 45 Doc D17: The Semantic Analysis of Tuku and Hoko in Early Māori Texts, Auckland, 1991; Philippa Wyatt, 'The Old Land Claims and the Concept of "Sale": A Case Study', MA thesis, University of Auckland, 1991. The missionary to whom the writing of the deeds has been attributed was William Puckey, who had lived in New Zealand for 16 years at the time the deeds were written. His language competence was analysed by linguist, Dr. Winifred Bauer, see Joan Méte, 'Cross Cultural Communication and Land Transfer in Western Muriwhenua 1832-1840: Submission to the Waitangi Tribunal', 1992, p.151.
61 Muriwhenua Land, p.85. After his 1840 visit, Ernest Dieffenbach commented that ‘A great many of these first settlers, doubtful of being able to maintain their claims to their immense purchases, have no other object than to clear the greatest possible amount of profit in the shortest, time, even at the sacrifice of a large and invaluable forest.’ Ernest Dieffenbach, Travels in New Zealand; with Contributions to the Geography, Geology, Botany, and Natural History of That Country, London, 1843, p.228.
62 Muriwhenua Land, pp.91, 98.
63 ibid., pp.99, 104.
date would be recognised. Land Claims Commissioner Godfrey appears to have accepted that the transaction was negotiated earlier, in November 1839.64

Clearly, Pororua and Panakareao were among those Māori who saw advantages in settling Europeans in their midst. Less clear is the position of their equal-ranking contemporaries whose names do not appear on the land transaction deeds. Absences could indicate either disagreement with European settlement, failure to compete, or questionable actions of another in their territory. Transactions in the central and northern territories are examples of the latter, where Pororua and Panakareao negotiated arrangements in the territory of Ngāti Kahu, and Panakareao also negotiated for Te Aupōuri/Ngāti Kurī, sometimes with, but also without, their apparent participation or consent. Panakareao was at least indirectly connected to Ngāti Kahu through Te Paatū, and Te Aupōuri through Te Rarawa; Pororua’s Ngāpuhi connections were more remote, and neither necessarily conferred the traditional mana whenua role, which belonged to hapū. But, significantly, there was a difference in the motives for claiming mana. For Panakareao the intention was to establish long-term relations between the far northern iwi and occupants of the land; for Pororua the issue was having his dubious interests recognised for personal gain.65

Pre-Treaty land transactions were between individual Europeans and local Māori, substantially on Māori terms.66 In all of these transactions Māori expected to and did assert their continuing authority following the arrangements, and beyond the signing

---

Dame Evelyn Stokes, *The Muriwhenua Land Claims Post 1865: Wai 45 and Others*, Wellington, 2002, p.413. Inconsistently, this acceptance or assumption lends weight to the contractual basis of the transaction being the verbal rather than written agreement.


Reflecting this, the deeds specified boundaries and an approximate land area, but not with the precision of a survey. Therefore it is not possible to say exactly how much land was covered by the deeds themselves. What is possible to recognise are the outcomes of the various post-Treaty resolutions of these pre-Treaty transactions. (Table 2 shows the total acreage attributed to the pre-Treaty transactions.)
of the Treaty wherever they could. Those Europeans who accepted the nature of Māori land tenure were complicit in extending that authority. Thus, the transactions did not amount to alienation of land until some (often considerable) later time, although the ratification process, and the debate over ‘surplus’ lands, soon took the first steps in that direction. Māori bargained for a relationship, not the sale that might have been some Europeans’ preferences or intentions. The arrangement was personal – both ways probably. This feature distinguishes the pre-Treaty transactions from those following the Treaty. Māori expected pre-Treaty transactions to continue to be conducted according to the lore or custom under which they were originally entered into; some/most Pākehā saw differently.67 Post-Treaty transactions were alliances entered into by hapū with the governor, the other party to the Treaty to which far northern Māori attached particular significance for the economic relationship.

Far northern chiefs Hare Hongi, Te Awa, Te Wai, Moka, and Paerata68 were among the 35 original Māori signatories to the 1835 Declaration of Independence, which pronounced the signatories to represent a confederation of tribes holding paramount authority over their lands, and which was recognised by Britain. Panakareao, Kiwikiwi, Te Morenga, Mahia and Papahia were unable to attend the meeting and signed subsequently, along with 12 from other iwi, between 1835 and 1839. The document thus remained live amongst those in the north over the 5 years between the Declaration and the Treaty.69 It was this confederation that was referred to in the text of the Treaty of Waitangi, which all the prominent chiefs of the far north signed. They understood it as setting out the basis of social, political and economic relations between Māori and Europeans, whether settler or itinerant. Based on his study of

67 Muriwhenua Land, p.108.
68 Moka was of te Patu Heka, Matenga Paerata was from te Patu Koraha (Te Rarawa/ Te Paatū/ Ngāi Takoto). McConnell, Taua of Kareponia, p.22.
69 Matiu and Mutu, pp.219-20.
Māori narratives, Manuka Henare argued that rangatira of the period had purposive intent, exercised freedom of thought and intellectual sovereignty, and were not just open to, but were agents of, change moving towards nationhood between 1820 and 1840. 70 On these foundations, the far northern tribes laid claim to their self-determination in their economic relationships with Pākehā.

Perception of the Treaty of Waitangi as a social contract has been propounded: ‘The moral authority of governance in New Zealand is based on a social contract, perhaps more so than any other country’. 71 A social contract is between individuals in a society and its governors, in which individuals give up some rights and powers, and the governors agree to respect the rights retained and to govern subject to them.72 The first two articles of the Treaty correspond to the two theoretical parts of the social contract. The proposition holds that because European theory assumed the social contract was unwritten, this intangible English contract made necessary the third article, that Māori signatories would have the same rights and duties as the people of England. The third article had the effect of attaching the intangible, including common law.73

While some maintain an oppositional view to such an argument, that the Treaty was the documentary basis that conferred the authority to govern is generally agreed.

---

70 Henare, p.245.
73 Easton claimed the third article is reflexive, i.e. if Māori had the same rights as other New Zealanders, then other New Zealanders had the same rights as Māori – the social contract applied to all citizens of the country. Brian Easton, For Whom the Treaty Tolls, 5 February 1990, available at: http://www.eastonbh.ac.nz/article292.html (2 May 2005).
Significantly, the Treaty as social contract articulated a basis of relating economically that was congruent with the extant Māori economy, based, as it was, on social capital. But the Treaty was not just a commercial compact. Others have expounded the concept of the Treaty as covenant. Andrew Sharp argued that the ‘mix of biblical and legal language is intentional, and the idea of a covenant is said to have lain deep in Maori culture at that time’. The Waitangi Tribunal refers to the Treaty as ‘a sacred covenant entered into by the Crown and Maori’. Shane Jones recalled that in the 1960s, his Te Aupōuri and Ngāi Takoto elders, from their still strong position of faith, saw the Treaty as kawaneta, ‘it was a covenant between their tupuna, marked with the moko, and blessed in the presence of God’, a perception that loses lustre in a secularised society. In essence the elements of social contract are present in the biblical covenant. Whether as social contract or covenant, far northern Māori held the Treaty to support the basis of trade in land, timber and other exchanges.

The Treaty created a disjuncture between pre- and post-1840 land transactions. Post-Treaty transactions did not establish a personal relationship between Māori and the individual settlers, who would ultimately buy from the government parts of the subdivided blocks. Rather, the Treaty prohibited individual purchasing. Nevertheless, the two sets of transactions were connected in respect of principles on both sides; pre-
Treaty transactions set the pattern of the transactions that followed up to 1865. The Old Land Claims’ process set new precedents.\textsuperscript{80}

In the Muriwhenua land claim, Crown grants for pre-Treaty transactions and the ‘surplus’ arising from them amounted to 47,394 acres, compared with over 280,000 acres purchased by the government between 1850 and 1865 (Table 2). Particular aspects of the old land claims applied also to pre-1865 Crown purchases, but with greater significance, because the latter were so much more extensive. Old land claims were the forerunner of Crown purchases in that they set the pattern of extinguishment that the Crown repeated with its subsequent purchases.\textsuperscript{81} The connection between old land claims and Crown purchases was not only in principle, but also in the parts played by key men. Of interest in the northern area is the career of William Bertram White at Mangonui, a former New Zealand Company surveyor and Native Land Purchase Commissioner. White carried this influence into the study period when he practised conflicting roles, including judge of the Native Land Court 1865-69. He might well have seen these roles as logically related rather than conflicting.

However, as holder of all government offices for the district, in the Waitangi Tribunal’s assessment White more regularly upheld his own law rather than the British law he was appointed to.\textsuperscript{82}


\textsuperscript{81} ibid., p.75. Crown purchases were characterised by lack of an adequate Māori version of the story. While Māori gave evidence about the transactions in these hearings, the evidence was recorded as a translation into English. Thus commissioners failed to allow Māori to speak with their own voice, which makes it difficult to establish whether or not Māori knowingly and willingly consented to ‘extinguishment’. Certainly they were not consulted over ‘surpluses’, and were not in agreement. Scrip and surplus land issues arose during many Crown purchase negotiations, and even more than the old claims, Crown purchases threw up further issues with respect to native reserves.

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Muriwhenua Land}, p.187; Stokes, p.19.
During the 1850s, government officials started negotiations in earnest with far northern Māori to purchase large contiguous blocks of the most fertile lands, on which to settle Europeans. Panakareao continued to encourage settlement and readily participated in discussions, on the basis that these were under his authority. He was concerned that too few settlers were entering the region, and the economy was in decline, following the government’s shift to Auckland. Some of his people had followed an employment trail to the kauri logging centres at Hokianga and Whangaroa, and some Ngāti Kahu had migrated to the northern Wairoa. But through all the discussions he remained adamant that Victoria Valley should be excluded and retained in Māori ownership. To this end he sought to extend his control beyond the grave by insisting on his burial there with his wife, thus creating a tapu area. However, Resident Magistrate W. B. White arranged for both to be exhumed and Ati to be returned to her people. Panakareao’s remains were reinterred at the mission cemetery and two other locations. While having mission ground imbued with Pana’s mana would conform to tikanga Māori, it would be stretching credibility to suggest that the missionaries did not suspect White’s ulterior motive and at least tacitly support it.

Government land purchasing efforts were concentrated in three stages. The first stage, until 1859, focused on a narrow central band from Ahipara through to Kaitaia, Awanui, Taipa and Mangonui, connecting east and west at the base of the peninsula. The second stage, 1859-65, concentrated on the main valleys, extending outwards from the central line by a series of connected block purchases with the intention of bringing the whole of that fertile district into connection with the port of Mangonui. The third stage, which continued after 1865, dealt with the remainders and extremities

83 Muriwhenua Land, pp.190-1, 303-6.
but was part of the same thrust to acquire as much of the remaining Māori land as possible for European settlement. There was a lull while the Native Land Court investigated titles, but the drive proceeded under policies of the Immigration and Public Works Acts of 1870 and 1873, and included reserves from earlier purchases, Victoria Valley and outer areas mainly from Kaitaia south to Whangape. The range of transactions is summarised in Table 2.

Table 2 - Summary of land transactions before the Native Land Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title change and Crown assumption acres</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crown grants pre-Treaty</td>
<td>20774 Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Surplus'</td>
<td>26621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown purchases 1850-65</td>
<td>280179 Notes 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>327574</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

(1) Excluding grants to men with Māori wives.
(2) Crown assumed further 64,136 acres for Taylor, Muriwhenua East & Oruru valley without declaring surplus.
(3) Access to Crown lands continued through gumdigging period.

Although it has been assessed that 43% of the Muriwhenua claim lands had legally changed hands by 1865, leaving 57% (approximately 427,000 acres) to Māori who, at that time, comprised about 90% of the population, in effect far northern Māori still had access to, and used most of, the ‘alienated’ land. Sawyers’ extended families used land granted to them, Māori continued to use mission and missionaries’ lands, Crown purchases remained largely unoccupied and, even when some was leased to Pākehā for depasturing, Māori understood they had the right to dig gum on the Crown-owned land. The shadow of ownership was yet insubstantial.

---

84 ibid., pp.212-16.
The *Muriwhenua Land Report* identified several factors most likely to have influenced Māori in entering into the transactions: their desire for European settlement because of their expectation of benefits it would bring, their perception of an alliance with the governor, and traditional beliefs. Even as Māori in the central North Island had taken arms to stem the flow of Europeans, settlement in the north was supported, because Māori were the majority population and saw themselves as being in control. In this respect the motivations and circumstances are consistent with those identified by Angela Ballara in her re-evaluation of the land alienation process. However, Māori ambitions and government plans diverged in concept and intent. While the government could see only a land sale, Māori saw a plan for

---

85 Stokes, p.12 figure 2. Map drawn by Max Oulton, reproduced with permission.
86 Angela Ballara, 'The Pursuit of Mana? A Re-Evaluation of the Process of Land Alienation by Maoris, 1840-1890', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 91, 4, 1982. Although, W. B. White, had been appointed Inspector of Police in 1848, and later Resident Magistrate, he was a lone presence removed to the east of the main population, and his authority did not match that of local Māori leaders of the time.
settlement, where they would be partners with the governor and substantial
beneficiaries in a new economic regime.\textsuperscript{87}

The proportion of land bought by the Crown in the period 1850-65 (mainly from 1856
on) was many times greater than the pre-Treaty transactions; the 1870s purchases
mopped up most of the remaining fertile lands. The 1856 breakpoint in transactions
occurred in the year of Panakareao’s death, which event it has been suggested created
a vacuum in the far northern leadership.\textsuperscript{88} I would argue that any gap in competent
leadership might have been more a European perception and predilection for dealing
with one person on behalf of a larger group. If a gap existed, it would have been in
one aspect of leadership, rather than leadership itself; there were other competent
leaders at the time. Because the relationship of leaders to their communities cannot be
understood apart from the economic arrangements of the communities, it is important
to establish this point.

Panakareao cultivated relationships with those Pākehā whom he considered would
enhance his power base.\textsuperscript{89} He might well have been more convinced of his strategy
than some of his contemporaries, but they had not bridged between the two cultures
as assertively as he had. Following Panakareao’s death, the gap was rather in the lack
of established relationships (bridges). The bridging issue coalesced with the rise of
internal conflicts about policies in relation to land sales, combined with a tradition
that political succession was not as immediate as in European culture (The king is
dead, long live the king). A rangatira’s mana is often held to remain for a time after
his death.

\textsuperscript{87} Muriwhenua Land, pp.181-2.
\textsuperscript{88} ibid., p.181; O’Malley and Robertson, p.8. Panakareao and Ereanora had one daughter who did not
take a leadership role. When he died, the oldest of Panakareao’s second family (four children in union
with Ere Awarau) was only four.
\textsuperscript{89} Muriwhenua Land, p.183.
The signal event of Panakareao’s death highlights the importance of social capital and bridging in the economic relationship. For as Tu Williams noted: ‘A key issue for Maori is the process of moving from bonding (iwi-based) social capital that holds a group together, to bridging social capital that enables one iwi to connect with another and with the non-Maori community.’90 How this bonding and bridging affected the relationship of Mäori to the Päkehä economy in the study period is explained in the next chapter, Contested kaupapa.

---

90 Williams and Robinson, 'A Maori Perspective', p.16.
Chapter 3 – Contested kaupapa: law, land, god

and politics

Formal and informal economic activities were distinguished in Chapter 1 on the behavioural basis of ‘whether or not the activity adhered to the established, prevailing institutional rules of the game’. These rules were inchoate and in transition during the period under study – Māori and Pākehā each sought to manage, if not control, the process in accordance with their own sets of rules. How one set was disestablished and the other came to prevail is the subject of this chapter. Change came slowly to the north, but accelerated from 1859, causing turbulence until the determining event of the Hokianga ‘Dog-Tax War’ of 1898. Contested kaupapa was the central economic issue for these four dynamic decades.

Many economists and economic historians emphasise the role of institutions in a country’s economic development, explaining that the ways in which a society’s institutions mitigate the fundamental problem of voluntary exchange of scarce resources determine its efficiency and distribution.¹ At the central institutional level, economics and politics are inseparable. This first analytical chapter addresses institutional decision-making and the structural element of a market economy. However, the peopling of institutions influences both structures and implementation of their edicts. Institutions were also potential sites of employment and economic engagement for Māori. For this reason, more emphasis is placed in this thesis on the

social context of Māori and new institutions. In particular the role of religion is analysed, both with respect to churches as institutions (economic as well as politico-religious) and the integration of church with the politico-economic Pākehā institution of government. The process by which rules changed is explained by first surveying broad-level national and local decision-making, and politics of organisation. This survey shows the extent of Māori initiatives to retain autonomy, particularly with respect to land. Second, the role of religion in forging social connections, to build bridging social capital between Māori and Pākehā institutions, is elucidated. Beyond institutions and social contexts, resource endowment is also an important determinant of economic outcomes. This is addressed in later chapters.

The significance of contested kaupapa (rules’ contestation) lies in the part it played in shaping, but not determining, how and in which part of the Pākehā economy Māori would, or could, engage. Māori interactions with Pākehā depended on the prevailing law and its enforcement. However, law and enforcement could differ greatly. The contest of rules had negligible impact on economic transactions between exclusively Māori parties, who continued to exchange among themselves according to kaupapa Māori, until money became useful to them. And between Pākehā and Māori, as well as between exclusively Pākehā parties, some economic transactions were conducted with disregard for, or in contravention of, Pākehā rules. The relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy was not restricted to activities that conformed to Pākehā regulations; there were many informal transactions. Therefore, the full significance of the contest of rules lies not just in the prescription and proscription of Māori involvement in the formal Pākehā economy, but also in defining what would ‘officially’ be regarded as a shadow or informal economy, with its sometimes-pejorative connotations.
At the heart of decision-making concerns was mana whenua. Land was ‘the foundation stone of the native economic system’, as well as the basis of their social structure and sense of identity. Consequently, rules affecting land were the most strongly contested, and changes to such rules had the most profound effect on social and economic interactions of Māori and Pākehā. In the colonising contest, understanding the juridical process in state formation ‘cannot be separated from its economic role in facilitating the settlement of land for farming’. A selected range of transactions is used to illustrate principles of rule changes in relation to land ownership and access in the far north.

The historiography of Māori and the politics of colonisation was refreshed in a series of broadcast talks in 1965. J. G. A. Pocock fitted the themes from these talks to a model used by political scientists, which was, at that time, seen to be common to a number of colonised countries, and then he analysed their divergence. A succession of writings, following Pocock’s, sought a deeper understanding of the social and political interplays, and challenged some of the conformity Pocock found. In particular, the concept that pre-contact social and political structures largely

---

2 Firth, *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, p.447.
5 The volume of material available on land transactions could overwhelm this study. While land transactions were a dominant influence on the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy, my objective is to set them within the context of the wider economic interaction. Because patterns and principles are more important to this subject than the detail, I deal with land transactions in a substantially summarised fashion, using selected examples to illustrate principles, rather than to represent a comprehensive picture, and concentrate on the largest acreage blocks and distinctive complexities.
6 Pocock, pp.5-12.
disintegrated under Western impact, and the idea that any vestiges were retained, in
isolation or under paternal control, for Western political purposes, were found not to
reflect adequately the agency of Māori. Themes of conflict and compromise, protest
and co-operation, elucidating a dichotomy of responses by Māori, recurred regularly
in the late 1960s-90s.8 In response to Alan Ward’s *A Show of Justice*, which was a
thorough interrogation of nineteenth-century government policies and legislation
aimed at integration,9 Kwen Fee Lian addressed the influences that politicised Māori
up to the Ratana era of the 1920s, bringing many of the ideas produced by the New
Zealand writings together with those of overseas socio-political theories.10 In his
publications spanning 1986-2001, James Belich placed the political and economic
interpretations in a broader social context, exposing in the process previously
unrecognised successes of Māori initiatives and strategies.11

Building on these, and his own earlier works, Richard Hill argued that ‘ongoing
Maori structural and conceptual reorganisation, reflecting Maori aspirations to
become as autonomous from the state and the institutions of the dominant culture as
possible’, persisted into post-nineteenth-century history.12 Hill’s work on the first
half of the twentieth century followed his earlier collaborative writing (with Vincent
O’Malley), which bore witness to the vigorous exercise of Māori agency at local and

---

9 Alan Ward, *A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth Century New Zealand*, Canberra,
1974.
10 Two of the more relevant here are: Lian, ‘State and Tribal Political Development in a Settler
Society’; Kwen Fee Lian, ‘Tribe, Class and Colonisation: The Political Organisation of Maori Society
11 James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, Auckland,
national levels over the mid-nineteenth to twentieth centuries. In turn, O’Malley, working with Stephen Robertson, confirmed the strength of Māori agency in the far northern area in the late nineteenth century. Although economics provided the impetus for challenging access to, and use of, resources, the political (referred to later as the hardware and software of colonisation – war and law) rather than the economic relationship, was the focus of these writings. Hill challenged that generations of ‘traditional’ historians had missed the fundamental point that the state possessed overwhelming power, which it would use to pursue its purposes, these being as much economic as political.

However, as noted in the introduction to this chapter, many economists and historians have placed considerable emphasis on the role of institutions in explaining a country’s economic development. In the decade 1980-1990 they were saying: ‘The role of the state in settler societies cannot be overestimated’; ‘The state performs essential tasks of adjustment and integration. This will be especially the case where social formations are in transition … and there are considerable conflicts of economic (and political) forces’; ‘the state, as a set of institutions, influences the ability of different social forces to realise their interests through political action’. In the 1990s, Avner Greif expanded the debates, still believing that ‘lacking an appropriate theoretical framework, economists and economic historians have paid little attention to the relations between culture and institutional structure’, which he considered to be at the heart of economic development. Further, ‘the analysis of the interrelationship
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14 O’Malley and Robertson.
15 Hill, State Authority, Indigenous Autonomy, p.266.
16 Lian, ‘State and Tribal Political Development in a Settler Society’, p.66.
between political and economic systems in bringing about … economic growth has been neglected’.19 In 2000 he claimed ‘we know very little about the institutional foundations of markets in past and present societies’, and wanted to call ‘attention to the need, ability and promise of studying the historical evolution of institutions that mitigated the fundamental problem of exchange’.20 By now, there is a large body of research on institutional economics and its history.

Important as it is, I find the narrow focus on institutions inadequate for explaining economic relationships and changes in them. Most historians recognise that ‘religious ideology has played a significant role in articulating protest and inspiring political activity’ in Māori society,21 with reference to such prophetic movements as Pai Marire, Ringatu, and Ratana. But very few acknowledge the politico-religious aspect of Anglicanism in the Māori context. John Stenhouse alluded to the possibility, but chose not to pursue it, in his analysis of God and Government, because of limitations of understanding.22 The gap needs to be addressed, and will be here.

Compared with other colonies, New Zealand was one where the greatest proportion of land was acquired by purchase rather than conquest. From 1844, the British government recognised Māori as possessing full property rights in all of the colony’s land (ignoring a momentary dalliance with the ‘wasteland’ doctrine in the late 1840s, which Governor Grey refused to adopt). It also recognised that clichés (the pen is mightier than the sword; he who holds the pen holds the power) could hold true, but
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19 His general statement was applied in particular to the late medieval commercial revolutions, which were a watershed in the economic history of Europe.
21 Lian, ‘State and Tribal Political Development in a Settler Society’, p.78.
the power rested on the military, technological, financial and organisational capability of the British. However, the penny is also mightier than the sword. Military power is expensive. While the British had the wealth to support its warring, spending it on fighting militated against the higher imperative of economics – one of the primary objectives of colonisation was wealth gain. Thus the software of imperialism – products of the pen such as law, regulation, accounting, education and literacy, which are all elements of Pākehā cultural capital – was exercised in preference to the hardware of war.

Notwithstanding such a challenge, Māori exercised the political choices available, but with varied success for economic outcomes. John Williams argued that Māori politics were an interplay between protest and co-operation, and that while it was tempting to say that more was achieved by co-operating, in fact many of the achievements of co-operation should be attributed to the pressure of protest. Māori attitudes to, and motivations for, land sales have been subjected to scrutiny by a number of historians. Ann Parsonson stressed the issue of mana for validating authority over particular land blocks. While Angella Ballara agreed mana might have been the motivator before 1860 and while Māori were in a sound negotiating position, she emphasised that the need for money claimed primacy after 1860, and insecurity of tenure would prompt hapū to make dubious claims.

Stuart Banner suggested that historians focussing on the conduct of individuals acting within the market in Māori land had been blinded to the allocative effects of markets’ constitutive rules, by having a poor theoretical understanding of the relationship
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between law and markets. He argued instead that the British modified the *structure* of the land market, intentionally and/or inadvertently, by legal process and practical application of law and English custom, to transfer wealth from Māori to themselves.²⁶

Kwen Fee Lian made a similar connection by identifying two types of state activity: the political function of securing law and order and defending territorial integrity, and the equally important economic role.²⁷

Doubtless, the prime example of the structuring and application of law was evident in the Native Land Court. David Williams made the significant point that in the nineteenth century the Court was not an independent body but an instrument of government settlement policy.²⁸ Drawing on the work of other historians,²⁹ he concluded that:

Informed historical research and writing tend to conform to an orthodoxy that the [Native Land] Court distorted social relations within Māori communities. It is also generally accepted that these distortions of tikanga Māori had consequences which were beneficial for Crown and private land purchase agents. They encouraged or cajoled Māori to resort to the Land court and then diligently fostered the alienation into the hands of settlers of individualised Māori interests in what shortly before had been tribal land.³⁰

Using much the same information as Banner, Keith Hooper and Kate Kearins argued that ‘[a]ccounting functioned as “the software of imperialism” making it possible to enclose, price and levy charges’ in a process of wealth confiscation under the Liberal

²⁶ Banner, p.47.
²⁷ Lian, 'State and Tribal Political Development in a Settler Society', p.69.
²⁹ Kawharu, Gilling, Ward, Hill, Sorrenson, Ballara, Parsonson and others.
³⁰ Williams, *Te Kooti Tango Whenua*, p.20.
government, which continued to use Māori land as a source of revenue until it was effectively exhausted.31

The common thread of argument between Banner and Williams, and Hooper and Kearins, was that law and accounting were used to distance and depersonalise the Crown’s relationship with Māori; ‘[t]he “objectivity” and technical fairness of accounting not only allows control at a distance but allows others in government and business to distance themselves’.32 The same wording could be used to describe law and the oft-touted principle of ‘one law for all’. These devices of plausible deniability, used to shift responsibility and blame, were the very antithesis of the kanohi-ki-te-kanohi (face-to-face), social-capital basis of the Māori economic system.

Having concurred with the view that decision makers on both sides, through time, ‘understood the other very well indeed in the direct conflict of interest over the land and its resources, and over the control of state power’,33 Hill was concerned with the strategies and tactics Māori employed to resolve the problem of organising in a way that could build on this understanding and generate desired results. Likewise this part of the thesis considers how Māori dealt with the threat and reality of imposition of a differently based economic system. In this respect the surprisingly early (1954)

and almost forgotten writing of Robert Merrill makes its contribution. Merrill questioned how Māori achieved appreciable economic growth, involving considerable investment, 1840-1860 within a non-Western and apparently unfavourable cultural milieu of kinship-related institutions. He concluded that the effect on economic growth of any social institution depended on whether economic changes were brought about by individual or group-oriented action, which is supported by my research.

Avner Greif hints at a contrary conclusion in his comparison of the economic efficiency of individualist (Genoese) and collectivist (Maghribis) societal organisations. And yet his conclusion appears to be based on the very assumptions that Merrill was questioning, particularly that ‘the division of labor is a necessary condition for long-run sustained economic growth’ and therefore ‘formal enforcement institutions that support anonymous exchange facilitate economic development’.

This chapter draws heavily on the *Muriwhenua Land Report* of the Waitangi Tribunal, Dame Evelyn Stokes’ report for post-1865, and several of the national theme research reports of the Tribunal, with the purpose of drawing this valuable research into mainstream historiography. The Muriwhenua and Stokes’ reports record the details of the transactions in the area roughly equivalent to the present-day Mangonui County, over the period from 1830 into the twentieth century; the national theme reports collate research that applies to the whole of the country.

The *Muriwhenua Land Report* records the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal after taking into consideration both the Crown’s and the claimants’ positions, Stokes’ report presents information from the claimants’ perspectives. Both interpret historical
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evidence focussing on government action and responsibility towards and affecting Māori, particularly with respect to land. As explained earlier, they are juridical histories written for the purpose of enabling a judge to examine:

acts and omissions in the past … to find among them those that have constituted present just and proper relationships; what it is that authorises and establishes them; he has not much other interest in the past. … it is the judge’s job to attend to the discrepancy between the distorted present and the authoritative past … to restore the parties to the relationship once rightly set up but subsequently wrongly distorted or destroyed by unauthorised and destructive past acts and omissions.37

While this thesis is also concerned about relationships, and what it is that authorises and establishes them – and there are thin lines between assessment, opinion, argument and judgement such that my writing cannot necessarily be labelled non-judgemental – its points of departure from juridical history and the Waitangi Tribunal claim reports are several. First, the thesis is less concerned with what is just and proper, rather it describes and argues causal links; second, it focuses on the economic relationship between Māori and Pākehā more than the political or fiduciary; and third, the economic relationship extends to all Pākehā, not just the Crown’s relationship to Māori. Specifically, this chapter is interested in how Māori dealt with an economic environment being changed by tauiwi (foreigners), within which environment land was one, albeit a dominant, element.

Decision-making and political organisation

By 1860 far northern Māori had been living in continuous contact with small groups of European settlers for 30 years. Their numbers had already declined through the effects of introduced disease, but the population was about to be dealt another severe body blow. The worst outbreak of typhoid fever in about 45 years spread rapidly

37 Sharp, p.34.
from an American whaling ship berthed at Mangonui, affecting mainly children and men. The church doors were closed for more than eight weeks, to try to curb contagion.\(^\text{38}\) The epidemic appears to have abated by the mid to late 1860s.\(^\text{39}\)

Notwithstanding this tragedy, far northern Māori had demonstrated willingness and ability to be at the forefront of engagement in new decision-making bodies. Theirs was a willingness to co-operate rather than resist, but willingness that fell short of collaboration. The path chosen had its origins in earliest European contact. As Panakareao put it to the Treaty hui in Kaitaia, on 28 April 1840, ‘My grandfather brought the Pakehas to this very spot, and the chiefs agreed with what my grandfather did. He went on board the ship and got trade. ... Let us act right as my ancestors did. … Let us do them [the Pakehas] no harm. …We have always been friendly with the Pakehas’.\(^\text{40}\)

Māori engaged with the Pākehā economy as individuals and as communities. Key economic decisions affecting Māori communities in the far north, as in pre-European contact times, were usually made by a rūnanga of elders of a hapū, which was the effective social and political unit of Māori society.\(^\text{41}\) Rangatira of the hapū were traditionally chosen on the basis of both descent lines and demonstrated leadership skills, and were usually expected to guide their people towards consensus-based, rather than unilateral, decisions.\(^\text{42}\) Although it might have been preferable to trace descent from the most important ancestor through male lines, in practice, where a


\(^{39}\) Over the winter of 1867, 20 Māori were treated at the mission station and no deaths occurred, and 11 were treated in 1868 and all survived. ibid., pp.501, 517.


\(^{42}\) Hill and O’Malley, ‘Maori Quest for Rangatiratanga’, p.2.
woman’s line ranked higher the matrilineal line would be traced. For instance, Nga-Kahu-Whero had authority to establish land boundaries and to give land to people, and trees growing on the land in her Waihou area could only be felled with her permission; and Panakareao’s wife, Ereanora, signed the Treaty of Waitangi in Kaitaia in April 1840, in addition to him, her rank being senior to his. At her death, Ereanora was described as ‘a strange mixture of violence and kindness, once ruling the tribes with a rod of iron’.

During the period of early contact the pattern of community decision-making continued; there was no need to change or adapt until more formal or official government-related communications commenced. But between 1860 and 1940, Māori groups adapted to contact with national and local governments, farming communities, and local and export businesses. Traditional rūnanga encountered new Pākehā group forms. National movements such as Kingitanga, Kotahitanga and Ratana influenced decisions and formation of some of these groups. But, as James Ritchie noted, neither Pākehā nor government could ‘control or direct social change in the Māori world’.

The first of the ‘formal’ contacts in the far north was with missionaries of the Church Missionary Society from 1832. Being church-based, some formal structures were introduced along with Christianity. Committees for churches and schools were formed, and a system for instructing lay-readers was introduced by 1838. The pattern
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45 W. G. Puckey to CMS, 8 May 1848, WGP, L&J, p.192.
46 For example, church and school committees, Mothers’ Union, Farmers’ Union, Māori Division of Country Women’s Institute. During and after World War Two, the Māori War Effort Organisation and Māori Women’s Welfare League took on more functions as state-sanctioned new institutions.
of Māori group decision-making changed little before 1840, apart from participation
of missionaries in those activities that touched church life. But where these did, some
changes crept in; for example, undermining the influence of tohunga and failure to
acknowledge mana wahine – the influence of women in community decision-
making.\textsuperscript{48}

Māori in the north expected little change to their organisation and decision-making
after 1840, given their right of rangatiratanga in the Treaty of Waitangi’s Article Two.
With a small settler population and limited military, police and financial resources,
early governors were seldom in a position to impose their will as they might have
wished, according to their understanding that Article One ceded governorship to the
Crown. British sovereignty had little impact where Māori continued to govern their
affairs according to their own customs and laws. Far northern Māori sometimes
allowed one of their people to be tried according to British law, but the resident
magistrate carefully obtained consent for a trial from the chiefs, who would then hear
the case in the magistrate’s presence. Even a case that ought to have been heard in
the Supreme Court was dealt with locally because the old people could not travel.\textsuperscript{49}

As late as 1868, trial followed after the accused had been subjected to Māori custom
and law, whether the crime be against a fellow Māori or a Pākehā.\textsuperscript{50} In these areas of
little more than ‘nominal sovereignty’, such as the far north, British influence
generally relied on efforts of ‘moral suasion’ – a continuation of the missionary
influence.\textsuperscript{51} Mangonui’s Resident Magistrate White, commenting on the proposed

\textsuperscript{48} Matiu and Mutu, p.63.
\textsuperscript{49} W. B. White to Native Secretary, 6 August 1861, BAFO 10852 2a (previously A760/11), pp.69-71,
ANZA; White to Native Secretary, 27 November 1861, BAFO 10852 2a, pp.96-98, ANZA.
\textsuperscript{50} William Gilbert Puckey, annual letter year ending 31 December 1868, Journals and Letters, 1831-68,
typed transcript, qMS-1665-1666, and microfilm MS-Copy-Micro-0019, Alexander Turnbull Library,
pp.525-6; O’Malley and Robertson, p.100.
\textsuperscript{51} Hill and O’Malley, ‘Maori Quest for Rangatiratanga’, p.4.
Resident Magistrates Act of 1867, wrote ‘I am generally opposed to exceptional laws, but in districts like this so distant from a large European population, it must take a greater time to thoroughly eradicate native prejudices and customs’.  

From the 1850s the advantage of strength in numbers was recognised. The two main unifying movements – Kingitanga (1850s) and Kotahitanga (1880s) – although pan-tribal, operated through tribal structures, the former developing partly in response to the threat of land ‘sales’, and the latter to the broader issue of self-determination. Towards the close of World War One, the Ratana movement gathered momentum, operating outside the tribal structure as a pan-tribal Māori collective, and focussing on current economic issues and honouring of the Treaty of Waitangi. While far northern tribes stood aloof from the Kingitanga movement, they were significantly involved in Kotahitanga. Their response to the Ratana movement of the 1920s (discussed later in this chapter) was initially more divisive than the Protestant/Catholic rift had been in the previous century.

The New Zealand Constitution Act of 1852 provided for self-governing Māori districts and for provincial and general assemblies but, in practice, legal technicalities generally precluded proclamation of the districts. Against these odds, in 1859 Mangonui became the first district to be proclaimed under the Native District Regulations Act of 1858. Rūnanga within this district were empowered to issue by-laws on matters of local concern, under the chairmanship of a Pākehā official. The Native District Circuit Courts Act provided for circuit Pākehā court judges to enforce
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these laws with the assistance of local Māori Assessors, although, as has just been discussed, initially the roles of enforcement and assistance were somewhat reversed in the far north.

Arguably, Mangonui set a precedent as a Māori District because the tribes of the far north had chosen a path of cooperation with the Crown, in contrast to that of resistance demonstrated by Hone Heke’s faction of Ngāpuhi. Mangonui’s port became more important during the turbulent 1840s, and the area’s stable missionary influence had been established early in the 1830s, before the CMS’s push south. W. B. White was posted to Mangonui, in 1848, as Collector of Customs and Inspector of Police, with a detachment of 12 armed constables, including some Māori. When he was appointed Resident Magistrate later in the same year, the two foremost chiefs of Te Rarawa, Nopera Panakareao and Puhipi (Busby) of Pukepoto, were nominated as Assessors by a meeting of chiefs at Kaitaia. Panakareao challenged White’s authority and control of trade and customs, whereas, Ward argued, ‘the working partnership of White and Puhipi … demonstrated possibilities in the Resident Magistrate and Assessor system far richer than the formal duties set out in the Ordinance’. Panakareao’s influence in both Pākehā and Māori spheres was waning. It is questionable whether he had held the mana attributed to him by Pākehā from the time of the mission establishment to the signing of the Treaty. Three years before
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58 ibid., pp.78-9.
59 Panakareao’s paramountcy had not been accepted by all iwi and hapū. See Angela Ballara, Panakareao, Nopera? – 1856, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 16 December 2003, available at:
the first Rūnanga was established, Panakareao died. The experimental Rūnanga might have been an opportunity for northern Māori were particularly receptive to, because an inter-tribal power struggle developed between the many able chiefs in the district following Panakareao’s death.  

The responsibilities of the experimental District Rūnanga established in 1859 were extended to allow adjudication on land titles. This enhanced body was provided for retrospectively in the Native Land Act of 1862, along with the Native Land Court (which did not become active until 1865), but the Mangonui District Rūnanga had been established as a model before the Act was passed. The Rūnanga had been set up with 13 Native Assessors receiving £100 for the year. By 1862, seven chiefs, the most important of the district, had been elected to the District Rūnanga, at salaries of £40 each per annum, with three wardens and 14 karere (constables) to assist them (Appendix 1). Alan Ward argued that some chiefs were chosen as Assessors specifically because they favoured land-selling, but men appointed by the resident magistrates were generally chosen for the purpose of promoting law and order. Both elements featured in the selection of far northern Assessors, as later sections of this chapter show. Ward and Hill agree that Assessors accepted appointment to enhance or protect their power in the process of engagement with the Pākehā system. Ward adds a dimension of prestige for the chiefs, whereas Hill emphasises the aspect of Māori appropriating new institutions, established by Pākehā, for their own purposes. Far northern Māori motives will also be discussed later in this chapter.


60 Muriwahoe Land, p.305; O’Malley and Robertson, p.186.
61 O’Malley and Robertson, pp.7, 16.
The first meeting of the Mangonui Rūnanga (29 July-1 August 1862) under the Act generated much local Māori and Pākehā interest. By-laws on fences, taking of a census, and court fees and fines were passed. Resident Magistrate White and Pākehā observers commented favourably on the intelligence and capability of the meeting’s conduct. Te Rarawa ki Hokianga, who had been arbitrarily included under the Bay of Islands county, requested that their tribe be united under the scheme.63 However, local enthusiasm and interest was not shared further afield. An Auckland paper expressed horror that European settlers would be subject to ‘Maori law administered by Maoris’,64 as though that had not been the situation in earlier times.

Ultimately the Rūnanga met more Pākehā objectives than Māori aspirations. Despite disputed ownership of substantial areas of land that had been acquired by the Crown prior to 1862, none was referred for investigation. Local disillusionment had led to efforts by Hemi Kahoe to establish an ‘outside Rūnanga’ – outside the restraints of European law and conducted on Māori principles.65 Following its fourth meeting (28-30 March 1865) Resident Magistrate White reported that he ‘did not consider it necessary to invite the Runanga to pass resolutions as to the government of the district, as I wish to lead them to accept the laws in force amongst the Europeans, as they are so intimately mixed up with Europeans throughout the District’.66 In practice, the court revised the proceedings of the Assessors, and altered or confirmed their judgements. By 1866 Māori salaries had been reduced to £260 and some individual salaries halved. Consequently, local interest and trust diminished and there

63 White to Native Minister, 12 and 20 August 1862, 10 February 1863, BAFO 10852/2a, pp.174, 176-83, 227-8, ANZA.
65 White to Native Secretary, 2 May 1864, BAFO 10852/2a, pp. 303-6, ANZA.
66 White to Native Minister, 5 May 1865, BAFO 10852/2a, pp. 360-1, ANZA.
is no further record of the Rūnanga meeting. Māori might have mirrored the Pākehā officials’ less than full commitment, if Ward’s evaluation is correct – that the impressive feature of the new institutions was ‘not the Maori rejection of [them] … but their selective acceptance’. It must also have been difficult for Māori to maintain motivation during the period that the Rūnanga was operating, when it coincided with one of the worst typhoid epidemics in the district.

Control of land ownership issues was important to far northern Māori. They had sought to maintain control through the Rūnanga. Other iwi attempted different strategies to resist covert Crown purchases. Traditional rūnanga were strengthened, and the ideas about a Māori parliament and kingship, first promoted in 1853, gained more support. The King movement had been intended as a parallel sovereignty, to preserve the self-governance promised by the Treaty, rather than a challenge to the Queen. However, the government and expanding numbers of settlers saw (or chose to represent) it as a threat against which the Crown took a stand. The 1860-72 wars followed.

Contemporaneously with the passing of the Native Lands Act, the government seat was transferred from Auckland to Wellington in 1865. In 1841 it had moved from Russell. Whereas at the time of their signing the Treaty the far northern tribes had been within a day’s walk or paddle from the infant nation’s decision-making seat, by 1865 their access to, and influence on, national politics were practically eliminated. As the European population in the far north increased, Māori influence at the local body level was severely diminished by exclusion. Decisions about engagement with
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Pākehā, their laws and economy, continued to be taken, as they had previously, by the traditionally adaptive rūnanga; the dual economy was shadowed by a dual kaupapa.

Attempting to strengthen their bond and influence, in 1870 far northern Māori had welcomed the governor at Ahipara and Mangonui, and reaffirmed loyalty to the Crown.70 Continued loyalty was not seen as inconsistent with continuing tribal autonomy and control, which they sought to achieve by co-operation. While the Mangonui Rūnanga was potentially a successful vehicle for co-operative control, it was never fully empowered for its task because of settler backlash against Māori over the 1860-72 wars.71 The far north had not been involved in the kingship controversy or the New Zealand Wars. Thus, far northern Māori were set back in their efforts towards co-operative autonomy by conflicts in which they took no direct part.

Four Māori seats were created in Parliament in 1867, but Māori membership was not particularly effective; the Bills they proposed were treated with disdain. Keith Sinclair argued that Māori politicians only became effective when they could speak English and had been educated in English, which was about the 1890s.72 In the Northern Māori electorate, Hone Heke Ngapua (MHR, 1893-1909) had attended St Stephen’s Anglican school, was fluent in English and was a competent orator. But Tau Henare (MHR, 1914-38) had received no Pākehā education, did not participate much in parliamentary debates, and often spoke through an interpreter, which limited his effectiveness in the house.73

71 O’Malley and Robertson, p.7.
72 Sinclair, p.92.
If Māori could not achieve their goals through Parliament, many sought their own institutions of government, even though the state did not accept them. Nevertheless, the choice was not mutually exclusive between Māori and national politics. Far northern Māori made use of every avenue available to assert their influence, participating keenly in parliamentary elections and selections, as well as seeking solutions through their own institutions. Tribal and colonial politics intersected, overlapped and intertwined, particularly over the vital issue of land, the basis of the economy. On the other hand, government feared any recognition of tribal authority on their part would replicate conditions preceding the wars.74

When the Land Court failed to protect their interests, Māori renewed their efforts to gain recognition of their right to administer their own affairs through mechanisms of tribal authority. The structures might have been without legal authority, and were therefore of limited legal effect, but in other respects they were not ineffectual. Te Rarawa chief Winiata Tomairanga convened a meeting of his tribe in 1869 for the purpose of electing a Māori ‘Superintendent’. Two were appointed – Wiremu Tana Papahia for Te Rarawa ki Hokianga and Timoti Puhipi over Kaitaia – to exercise their duties to act in support of the government. The resident magistrate who attended the meeting advised that, provided whatever they decided would be in support of the government, and for the benefit of the people, if they wished to have one man considered to be head of the tribe, ‘I did not suppose the government would decline to acknowledge him’.75

While issues relating to land ownership, use and control were common to all hapū and iwi in the north, issues of criminality assumed greater importance in those areas with

75 Resident Magistrate Edward Marsh Williams of Bay of Islands, AJHR, 1869, A-10, p.7.
greater exposure to Pākehā – Ahipara, Pupepoto, Kaitaia, Awanui, Mangonui and Hokianga. Consequently, Te Rarawa feature more prominently in the written records. Undoubtedly the strongest of the initiatives to achieve autonomy in land, civil, and criminal issues in the far north, was proposed in the 1879 petition of Timoti Puhipi and 41 of his fellow Te Rarawa. They sought to have their land proclaimed a district, and ‘twelve true men’ appointed (one at each of the principal settlements) authorised to administer the laws of the Queen and to enforce rules such as earmarking pigs, sheep, cattle and horses in their district. In common with many such petitions (as will be described later in this chapter), Parliament’s Native Affairs Committee declined to make a recommendation.

In the absence of such recommendation, or legal recognition, in the following year Te Rarawa proceeded to implement a system described as Tekau ma Rua (The Twelve) – committees of 12 in each Māori village in the district, to hear and determine all cases of either civil or criminal nature, and no cases were to be taken into ‘our’ courts of justice. They were strongly opposed to the enforcement of dog and sheep taxes. The village committees were voluntary associations of individuals, united by common kaupapa and tikanga, representing the strongest form of bonding social capital. They were perceived (by some authorities) as a potentially serious threat to the establishment of Pākehā rules.

The far north’s Tekau ma Rua was not the first of its kind. One of the same name had met in Hawke’s Bay before 1874. Although subsequent committees met during the 1870s, their influence appears to have waned by 1879. Nevertheless, as Sinclair argued, ‘they were an important link in the chain of Maori agitation for unity ...
leading to the great “Maori parliaments” of the late 1880s and 1890s’. Perhaps because of the East Coast experience, official reaction to the far north’s Tekau ma Rua by the new local resident magistrate, George Kelly, was swift, stern and coercive. While his reaction met with initial resistance, by 1881 he reported (wishfully) that he had ‘succeeded in stamping … out entirely’ the ‘attempt on the part of the Natives … to inaugurate a new system of self-government’ with the help of a few staunch Māori friends, including Reihana Matiu. In the same year, a disturbance over land amongst three hapū at Ahipara reached warlike proportions. Kelly resorted to reminding them it was the day before Christmas, which ‘had a magic effect’. Without moral suasion and the loyalty of Māori of considerable mana, Pākehā authority was still tenuous.

The year 1879 had been particularly significant for the far north; Timoti Puhipi was one of the most vocal Māori in the district; the year and the man both feature in the next section of this chapter. While Puhipi spoke for Te Rarawa at Kaitaia, Pukepoto and Ahipara, he might also have been voicing concerns, but not speaking on behalf, of closely-related Te Aupōuri and Ngāti Kahu. The year 1879 was also when Ngāti Whatua convened a Māori Parliament, in which Te Rarawa participated, and by the early 1880s kotahitanga (unity) was beginning to look attainable. The parliament did not achieve a positive government response to Māori calls for self-management of lands, but it was a successful catalyst for inter-tribal co-operation and debate.

Possibly perceiving the potential for a genuine threat in Māori unity, John Bryce attempted to stave it off with the 1883 Native Committees Act, which ostensibly provided for local self-government, but was watered down to an extent that rendered
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78 Sinclair, pp.105, 108, 110. The number twelve had Judao-Christian significance – 12 tribes of Israel, 12 disciples of Christ – which was adapted in the English tradition of 12 members of a jury.
79 AJHR, 1881, 2, G-8, p.1. Reihana Matiu was father of McCully Matiu, author of Te Whānau Moana.
80 Probably attributable to John Bryce’s measures of severely cutting back the number of Assessors.
any exercise of rangatiratanga impossible.\textsuperscript{81} Bryce invoked the wishful theory of ‘fatal impact’ to justify imposition of European rules: ‘The … idea … of providing a system of local government for the Maoris is an absurdity. … Looking at the large and increasing European population and the small number of Maoris, it is very evident that the best hope of the Native race is to frankly accept European institutions and laws’.\textsuperscript{82} The myth served to sustain ‘false’ Empire.\textsuperscript{83}

Despite its ineffectiveness, even in 1885, the Hokianga resident magistrate reported that northern Māori were ‘now trying to work “The Native Committees Act, 1883” and seem anxious for self-government’, at the same time noting that ‘though as loyal as it is possible to be, [they] take a great interest in, and to some extent sympathise with the doings of Te Whiti, Tawhiao, and other Maori Agitators’.\textsuperscript{84} Other reports of the period contradict the continuing interest in the Native Committees, and by 1890 they had become all but defunct; most Māori relied on the rūnanga or unofficial (in the Pākehā system) committees, which were beyond government intervention and control.\textsuperscript{85} The Rees-Carroll 1891 commission of enquiry concluded that the 1883 Act was ‘a hollow shell’, which gave Māori none of the autonomy they sought.\textsuperscript{86}

Repeated failure of local initiatives led to the concerted effort of the Kotahitanga movement, which originated partly in the north, initiated by Ngāpuhi. At first, there appears to have been some ambivalence and hesitance about participation on the part of far northern iwi, due to old animosities. Te Rarawa continued to regard themselves as a distinct tribe, taking responsibility for their own fortunes according to their own

\textsuperscript{81} O’Malley and Robertson, p.132.
\textsuperscript{82} Bryce to Governor, 11 February 1884, G49/20, ANZW; ibid.
\textsuperscript{83} Belich, \textit{Making Peoples}, pp.156-78.
\textsuperscript{84} Spencer von Sturmer (Resident Magistrate for Hokianga) to Native Under Secretary, 20 April 1885, AJHR, 1885, G-2, pp.1-2.
\textsuperscript{85} Hill and O’Malley, ‘Maori Quest for Rangatiratanga’, p.10.
\textsuperscript{86} AJHR, 1891, II, G-1, p.xvi.
strategies. They had been disinclined to go to war in the 1860s, and would only respond to their own chiefs.87

Tukaroto Matutaera (later Tawhiao) succeeded his father, the first Māori king, Potatau Te Wherowhero, on his death (1860), and then reigned for 34 traumatic and turbulent years. During his term, Tawhiao visited Te Rarawa marae in Hokianga hoping to muster support for Kingitanga unity, but at that time (1885) most Hokianga hapū elders rejected the Waikato chief’s overtures, preferring instead to put their efforts towards the Kotahitanga movement.88 Yet, there were strong bonds between far northern iwi and the Kingitanga movement. A Maniapoto leader, Te Kanawa, gave a child to Te Rarawa peace-maker Pōroa, when Pōroa persuaded Hongi Hika not to attack during one of his Waikato raids. The boy, Te Haumutunga Reewe, of Tainui Kingitanga, married Ngāhuka of Ngāti Kahu.89 Matire Kereama’s descent from Tainui was charted in Chapter 2, (Figure 4). A third example was the pre-1870 marriage of Waimarama Pene Ruruanga (Waikato and Maniapoto) to Paratene Katene Kapa (Te Aupōuri), which produced the leader, sportsman, and Anglican priest Mutu Paratene Kapa.90

Frustration, intensified by the ‘hollow shell’ of the 1883 Act, motivated a series of large inter-tribal gatherings early in 1888. A draft Bill was mandated by widespread representation of Māori interests, again aimed at returning full power to deal with

87 White to Native Secretary, 1860, BAFO 10852/2a, ANZA, p.516; William Puckey to CMS London, 20 March 1845, WGP, L&J, p.81; O’Malley and Robertson, p.112.
89 Matiu and Mutu, p.73n.
their lands. At the last of these meetings it was agreed inter-tribal differences should
finally be set aside in order to establish a national Māori parliament to give effect to
the Treaty of Waitangi. In March 1889, more than 1500 Māori from throughout the
north and other districts attended the annual Ngāpuhi meeting at Waitangi. This was
followed a short time later by a second gathering convened by Paora Tuhaere at
Orakei. The series culminated in the May 1890 hui at Omanaia, in the Hokianga
district, at which the structure and goals of the Tai Tokerau Kotahitanga movement
were finally negotiated. In April 1891 the first formal meeting of this movement
was widely attended by Māori throughout the north. Manuka Henare argued that
this series of hui indicate a continuing struggle by Māori to maintain mana Niu Tireni
and mana Aotearoa.

Somewhat confusingly, and competitively, the King movement set up the
Kauhanganui Parliament in 1891, while the inaugural gathering of Paremata
(Parliament) Māori in 1892 was convened under the banner of Kotahitanga. Northern
Māori were heavily represented in the latter, with 28 of its 93 members coming from
Tai Tokerau, and a significant number of these from the far north, including Timoti
Puhipi. He was subsequently elevated to the Rūnanga Ariki, which was modelled on
the Legislative Council. The Paremata was intended as a complement rather than a
threat to the official Parliament. While it was modelled on the Pākehā Parliament,
which excluded women, it did not follow slavishly. Meri Te Tai Mangakāhia
(daughter of the prominent Te Rarawa chief Re Te Tai, and great grand-daughter of

91 Orange, p.221.
92 O’Malley and Robertson, p.153.
93 Orange, p.224; Lindsay Cox, Kotahitanga: The Search for Māori Political Unity, Oxford, 1993,
p.66; O’Malley and Robertson, p.154.
94 Orange, pp.224-5; O’Malley and Robertson, p.154.
95 Henare, 'Changing Images of Nineteenth Century Māori Society', p.245.
96 Cox, p.68; O’Malley and Robertson, p.165.
97 Hill and O’Malley, 'Maori Quest for Rangatiratanga', p.10.
Ngā-kahu-whero, became the first woman to address Te Kotahitanga Parliament, when she spoke to her 1893 motion requesting that women be given the vote and be eligible to sit in the Māori Parliament. Although the Kotahitanga Parliament was disbanded in 1902, the movement was represented in the Pākehā Parliament by the MHR for Northern Māori, Hone Heke Ngapua, from 1893 until his early death in 1909. Henare Kaihau represented the Kingite movement over a similar time period, from 1896 to 1911.

Over the turn of the century, Māori continued to strive for autonomy, some through negotiations with government, and others by more direct action, even armed resistance, such as the ‘Hokianga Dog Tax Rebellion’ of 1898, in which Te Rarawa participated. Māori demographic revival towards the end of the century no doubt lent weight to their striving, but it also led government to counter the momentum with renewed efforts at integration designed to incorporate Māori as fuller participants in the political economy, but constrained to roles that served Pākehā objectives. The two countervailing forces were the rules’ contest. Whichever force prevailed would render the other a counter-culture, and overshadow its economic system. Counter-culture, here, means counter to the dominant (governing) culture, but consistent with the culture prevailing in the dominated community. In Chapter 1, I argued that if the process of legitimisation and support of political and economic systems does not accommodate the dominated culture, a counter-culture could be induced, which would expand the irregular and illegal sectors of the informal economy.
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98 Meri belonged to three hapū of Te Rarawa: Ngāti Te Reinga, Ngāti Manawa and Te Kaitutae.
100 Belich, Paradise Reforged, pp.199, 195. Ngapua was a great-nephew of the chief Hone Heke Pokai.
102 Two variants of counter-culture need to be differentiated – one being counter to the dominant (say Pākehā) but consistent with the prevailing Māori community culture; the other being counter to both i.e. where a dissident group of Māori disagrees and takes independent action from that decided by their community leaders.
As Hill and O’Malley have argued, most Māori structural reorganisations reflected attempts to become autonomous from the state and institutions of the dominant culture. Amongst them, the Young Māori Party rose to prominence in the early twentieth century, offering the state and Māori a middle ground by adopting certain Pākehā ways and skills, while upholding Māori traditions.\(^\text{103}\) Of such persuasion was the non-northern member for Northern Māori (1909-1913, successor to Hone Heke), Te Rangi Hiroa, fellow Te Aute College graduate with Apirana Ngata.\(^\text{104}\) Members of this group played an important bridging role by negotiating between traditional Māori leaders and government. They achieved this by appropriating the pedagogic action of the Anglican Church college institution. (This argument is developed later in this chapter.) Both parties used cultural capital in an attempt to achieve their respective purposes, thus legitimising the capital of the Pākehā culture as dominant.

While some argue that Ngata was too accommodating,\(^\text{105}\) Hill claimed that the Young Māori Party’s programme of mutual self-respect, by including preservation and enhancement of key aspects of Māori tikanga, was far from being fully assimilationist.\(^\text{106}\) James Belich has interpreted Ngata’s actions as ‘benign segregation’, which made limited space for Māoriness in state and society.\(^\text{107}\)

John Williams saw the Young Māori Party being actively involved, along with Kotahitanga, in Seddon’s political proposals, which led to two pieces of legislation being passed by the General Assembly in 1900,\(^\text{108}\) whereas others argue that Carroll’s

\(^{103}\) Hill and O’Malley, ‘Maori Quest for Rangatiratanga’, p.13.
\(^{104}\) Te Rangi Hiroa, or Peter Buck, came from Taranaki. How he came to be the member for Northern Māori is discussed later in this chapter.
\(^{105}\) Durie, pp.4-5.
\(^{106}\) Hill, State Authority, Indigenous Autonomy, p.268.
\(^{107}\) Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.206.
\(^{108}\) Williams, Politics of the New Zealand Maori, pp.107-8.
legislation of 1900 (proposed by Seddon) was designed to restrain the Kotahitanga. The Māori Councils Act 1900 provided for self-governing tribal-boundary-based Māori Councils to promote ‘health and welfare and moral well-being’ of Māori, and village committees (komiti marae) to superintend and enforce by-laws. Hill and O’Malley believed that in reality their operations were constrained and guided by the state. As such they could be seen as agencies of the state rather than means of self-government. The Māori Lands Administration Act 1900 provided for establishment of six Māori Land Councils (with Pākehā majority membership), and the retention of the Land Court. Māori could form Papatupu Block Committees empowered to investigate titles, subject to confirmation by the Land Council. Papakainga lands were to be inalienable. The Māori Land Settlement Act of 1905 provided for the compulsory vesting of some lands in the new Pākehā-dominated boards, for non-payment of survey liens, thus removing all but the last vestige of Māori decision-making with respect to their most valuable economic assets. The most significant for the far north was Te Aupōuri land around Parengarenga Harbour, which is discussed in this and later chapters. The last vestige for potential control was the Papatupu Block Committees. Contrary to the understanding given to Commissioners Robert Stout and Apirana Ngata, they found the committees’ ‘results were astonishing’ in the Tai Tokerau region, in their nine-year lifespan until they were abolished in 1909.

111 O’Malley and Robertson, p.178.
112 AJHR, 1908, IV, G-IJ, p. 8; Jane McRae, ‘Participation: Native Committees (1883) and Papatupu Block Committees (1900) in Tai Tokerau’, Master of Arts in Maori Studies thesis, University of Auckland, 1981.
World War One intervened, shifting Britain’s relationship with other world powers, New Zealand’s relationship with Britain, and the relationship of Māori to Pākehā and their economy. These three shifts would have fundamental impacts on the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy. Far northern Māori were quick to volunteer, true to their 90-year demonstrated loyalty to the British.\footnote{Involvement of far northern Māori in World War One is discussed in Chapter 5 of this thesis.} After World War One remaining Māori Councils established under the 1900 Act were refocused to health issues, but many had already ceased to operate by 1909, and most by World War Two.\footnote{Hill and O’Malley, ‘Maori Quest for Rangatiratanga’, p.14.}

Tribal councils (a continuation of traditional rūnanga rather than vestiges of those set up under the 1900 Acts) carried responsibility for a broad range of community deliberations and decisions. One example from 1912, a council of marae committees of north and south Hokianga, had responsibilities for building and renovating houses, issuing licences for trout fishing and billiards, policing dog taxes and providing conveniences for Māori attending Land Court sessions at Rawene.\footnote{Henare Arekatera Tate, Kamira, Himiona Tapakhi 1880-1953, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 7 July 2005, available at: URL: http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/ (13 January 2006).} Another, Te Taumata Kaumatua o Ngāti Kahu (Council of Elders of Ngāti Kahu), set up in 1930, performed functions related to customs, status and community economics of Ngāti Kahu, entering it as the fifth iwi grouped under the auspices of Te Taitokerau.\footnote{Matiu and Mutu, p.172.} Māori supported the start of World War Two in 1939 through komiti such as these. Despite the introduction of many different organisations, the marae remains ‘the centre and focal point of a Māori community and is the one institution that has been...
left largely untouched by contact with Europeans’. It has persisted from pre-
European Māori society and has no Western legal base.

Earlier attempts at unity having failed, most Māori concentrated on maximising tribal independence, many by incorporation and consolidation of land under Ngata’s guidance. There had been at least one co-operative farming venture in the Hokianga by 1908. From 1919 large land consolidation schemes started in other parts of the country, and in the Hokianga a Mill Hill Father financed Whina Cooper’s farming, co-operative store and other business activities. Farm development by some individuals, and a dairy scheme at Te Kao, proceeded with seeding finance from the Tokerau Māori Land Board, from 1925. Whina’s farming activities became the basis for her community’s Ngata-style development scheme, with consolidations starting in 1929. As Māori engaged in farming in the 1920s, they participated in new Pākehā institutions that were directly relevant to this segment of the Pākehā economy, such as the Farmers’ Union and the Country Women’s Institute. Unusually, a woman (Whina Cooper) started the Whakarapa branch of the Farmers’ Union, was its first president, and built the membership to 72 in the branch’s district.

Despite, or because of, failure of earlier unity attempts, but consistent with other prophetic movements in Aotearoa and among indigenous peoples elsewhere, Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana (Ngāti Apa and Ngā Rauru of Taranaki) rose from outside traditional Māori ranks towards the end of World War One. He had a vision of uniting
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Māori people across, rather than through, tribal structures. As with earlier prophetic movements, what started as a religious movement quickly assumed political overtones. However, the Ratana movement differed from other indigenous prophetic movements in that, rather than rejecting colonising influences and calling Māori back to tradition, it rejected tribalism and marae protocol.

Phenomenal growth was achieved quickly with the conversion of whole communities at the traditional decision-making level of hapū, rather than that of iwi, or as individuals. Within these communities, rejection of traditional Māori protocols modified decision-making processes. Disillusionment with orthodox churches’ associations with capitalism and ‘Pākehā rules’ probably influenced the choice to convert. Hapū who felt overlooked by their earlier church associations were swayed by new ideologies that appeared to be more closely aligned with Māori economic and social concerns and aspirations of the time.\(^\text{122}\) Ratana might also have been able to appeal to descent from chiefs of the Kurahaupo canoe in common with those of the far north.\(^\text{123}\) The CMS fell short of achieving its objective to establish a Māori-led indigenous church, and the Anglican Church did not manage the transition from a missionary to a settler church well. Only in the face of the Ratana threat did the Church appoint its first Māori bishop, in 1928.\(^\text{124}\)

Te Hapua, half of Te Kao and Pupepoto, and the whole of Victoria Valley and Mangamuka converted to Ratana. But where faith tradition was strong, such as amongst Ngāti Kahu, who had established a pattern of providing men for ordained Anglican ministry, and north-west Hokianga with its Mill Hill loyalty, Ratana was

\(^{122}\) ibid., pp.90-91.


rejected, even though these regions shared economic marginalisation. With most of the best land gone or removed from their control, and the once-lucrative gum industry all but exhausted, most far northern Māori were channelled into unskilled labouring work. The interests of labourers, as with Ratana’s, aligned with the Labour Party, in 1935, focussing Māori policies on settling socio-economic problems. Paraire Karaka Paikea (Te Uri o Hau hapū of Ngāpuhi, and Ngāti Whatua) won northern Māori in 1938, the third Māori seat Ratana captured.

The economic life of Māori pre-contact, throughout the nineteenth century, and into the twentieth century, was strongly influenced by religious beliefs, ideologies, and associations that tended towards the politico-religious. As much as it is important to understand changes in the organisation structures (institutions) within which economic decisions (and political decisions affecting the economy) were made, the organisations themselves were important sites of employment, where Māori earned money as well as participated in decision-making.

Priests, police, and parliamentarians – the new professions

In November 1879 Timoti Puhipi wrote to the Secretary for Education, ‘We are quite tired of waiting for a reply to our letter, sent in May relative to our application to Government for a Grammar School’ for the far north to provide education that would qualify their children for government positions.125 Puhipi was a key figure in the north. The timing and nature of his statement has significance for several parts of this section. Resident Magistrate George Kelly’s covering note, forwarded on 7 July 1880 to the secretary, trivialised the letter as having been written in a fit of pique. Kelly represented that Puhipi had been personally promised a government position for his

125 Timoti Puhipi to Secretary for Education, 25 November 1879, transcribed into Resident Magistrate’s Outward letters, 1879-82, BAFO 10852 3a, p.188, ANZA.
son by the late Sir Donald McLean and John Sheehan, which had not been honoured. He also claimed that Puhipi did not know what he was asking for; that he really meant a trade school, rather than a grammar school. Kelly’s comment was designed to support his own suggestions, written in July and December 1879. On 4 July he had recommended that the government establish a system of apprenticeships for Māori boys in some of the principal towns, completely under the supervision of government. Housing would be provided, and would be paid for from the boys’ earnings. The intention was to ‘place them in a position of being able to procure an honest living and making him [sic] a far more useful member of Society’ and to ‘destroy the habit of communism’. Kelly considered ‘they are naturally clever and would make the best of mechanics’. In December he reported that the parents wanted their children to get a higher education but they requested that more than one child be sent so they did not get lonely. Kelly recommended instead that trade schools be applied for on merit and not ‘on account of their connections’. Puhipi wanted to keep the children close to home by providing a local school; the parents wanted family connections to be maintained by ensuring children did not leave home alone to go far away to school; Kelly wanted to weaken family ties and customs.

Puhipi knew very well what he was asking for. He knew that there was a wide range of occupational roles in society and he wanted the younger generation to participate in all those roles. Māori society had its similarities to parts of English society, in which the oldest son inherited the land, the second went into the army, and the third into the church. The senior line generally inherited mana whenua; military and tohunga roles were highly respected, and involved years of disciplined education and training. It
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might have been within Puhipi’s capacity to establish a whare wänanga, a school of higher learning, but he had neither the means nor the authority to establish a grammar school. Others had tried unsuccessfully.128 The frustration must have been immense because he knew higher education was important, and he expected nothing less of his partnership with government. But his aspirations were out of step with those of government and the local community. The state was interested in channelling Mäori into labouring and trades through schooling similar to Britain’s, which excluded working-class children from higher education. Secondary education was not provided in the far north until the 1930s, largely due to local settler apathy.

Puhipi’s motivation could be attributed to ‘the pursuit of mana’, as Ann Parsonson argued for the sale of land by Mäori in the 1860s,129 the pursuit of money to paraphrase Angella Ballara’s argument for the later period,130 or ‘the pursuit of modernity’ to use the term Lyndsay Head applied to motivations for choices about allegiance to government during the 1860-72 wars.131 Each would contribute to an explanation, but equally Puhipi’s motivation can be perceived as his expectation that the next generation of Te Rarawa should participate in the full range of roles in a society and economy he, and his father (Puhipi Te Ripi) before him, had been instrumental in rearranging, by inviting Päkehä into their world. He was attempting to continue exerting that instrumentality. From his 1879 perspective he could see professional opportunities for Mäori contracting, rather than expanding, and a grammar school was important for acquiring human and cultural capital. Students
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129 Parsonson, ‘The Pursuit of Mana’.
131 Head, p.98.
who adopted the dominant culture offered in institutionalised education would be
rewarded by employment in organisations controlled by the dominant class.

Timoti Puhipi had been born about 1834 and lived until 1910. Baptised at the age of
ten, at 18 he had been appointed a lay-reader in the Anglican Church. He was a
mission-trained teacher and son of the respected rangatira Te Ripi, who had replaced
Panakareao as protector of the Kaitaia mission. Puhipi had conducted services at his
kainga and had attended Synod in Auckland in 1870. That same year he was
appointed a native assessor, from which post he resigned in 1888 when he stood,
unsuccessfully, for Parliament in the Northern Māori electorate. At the time of his
death, telegrams of sympathy were received from the Bishop of Auckland, James
Carroll and Apirana Ngata. His lifetime had encompassed three new ‘professions’
(lay-reader, teacher and assessor) and glimpsed a fourth (MHR). But in 1879, when
he had written to the secretary for education, times were changing. The first of the
founding missionaries, William Puckey, had died, there had been no effective
succession and a new order had long been in the ascendancy. The first order, church,
had fostered qualification of Māori men to its professional segment to some extent.
But in 1879, with the ever-diminishing influence of Assessors, Puhipi was struggling
to gain access for Te Rarawa Māori to equivalent government circles.

From the 1850s, the Anglican Church had been ordaining Māori men as deacons and
priests. Of the 35 Māori ordained up to January 1880, eight (23%) came from far
northern iwi. Most of these returned to serve their own communities at first, some
served outside the district later. This success demonstrated to Puhipi (and, he
expected, to Pākehā) the aptitude of far northern people for higher education.

132 Obituary, *North Auckland Age*, 19 September 1910; *The Northlander*, 19 April 1923, V/F 530 P,
Far North Regional Museum.
Education for ministry was transferable to other vocations. In 1867, Resident
Magistrate White had appointed a young man, Hare Reweti, as an assessor, because
of his ‘very superior intelligence and education, he speaks and reads English fluently;
he was educated for the Ministry’.

But by 1879, admission of more highly
educated far northern Māori to other influential roles in the Pākehā system had not
succeeded. This lack of success in permeating formal Pākehā structures was not
exclusive to far northern Māori. Although some Ngāti Porou were more
successful, a comparison provides useful points of similarity and distinction over the
study period, not just with respect to government positions, but also with church and
farm development (discussed in Chapter 6).

Like the far northern iwi, Ngāti Porou were loyal providers of priestly candidates to
the Anglican Church. By 1880, 11 of the ordinands (31%) were from Ngāti Porou.
Of the 75 ordinands recorded to 1901, 51% had come from the combined East Coast
and far northern regions – 28% and 23% respectively.

Figure 11 - Far northern iwi and Ngāti Porou ordinations

Sources: Biographical Directory of Anglican Clergy; Mission and Moko
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Ngāti Porou had several advantages compared with the far north, not least being that their educational (and farming) aspirations were fostered and supported (even financially) by the missionary Williams brothers’ families. A new diocese of Waiapu was created in 1859, with William Williams consecrated as bishop. The diocese was designated from the outset as especially set apart for Māori and gave priority to training a Māori pastorate. The first ordination in Waiapu was in 1860 and by 1865, the last year of the Turanga mission, there were eight Māori clergymen in the diocese. By the end of the CMS period (1882), over 30 Māori had been ordained in Waiapu, from within and outside Ngāti Porou. Subsequently, two more generations of the Williams family were consecrated bishops of Waiapu. And it was there, but only in 1928, that Frederick Augustus Bennett (Te Arawa) would eventually be consecrated suffragan bishop to the Waiapu diocese, with the title Bishop of Aotearoa. Being well-educated themselves, members of the Williams families had been able to oversee the establishment of teacher training from 1865, and secondary level schooling at Te Aute from 1872. Archdeacon Samuel Williams was closely involved with Te Aute College, which Apirana Ngata attended.

Throughout the period 1860-1940, the Anglican Church continued its ordination programme and played a distinctive role in connecting Māori with the Pākehā
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136 The appointment of the Māori bishop would have little benefit for far northern Māori Anglicans because the Bishop of Auckland (Simkin, 1940-60) did not accept Bennett’s influence in the northern diocese.

137 Samuel was living at Te Aute in 1868 when his uncle, Bishop William Williams, determined to commence his Māori training school. Building started in 1871 and was completed and paid for in 1872. The schoolmaster was under Samuel Williams’ immediate direction. Frances Porter, ed., *The Turanga Journals 1840-1850: Letters and Journals of William and Jane Williams Missionaries to Poverty Bay*, Wellington, 1974, pp.603-4.
Candidates from the far north were trained at St John’s College, first at Waimate North (where the college was established) but later in Auckland, following its relocation by Bishop Selwyn. After the establishment of the Waiapu Diocese, Te Rau Kahikatea Māori Theological College (opened in 1883) took over the task of training Māori for the pastorate until 1921. By 1940, of the 69 Māori men ordained in the Auckland Diocese, 29 (42%) came from the far northern iwi. One of these, Wiremu Netana Panapa (Ngāti Ruanui, Te Rarawa and Ngāti Kahu), first ordained deacon in 1921, became second bishop of Aotearoa in 1951.

Priesthood presented one of the few opportunities for advancing education for Māori men, and providing entry to a profession that was recognised in the Pākehā (and English) world, thus bridging between Māori and Pākehā social networks at the professional level. Some Māori women studied alongside their husbands at Te Rau, but were not eligible for ordination. For many far northern Māori candidates, training at Te Rau, in Gisborne, was a miserably lonely and culturally isolating experience. Many did not complete the course. Those who did reach ordination came to regard themselves as nga rāwaho, the outsiders, but nevertheless it was an opportunity. There was a second dilemma. Typically, Te Rau’s students were mature lay-readers, Māori was the language of instruction and the curriculum was limited. The development in English education in the Church’s Māori secondary schools, and the
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138 Most were trained at Te Rau Kahikatea Theological College in Gisborne, which was set up under the CMS. After the CMS terminated its activities in New Zealand, there was a gap in training Māori for the priesthood. Eventually ten places a year were offered with scholarships at St John’s Theological College.
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low stipends of Māori clergymen, were deterrents to attracting students from Te Aute or St Stephen’s.\textsuperscript{143}

Remuneration levels for Māori were significantly lower than those for Pākehā clergy. In 1892 the stipend for Māori deacons was £50 annually and for priests £60, the latter falling back to £50 in 1898, because of falling interest rates, but rising again to £70 in 1905. Many had to cultivate land to support their families.\textsuperscript{144} By World War One the aim of raising stipends for Māori priests to £100 and £80 for deacons was appearing achievable, whereas, after World War One the recognised stipend for Pākehā parish priests was between £200 and £300, sometimes with travelling allowance and house. When depression struck, some parishes could not meet costs. The revenue from all sources was scarcely sufficient to pay Māori clergy a stipend of £100 a year, and stipends were reduced by 25%.\textsuperscript{145}

The Church introduced a new bridging role between iwi, breaking with past tradition by locating priests in tribal areas to which they were not related. One relocated priest was Hori Piri Raiti from Oruru, who spent most of his ministry in the Waikato, was the first Māori ordained Archdeacon there, and his tangi was, at Te Puea’s request, held at Turangawaewae marae.\textsuperscript{146} Some Māori men travelled further afield as part of their church vocation. Rev. Hone Tane Papahia (Te Rarawa, Ngāpuhi) visited the Melanesian islands with Ven. Hawkins (Waiapu) in 1907 to examine the feasibility of Maori clergy becoming teachers for the Melanesian mission.\textsuperscript{147} Kahi Harawira (Te Aupōuri), educated at Te Kao native school and Te Aute College before volunteering

\textsuperscript{143} Morrell, p.121.
\textsuperscript{145} Morrell, pp.125, 180-6.
\textsuperscript{146} Personal communication, Sharon McLaughlan (Raiti’s grand-daughter), January 2006; research correspondence, Michael Blain and Janet Foster, 15 March 2006, Anglican Diocesan archives, Parnell.
\textsuperscript{147} Toi.
for active service in World War One, attended Te Rau College on his return and
achieved Grade III in the Board of Theological Studies. Ordained in 1920, he served
the church in a variety of capacities at Whangape, Waitara (Waikato diocese)
Manutuke (Waipu diocese) and Ohinemutu before being appointed the first Padre to
the Māori Battalion in 1940.148 His comments reveal a little of the ideology of this
apparently contradictory contribution to war.

It was not until I was a Padre in the Second World War that I fully
appreciated the worth of the Maori soldier. One General said:
‘Give me a Division of Maoris and I can clean up North Africa in
no time.’ The Maori soldier is no angel, but he is deeply religious
and he does believe in Divine providence and guidance, and made
much demand on the Padre’s time.149

The role of Padre, along with the wider war experience, served to bond Māori across
all iwi in the Battalion, and illuminates the part religion played in building social
capital. Ordained clergy who returned to minister in their home area bridged between
far northern iwi, and some clergy from other regions ministered in the far north.

While the church broadened the roles of Māori men, it restricted those of far northern
Māori women (as it did those of Pākehā women). It has been contended that the mana
wahine was undermined during early contact, through the misperceptions of outside
observers. These assumptions ‘were strongly promulgated by missionaries and
various churches where the subservient role of women was often institutionalised’.150
Only men sat on church committees, and were trained as lay-readers and for
ordination. It was only in the 1890s that women’s voices and energies could be
channelled through the Mothers’ Union (if they qualified), but the first Māori branch
was not formed in Northland until after 1933, with the encouragement of their Rev.
Wiremu Netana Panapa.\textsuperscript{151} It would not be until the 1970s that women would be ordained in the Anglican Church, and in 1978 Puti Hopaia Murray of Potahi marae, Te Kao (Te Aupōuri), became the first Māori woman ordained to the Anglican priesthood.\textsuperscript{152} The second Māori woman ordained was Hita Toko Matenga Mani of Ngāi Takoto and Te Aupōuri, in 1982. Hita was grand-daughter of Rev. Hoani Matenga Paerata, who was in turn the son of Rev. Matenga Paerata and also the father of Rev. Maori Marsden and the Venerable Taki Marsden.\textsuperscript{153}

**Figure 12 - Paerata network**

Sources: *Biographical Directory of Anglican Clergy*, Popata family book\textsuperscript{154}

Lack of recognition of Māori women by the church was out of step with their then current roles in Māori society. In his evidence to the 1934 Royal Commission, Judge Acheson noted: ‘It is perfectly essential to work in harmony with the Chiefs and

\textsuperscript{151} Henare, *Panapa, Wiremu Netana 1898-1970*.
\textsuperscript{152} Mana, issue 53, August-September, 2003, p.19; *Weekend Herald*, 31 December 2005, A22.
\textsuperscript{154} Personal communication Peter-Lucas Jones, Te Aupouri House; Blain; Nopera.
Chieftainesses. Very often it is the latter that are the driving force!' He would have been referring to women such as Te Paea (Ngāti Kahu; Eru Ihaka’s wife) and Whina Cooper (Te Rarawa). The leadership of Te Puea (Tainui) was also influential with her kin in the far north in the 1920s. Te Puea was known as a matakite (visionary); spiritual leadership was not distinct from the role of ariki. The spiritual leadership of Māori women had been a feature of the nineteenth century too. A senior leader and matakite in the upper Hokianga, Ani Kaaro, had been recognised as a prophet in 1885. Margaret Mutu, Tariana Turia and others argue that the source of strong leadership of Māori women is their mana wahine, which originates in woman (Hine-Ahu-One) being the first human form, in oppositional contrast to the Judeo-Christian Adam and Eve construct. Tariana Turia spoke of connections between people and land being strongly female, Mutu of complementary roles for women and men, and the woman’s voice being the first heard on the marae. Their comments echo references of Whina Cooper and Mihi Kotukutuku (Te Whänau a Apanui) in the 1920s to the definition of women as whare tangata (bearers of people). Judith Binney found, from conversations with Ringatu women, ‘that women’s roles in pre-European and nineteenth-century Maori society were more varied and flexible than have generally been allowed for’, and that it is possible that some were considered to have a particular affinity with the divine forces.

156 Binney. Kaaro.
157 For an historically sensitive documentation and deconstruction of the tradition of telling origin stories in the larger history of political thought, see Joanne H. Wright, Origin Stories in Political Thought: Discourses on Gender, Power, and Citizenship, Toronto, 2004.
158 Matiu and Mutu, p.163.
159 King, p.102.
However, in the time period of this study, women were probably more influential in the church by association with men, particularly through marriage. The Matenga (Marsden) and Paerata names are two that appear among a close-knit cohort of interrelated families professionally (vocationally) associated with the Anglican Church. The many connections are too complex to represent in their entirety, but the network charts presented here, beginning with the Paerata/Matenga families, illustrate some of these, and the linking role of women.

There are multiple instances of father, son and more generations, uncles, nephews, and cousins, frequently recorded as of rangatira status, following the priesthood vocation. In clear contrast with the trader and transporter networks described in later chapters, but with variation in Ngāti Kahu, the social network connections were with the church rather than through Pākehā-Māori. These connections were mutually reinforcing at first. Ordination of high-ranked Māori cemented the status of the church within Māori society; it also reinforced the position of Māori within the established church of the country’s coloniser. Mutual reinforcement built both bonding and bridging social capital. Once Pākehā numbers increased, the church, too, no longer needed Māori. After 1880 Anglican and Catholic churches were more concerned with settlers.

161 Ngāti Kahu stands out as an exception to the pattern of other far northern iwi in their relationship between ordained ministers and MHRs. Ihaka Te Tai Hakuene and Hone Heke Ngapua were fairly closely related through both their Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa/Ngāti Kahu lines. But the two Members were not so closely related to the Ngāti Kahu ordained priests, who came from a more dispersed set of families, some of whom descended from early European-settler sailors, sawyers and timber traders. Rev. Timoti Manuera was descended from a Portuguese sailor, José Manuel, who deserted his ship in 1866; Rev. Timoti Flavell was descended from sawyer/trader Thomas Flavell, who settled amongst Ngāti Kahu in 1831; and Rev. Kingi Ihaka’s paternal grandfather was a sailor, David Isaacs (or Isaac Campbell). The difference might be explained by the earlier exposure of Ngāti Kahu to sawyer traders based near the port of Mangonui, and their integration into Ngāti Kahu by marriage (Appendices 2 and 3).
Te Rau closed after World War One, amidst protest from Waiapu Māori, without consultation with Māori. The reason appears assimilationist.

Maori candidates … have been educated at Te Rau … and those who were not sufficiently conversant with the English language to study in it were educated in Māori. For some years past, however, a number of the men have been able to take the examinations of the Board of Theological Studies [in English], and as now they are all doing so the need for a separate college has passed away.\(^{162}\)

Training of Māori for the Anglican priesthood was transferred to St John’s Theological College, in Auckland, under an agreement where the Mission Trust Board paid £350 a year for 20 years to the College Trustees, in return for which they were entitled to place ten Māori students a year. Even though the agreed sum was paid, placements were seldom at this level. In 1925 and 1926 ten attended, but thereafter the number dwindled from eight in 1927, down to zero in 1933, with an average of 2.7 over the 14 years 1927-1940.\(^{163}\)

The familial path into a professional segment of the Pākehā economy aligned with a particular type of civic association. For instance, Timoti Puhipi had been closely involved with the church from an early age, was appointed an assessor and performed those duties until he stood for Parliament. Hare Reweti has already been mentioned. From the time of establishment of the first Rūnanga in Mangonui in 1859, Māori men had been appointed to a variety of official positions, all of which were instrumental in extending Pākehā rules (policing) into Māori society,\(^{164}\) although the jurisdiction of Māori officials also applied to Pākehā in some instances, such as at an 1863 hākari.


\(^{163}\) Te Paa, pp.72-5, 90.

Natives behaved with greatest propriety the Constables doing regular duty and apprehending all disorderly persons, who, as usual under such circumstances were found to be Europeans.  

Archdeacon Hori Piri Raiti’s family illustrates the policing and priestly association. The Archdeacon’s father, Piri Raiti, was ‘retained as Native Constable at the rate of £40 per annum and provided with a suit of clothes’ in 1868, having earlier acted as a policeman at £10 a year. He still held the position in 1883. Ven. Hori Piri Raiti’s niece, Meri Kiritipa Raiti, married the grandson of Timoti Popata (a Karere in 1865, and a kai-karakia at Kareponia in 1891) and Emerina Ikoroa. Timoti’s sister, Te Ao Marama Popata married Rev. Wiremu Te Waha, whose cousin was Rev. Hara Peka Taua.

Figure 13 - Network of police and priests


---

165 White to Native Secretary, Auckland, May 1863, Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook, BAFO 10852 2a, p.256, ANZA.  
166 H. Halse for Under Secretary to Native Secretary Office to Resident Magistrate White, 15 August 1868, Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook, BAFO 10852 2a, ANZA.  
167 Entries dated 4 July and 1 December 1883, BAQS 4760, 1a, 1870-1912, ANZA. (Restricted access.)  
168 *Church Gazette*, January 1892, Auckland Anglican Diocesan archives.  
169 Blain; Nopera.
According to Richard Hill, ‘policing has been a constant in the long and ever evolving story … [of Māori collectively organising] in a self-determinationist way, seeking partnership with the Crown within the nation. … It has been integrally involved in both the numerous Māori requests for rangatiratanga, and the Crown’s responses to these’. He explained that at first the state used Māori experts to gain knowledge of the physical, political and cultural environments of Māoridom, for the purpose of developing methods of controlling Māori. Māori might have been motivated to participate in policing to pursue collective interests against other tribal groupings, to ensure their own survival in the face of Pākehā military might, or to limit loss by working from the ‘inside’. Once the Māori populace was deemed to be under control, the state’s need for expertise diminished and Māori police started to be phased out, the last regular Māori constable was ejected within a year of the disarming of police in 1886. Whereas the Anglican Church scaled down participation of Māori in priesthood, Māori police had been all but eliminated.

As noted in the previous section, the 1863 list of official appointments reported by the resident magistrate was cut back severely by 1867 to three categories of assessor, police or pensioner. Cost reductions were being called for from central government and even the resident magistrate had a salary reduction imposed after more than 20 years’ service. Timoti Puhipi had replaced his father, Puhipi Te Ripi, in 1870. In the 1860s he had lost all of his children living with him to whooping cough, and his wife,

---

171 ibid., pp.5-6. Some were appointed as part-time, rather than regular, police over the next six or seven decades. For instance a far northern Māori World War One volunteer, Rori Rakena of Kaitaia, gave his occupation as Police Constable, in 1916. (Nominal Rolls of the Maori contingents and Reinforcements 1914-18, Christopher Pugsley, Te Hokowhitu a Tu: The Maori Pioneer Battalion in the First World War, Auckland, 1995.)
172 Seven Upoko Runanga (Chiefs), five Assessors, five Probationers nominated by the Runanga, three wardens (Kaitiaki) and fourteen Karere (Appendix 1).
Mere Ngaropo (‘Queen of Aupōuri’), had died in 1867. Mere’s sister Erinatea was married to Natanahira, who had been appointed a policeman in 1867. But by 1879, Puhipi would have been aware of the diminishing influence of these roles.

Resident magistrates had falteringly attempted to move away from rank as a basis of appointment to official positions. After all, to impose Pākehā control effectively it would be necessary to supplant the Māori system of authority. White had retained Pororua Te Tahepa, in 1861, only because of the usefulness of his rank, considering him otherwise unfit; ‘he is a dissipated, unscrupulous person, though from his rank I have retained him as an assessor’. Six years later he appointed the young man Hare Reweti ‘over the heads of some of the old assessors’, simply because the others were old men. And yet 12 years on, George Kelly found he had to replace one of his appointed Assessors. Although he was a ‘respectable, industrious young man, … [he] lacks force of character and is the son of a slave on his mother’s side, hence a very strong feeling exists against his being raised to this position of Assessor, over the leading chiefs of his Hapu. He does not command the respect of the people’. Kelly proposed appointing two Assessors in his place, chosen by two vigorously competing neighbouring iwi, to avoid jealousy and thus gain acceptance of one or the other.

Rank remained a basis of choice for both priests and policemen. As would be expected, it featured in selection of parliamentary candidates for the four Māori parliamentary seats. James Belich noted that it was kupapa chiefs who were appointed to first Māori seats, and kupapa and ‘insiders’ dominated the four seats for

---

174 White to Native Secretary, 28 August 1861, Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook, BAFO 10852 2a, pp.84-5, ANZA.
175 White to Native Secretary, 26 March 1867, Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook, BAFO 10852 2a, p.520, ANZA.
176 Kelly to Secretary for Education, 21 October 1879, Resident Magistrate’s Outward letters, BAFO 10852 3a, ANZA.
the rest of the century. He also emphasised the special case of Ngāpuhi, who both resisted and collaborated, and were the mainstay of the Kotahitanga, which was supported mainly by kupapa groups.\footnote{Belich, \textit{Making Peoples}, pp.266-7.} I have made the point that the co-operation of far northern iwi fell short of collaboration. Anglicanism was a component of the co-operation; Catholicism, adopted in the Hokianga, was more often a denomination of dissent. Co-operation and resistance can be seen as divided along these denominational lines.

For co-operators, a close association emerged between the three categories of occupation (priests, police and parliamentarians) within the Pākehā politico-economic system. Figure 12 showed connections between Tau Henare (MHR Northern Maori, 1914-38) and priests in the Anglican Church. Henare married Hera Paerata, daughter of the Reverend Tiopira Paerata’s second wife, Ritihi of Te Aupōuri.\footnote{Although Hera was daughter of Paerata’s second wife, her father was John Henry Subritzky, but she was raised as Paerata’s atawhai (foster) daughter. Hera was Sir James Henare’s mother.} The marriage of Tau and Hera Henare’s son, (Sir) James Henare, to Rose Cherrington, a taumau (arranged marriage), was conducted by Rose’s uncle, the Rev. Wiremu Keretene. Tau and Hera’s daughter Bella married Paihana Taua, whose brother, Hoani Taua, was a kai-karakia (lay-reader) in her mother’s church at Kareponia (near Awanui) in 1905.\footnote{Noble, p.19.} Paihana’s father and three sisters were teachers in what were termed ‘experimental’ Native schools employing Māori teachers (see Chapter 6). The Taua, Paerata, Popata and Matenga families share common descent from Uere, as shown in Figure 13.
The family of Eparaima Te Mutu Kapa (MHR for Northern Māori, 1891-93), shown in Figure 14, also conforms to the pattern of connection between church and parliamentary representation.

Figure 14 - Kapa priests and parliamentarian

One of Kapa’s brothers, and a nephew were ordained. The nephew’s second wife was from the Popata family, another closely connected with the church and also on the list of ‘police’ in one of its forms.\(^{180}\)

Although first and third Members for Northern Māori, Frederick Nene Russell and Hori Karaka Tawhiti, were of Pākehā-Māori descent without noted attachment to church, and Hone Heke Ngapua needed only his namesake descent line to confer mana, subsequent members tended to have close church associations, as shown in Table 3. Ihaka te Tai Hakuene would have trained for the Anglican priesthood, but for his wife’s health. Paraire Karaka Paikea had been ordained and had practised as a Methodist minister before converting to Ratana, in which movement he and its other parliamentary representatives were ministers.\(^{181}\) Church attachment alone might not have been remarkable in a recently Christianised Māori populace, but members who

---

\(^{180}\) It is from the Kapa family that Rev. Puti Murray descends. Her sister Keita was also ordained.

represented the far northern iwi (other than Paikea, Honi Mohi Tawhai and the two of Pākehā-Māori descent) were almost at one with the Anglican Church.

Such close association between the Anglican Church and parliamentary representation was not confined to the far north as Figure 15 indicates. The association resonates with the privileged access of the Anglican Church to Parliament in England, where it was (and is) the established church.

Figure 15 - A group of old Thornton boys (not dated)
Table 3 - Members of the House of Representatives, Northern Māori, to 1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Iwi affiliation</th>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Nene Russell</td>
<td>1868-1870</td>
<td>Ngāpuhi</td>
<td>Not stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiremu Katene</td>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>Te Aupōuri, Ngāpuhi</td>
<td>Anglican.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hori Karaka Tawhiti</td>
<td>1876-1879</td>
<td>Te Rarawa</td>
<td>Not stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihaka Te Tai Hakuene</td>
<td>1884-1887</td>
<td>Ngāpuhi [Ngāi Tawake], Te Rarawa</td>
<td>Anglican - prevented by wife’s health from training for ministry. Died after returning from Anglican Synod. Hone Heke Ngapua’s cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiremu Katene</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Te Aupōuri, Ngāpuhi</td>
<td>Anglican.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirini Taiwhanga</td>
<td>1887-1890</td>
<td>Ngāpuhi [Ngāti Tautahi &amp; Te Uri o Hua, Te Arawa</td>
<td>Anglican – educated at Waimate Mission school and St John’s College. One of few first Māori members with reasonable English fluency. Crewed on Marsden’s mission schooner, Undine, to Melanesia. Licensed surveyor. Married daughter of Kaikohe leader, Wi Hongi. Established day &amp; boarding school for Māori students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eparaima Te Mutu Kapa</td>
<td>1891-1893</td>
<td>Te Aupōuri, Tainui</td>
<td>Anglican. Brother of Rev. Hohepa Matiu Te Kapa, uncle of Rev. Mutu Paratene Kapa. Another brother, Hemi Reweti Te Kapa, reputed by Te Aupōuri to be one of the first Māori missionaries in Te Tai Tokerau area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pita Rangihiroa</td>
<td>1909-1914</td>
<td>Not northern</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraire Karaka Paikea</td>
<td>1935-1943</td>
<td>Te Uri o Hau o Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Whatua</td>
<td>Methodist minister, resigned to join Ratana.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Parliament website; Encyclopaedia of New Zealand; Dictionary of New Zealand Biography182

---

John Stenhouse has argued that privileged access strongly influenced the animosity of settlers to what they perceived as church intervention in politics during the New Zealand Wars, 1860-72. ‘The Anglican defenders of Maori rights, symbolising the religious-and-political privileges of the old English Establishment, aroused the fury of a critical mass of settlers. … many lay Anglicans warred against the clergy … as well as against Maori … demanding the subordination of church to state’.¹⁸³ Gary Hawke, too, saw a genuine radical element amongst European settlers wanting ‘rural societies free from squires and established churches’.¹⁸⁴

Intervention by Anglicans was not confined to the warring period of New Zealand’s history. In the early twentieth century, for Ngāti Porou, connections between Anglican Church and state were not just strong, but also influential in directing the Young Māori Party’s policies and allegiances, and the state’s acceptance of them. It has been suggested by Paul Moon, Hone Heke Ngapua’s biographer, that the apparently incongruous selection of non-northern Te Rangi Hiroa¹⁸⁵ for the Northern Māori seat in 1909 might have been influenced by the desire of Apirana Ngata, the Young Māori Party, and James Carroll to control the direction of Māori policy and to diminish Ngapua’s Kotahitanga emphasis.¹⁸⁶

Part of Moon’s argument was that evidence of non-acceptance of Te Rangi Hiroa in the north was in the election results – that although he won 58% of the votes in the 1909 bye-election, he polled only 26% of the total vote in 1911, and won only

¹⁸⁵ Peter Buck, successor to Hone Heke Ngapua, MHR.
¹⁸⁶ Moon, pp.330-6.
because votes were divided amongst an unprecedented number who stood against him, each one polling less than Buck. Moon’s argument is numerically correct but the outcome was simply that of the first-past-the-post electoral system. When a change of member was imposed (due to death or retirement) there were likely to be many contenders. When Buck did not stand in 1914, Tau Henare became MHR for Northern Mäori with only 23% of the vote, even less than Te Rangi Hiroa.\footnote{All information on election results, with the exception of the 1909 bye-election, comes from the relevant AJHR report, usually in the year following the election. AJHR, 1909, 2, Vol V, H-30a; Telegram Returning Officer, Russell, to Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington, 23 March 1910, Department of Internal Affairs, IA, I, 1909/424, ANZW; AJHR, 1912, II, Vol. IV, H-12A, pp.38-39; AJHR, 1915, Vol. III, H-24A, pp.29-30.}

For those familiar with horse-racing, as far northerners were, first-past-the-post suggested a tactic of each group (of hapü) putting forward its ‘runner’ and letting the fastest and strongest win. Ngata and Carroll knew that their preferred candidate need only achieve one vote more than the next highest polling candidate to take the seat. A strategy of recommending an outsider was faced with a much lower hurdle than for a clear majority. However, the hurdle should have been higher in 1911. In 1908 a second-ballot voting system had been introduced, and it was supposed to have been used again in 1911. After this, first-past-the-post was reinstated. The second ballot system provided that if no candidate won more than 50% of the votes a run-off would be held between the two top candidates. Despite Buck’s low polling in 1911, a second ballot was not held for Northern Mäori.\footnote{Research correspondence Electoral Commission, Wellington, 18 April 2006.} It seems more than coincidental that members of Parliament with responsibility for the Second Ballot Repeal Act of 1913 were: Hugh Poland, George Forbes, William Macdonald, Thomas Seddon,
Apirana Ngata, Peter Buck, Harry Atmore and George Witty. Was this another instance of not allowing due process to interfere with desired outcomes?

To understand the essence of opposition to Buck it is necessary to look behind the results to where support and opposition came from. Te Rangi Hiroa received most support from Kaikohe, Kohukohu, Matauri and Mangamuka, Motukaraka, Pakia, and a small block of votes from Parengarenga. Together these formed a narrow band, spread between west and east coasts, immediately south of the study region and slightly encroaching into it. Standing against him were four candidates from the far north – Herepete Rapihana, Riapo Timoti Puhipi, Hemi Te Paa (son of Rev. Wiki Te Paa), and Eru Ihaka – and other candidates from south of the narrow support band. Together, the far northern candidates polled 41% of the vote. In essence Buck’s strongest opposition came from the far north. This would have repercussions for Te Kao’s dairy scheme (Chapter 6) two decades later.

Tau Henare’s election in 1914, on the eve of World War One, faced a similar level of opposition from the far north, where candidates collectively received 40.5% of total Northern Māori votes. Henare’s closest rivals were Hemi Te Paa and Riapo Timoti Puhipi, both with 18%. No doubt there were reservations about Henare’s close association with Carroll, Ngata and Wi Pere (by whom he was raised as a youngster) – three East Coast men who called for the Kotahitanga movement to be disbanded in 1902. However, Henare’s performance during the war and the influenza pandemic, to which he lost his far-northern-born wife, earned him such respect that he polled

---

189 They even had a photograph taken to memorialise the event. Photograph taken by Stanley Polkinghorne Andrew, 1 December 1913, Part of S P Andrew Ltd: Portrait negatives (PAColl-3739), Timeframes Reference number: 1/1-014865-G, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.

190 The block of votes at Parengarenga was probably attributable to Lancelot Yates, the second son of Ngawini and Sam Yates, having attended school in Taranaki with Te Rangi Hiroa.

191 McConnell, Henare, Taurekareka 1877/78? - 1940; Lian, ‘State and Tribal Political Development in a Settler Society’, p.84.
68% of Northern Māori votes in 1919. All but one of the far northern contesting candidates had withdrawn. Henare’s largest single block of votes in 1922 came from his deceased wife’s hometown of Awanui. The remaining far northern contestor, Anaru Ngawaka, would eventually withdraw and enter the Anglican ministry in 1940, when he was almost 70. The secret ballot for Māori was only introduced in 1937, in time for the 1938 elections in which Paikea won Northern Māori for Ratana. Prior to that, there could have been sanctions against those known not to have supported a particular man. While it is correct to state that Buck’s support had significantly decreased by the 1911 election, it is too much to read into the election results such a definitive finding of opposition. Te Rangi Hiroa was supported more than any other individual in that election, which was how first-past-the-post worked. It is false logic to assume that all votes would have gone to the opposition if there were fewer candidates. With a more limited selection Buck might have polled higher because of intertribal rivalry.

The election of Tau Henare in 1914 returned the electorate to a ‘safe’ pair of northern Anglican hands, although Henare displayed political astuteness by maintaining friendships with both Anglican and Catholic bishops and sending his son James to Sacred Heart College. Catholic Māori had no direct, denominationally-based representation in Parliament, even though they comprised a high proportion of voters in the Hokianga. Lack of representation would have been consistent with the ‘politics of neutrality’, which Philip Turner argued that the Catholic Church adopted, although he claimed that by the 1880s ‘the Catholic church … had become a partner in white
government’. Such a shift in the church’s position is likely to have rendered Catholic representation even less acceptable to northern Māori. If Henare’s diplomacy attracted Anglican, Catholic and Methodist support, ultimately it was insufficient to outweigh the Labour-backed Ratana momentum from 1936, and he was defeated in the first election after the Labour-Ratana alliance was sealed.

Descent of Māori from Pākehā was probably advantageous in facilitating access to capital in the trading networks, and it might have favoured Frederick Russell’s selection as the first MHR for Northern Māori, and Hori Tawhiti (third MHR Northern 1876-79). But Tau Henare considered his descent from Robert Wynyard to be sufficiently disadvantageous to his parliamentary aspirations that he changed his name by deed poll in the lead-up to the elections. Although the sample is small, these changing attitudes appear to represent a shift, through time, of the value attaching to social connections (social capital). Pākehā-Māori descent might have been seen to facilitate bridging to the Pākehā institution of Parliament at first. The colonial churches’ ‘bridge’ was more effective until the mid-1930s, by which time it was perceived by many Māori to have been captured by the Pākehā state. The 1909 election wrangle can be seen as part of this tension. Hone Heke Ngapua’s Nakahi and Kotahitanga connections aligned him with northern Māori self-determination, whereas Buck and Henare were solidly of the Anglican co-operative ilk. The indigenised Ratana church offered a bridge with the potential to correct the imbalance.

196 Ngapua’s father was Nakahi and it was the Nakahi (Whiowhio or Papahurihia) politico-religious group who instigated the Dog-Tax War of 1898, just 11 years before the 1909 bye-election. Although Ngapua intervened to resolve the ‘war’, his sympathies were with the plight of northern Māori.
for Māori. Like its prophetic politico-religious predecessors, Ratana (the movement) was ideologically-based bonding, demonstrating the effectiveness of religion as a basis for building social capital.

For both the East Coast and the far north, the upset of Ratana’s capturing the four Māori seats represented a stark break from the Anglican tradition. Ironically, the Church’s act of constitutionally excommunicating Ratana’s followers, in 1925/6, resulted in the Church being effectively excommunicated from Māori parliamentary representation. It lost the privileged position it had previously held. Social capital was damaged. Anglican Church school graduates could no longer aspire to parliamentary representation in Māori electorates, once Ratana had captured all four seats. Although the Methodist Church had not enjoyed the same privilege as the Anglican, it too lost contact with Māori parliamentary representation in the north, because Paikea (MHR from 1938) was required to resign his position as an ordained Methodist minister after he converted to Ratana.

After 1940, the Mission Trust Board discontinued funding of Māori Anglican ordination candidates, handing responsibility to the St John’s College Trust Board, ‘to provide for the training of Maori ordination candidates in the same manner as European candidates’. Te Paa notes, ‘The long standing relationship between missionary and Māori, from which each had arguably derived significant mutual benefit, was ended and the immediate prospect for Maori candidates for Holy Orders was no less than total assimilation within St John’s College’.

Religion or church, in both colonised and indigenised forms, had its place in connecting Māori with parliament, where policy decisions affecting economic
engagement were made. Clustering and connections between families, whose members took roles of priests, police and parliamentarians, invites questions (and assumptions) about élitism and class. I do not expect to resolve the issue here. The work of Kwen Fee Lian is one useful reference, bringing together, as it does, the influences of other significant writers.\textsuperscript{199} However, I preface my treatment of his paper with two reservations. First is the issue of semantics, in the sense of the relationship between words, as symbols, and what they represent. It is important to distinguish between the significational system and the connotational\textsuperscript{200} – to separate the terms used from their underlying cultural assumptions that influence meaning. Second is an apparent assumption that ‘economic man’ is the motivational basis,\textsuperscript{201} which disallows alternative motivations. These two factors could lead to contrived, or spurious, logic.

Lian argued that class relations, based on circulation rather than production, were discernible in nascent form in Māori society in the mid-nineteenth century. The visible class structure could become class relations in a capitalist economy, where relations of production would develop (in the orthodox Marxist sense) and transcend relations of distribution in tribal society. This, he considered, could have occurred under conditions where settler colonialism began the transition of New Zealand society from a tribal to a capitalist economy. Within a stable political and economic climate, a faction from within the rangatira élite could entrench themselves as the dominant class, but settler colonialism excluded Māori from full participation in the economy and, therefore, class relations of production did not emerge. Lian further

\textsuperscript{199} In particular, Sahlins, Goldman, Godelier, Howard, Smith, Meillassoux, Hindes and Hirst, Davidson, Dalton, Rey, Winiata, Bowden, Wolf.


\textsuperscript{201} In the extreme, the exclusive utility-maximising individual devoid of any responsibility other than to self.
argued that ‘the elements of a nascent class structure facilitated the divide-and-rule strategies of colonial administrators and settler governments’. 202

With respect to the proposed transition from tribal to capitalist economy, it is clear that such a transition was not far progressed in the far north for much of the period of this study, although I agree with Elizabeth Rata that ‘By the mid-nineteenth century the encroachment of capitalism had displaced the traditional mode of production as an integrated economic system …’ to varying extents. 203 Lian’s concept of nascent class structure facilitating colonial strategies appears irrelevant as an explanation. Choices of co-operation, collaboration or resistance made by autonomous hapū were outcomes of pre-existing decision-making rather than some nascent form of class structure.

Lian wrote about nascent class relations in Māori society, in the Marxist sense. Colin Bundy identified a propensity for stratification amongst African peasantry. Both were supposedly triggered by the introduction of capitalism. In that pre-colonial Māori society was ranked, stratification already existed. But a ranked society did not amount to class relations in the classic Marxist sense. James Belich considered that tribal Māori could exist outside the class structures. 204 I interpret the clustering and connections of families to be a deliberate attempt to bridge between Māori and Pākehā institutions of decision-making and societal control, as would be expected in a true partnership arrangement. To suggest that this phenomenon emulates class relations in a capitalist society is not the only logical extrapolation. For instance, Chapter 4 describes a system of co-operative Māori-owned gum stores, which were

202 Lian, ‘Tribe, Class and Colonisation’, pp.406-7. Elizabeth Rata extended the thread of Lian’s argument to describe the emergence of a class-based neo-tribal capitalism amongst Ngāti Kuri through the Waitangi Tribunal claims’ process. Elizabeth Rata, A Political Economy of Neotribal Capitalism, Lanham and Oxford, 2000. Rata’s analysis relates to a much later time period than my study, but it remains important to consider whether the seeds of such an emergence were evident during the time period of this study.

203 Rata, Neotribal Capitalism, p.85.

204 Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.126.
the nexus between two economic systems: capitalist and communal. The two systems could co-exist, while two kaupapa regulated the economy. I would argue that far northern Māori sought roles in the Pākehā economy (and society) equivalent to the roles they held in their own. Roles in each were diverse – diversification, differentiation, and stratification reflected continuity rather than being capitalism’s products. However, new opportunities available in capitalism influenced the path of differentiation, in reaction to and against its tenets. While many European settlers sought to at least preserve their status, if not improve it, and were fearful of losing it, to automatically assume the same motivations operated in other cultures would be analytically limiting. That is not to say improvement of status (or pursuit of mana) was not a goal for some Māori, but rather that driving values sought a match or equivalence between systems, in which individuals would be valued and respected as partners. The emergence of a rural class in the early twentieth century can also be seen in this way.205

Paradoxically, it was the very nature of settler colonialism that ultimately inhibited the growth of a class structure in Māori society, Lian concluded. ‘Once settlers had effective ownership of the land, they had no further need for interchange … unless indigenous labour was required’.206 That Māori became less important to Pākehā is indisputable, but in the far north the need for interchange persisted. The next section of this chapter traces the effective transfer of ownership of land. The following chapters concentrate on the continuing interchanges, which involved much more than just use of indigenous labour.

Land ownership changes

Up until the mid-1850s, far northern Māori maintained a high degree of control over transactions. They had encouraged European settlement on their terms and their population still outnumbered Pākehā. In the second half of the nineteenth century Europeans outnumbered Māori only in scattered Pākehā settlements. In the region as a whole Māori maintained a majority into the 1890s, although they became increasingly excluded from the most fertile land. The Old Land Claims’ process, new legislation, the operation of the Native Land Court, aggressive Crown-purchasing programmes, financial constraints, and local-body rating severely eroded the control that Māori exercised over land. Land alienation, experienced as loss of ownership, access and control was concentrated in the 1860-1910 period.

Far northern Māori had encouraged European settlement from pre-Treaty times, expecting and fostering mutually beneficial partnerships on the traditional basis of incorporating individuals, and controlling events, even under introduced legislation, into the 1850s (Chapter 2). They had intended that government purchases up to 1865 would give rise to a partnership relationship with the governor. They expected that sufficient land would be reserved for their continuing and enhanced prosperity. Far northern Māori did not expect to be marginalised in the process. Up to the 1860s, the motivation for ‘sale’ of land was consistent with the notion of the ‘Pursuit of Mana’ – the desire to incorporate new people with their technologies and opportunities, and vindication of their claims to land.207 However, from the 1860s, the credit/debt trap caused casualties, and non-transparent, administrative and legal processes caused confusion. But when things changed adversely on the ground, every avenue, from direct negotiation and petitioning, to passive and even armed resistance in the 1890s,

was resorted to in attempts to influence change. That far northern Māori were not successful in achieving their desired outcomes in the hundred years following the signing of the Treaty, was not for want of effort. That they survived to tell the tale could be said to be due to persistence, adaptability and use of their greatest assets: the informal economy and social capital.

Land transactions in the far north fall into a small number of discrete types: pre-Treaty transactions, Crown purchases before the Native Land Court was instituted, sale of reserves from these Crown purchases arising out of the introduction of the Land Court, further Crown purchases in the 1870s and 1890s, and non-Crown sales arising from issuing of title by the Land Court. These are summarised in Table 4. Each type has its distinctive characteristics; together they form a pattern of initiatives and adaptive responses by Māori to the Pākehā demand for land. Transactions prior to the Native Land Court were covered in Chapter 2.

Panakareao’s strategy of encouraging Pākehā settlement persisted after his death. Timoti Puhipi reassured Governor Sir G. F. Bowen, on his 1870 visit, that:

While other tribes … have fought against you, I and my people have never done so … and unless you strike the first blow or attack us they never will. I shall be like my ancestors and fathers; I shall befriend the Europeans … here they will always be safe and unmolested.²⁰⁸

The government’s eagerness to buy, when faced with armed resistance in the central North Island 1860-72, converged with the far northern tribes’ eagerness to participate in a new economy, coming from a position of local cash scarcity. By this time the

need for money was becoming the motivation for land sales.²⁰⁹ It could have been a win-win arrangement. As the Waitangi Tribunal noted:

Māori envisaged participation in a new economic regime, and understanding that they had a special arrangement with the Governor for their protection, made available for settlement virtually all the land that was asked for. Taking what they could get for the present, they still had cause to think that the main benefits would come later, that they would still be partners in the new development, and that their authority in the district, and their association with their ancestral land, would continue.²¹⁰

But by the 1870s the anticipated benefits had not materialised, and attitudes hardened. Just as the Crown purchase agents sought to bind Māori into agreements to sell, by offering advance payments to some of the large numbers of owners on titles, so did far northern Māori attempt to bind the Crown to a definite plan of settlement and development through the allocation of further land for this specific purpose. Timoti Puhipi was explicit: ‘The reason of giving you this land is, that we want Europeans to come (and reside on the land) not later than January 1874’.²¹¹

Comprehensive land-buying before 1865 had left scattered reserves and remainders throughout the central Muriwhenua claim area. Deeds of conveyance for the remainders were lost from government files; when and how is not clear. Some of the land that the Crown purchased was sold; the Crown retained some. When the onus of proof finally shifted from the Crown (to prove acquisitions) to Māori (to show what

²⁰⁹ Ballara, 'Pursuit of Mana? A Re-Evaluation'. And see Chapter 4 for analysis of the development of a money economy.
²¹⁰ Muriwhenua Land, p.209.
²¹¹ T. Puhipi to T. McDonnell, 7 August 1873, AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/1 1873/12, ANZW; O’Malley and Robertson, p.97.
land was still theirs), the loss of conveyance deeds deprived Māori of the evidence required to claim the remainders.²¹²

Table 4 - Summary of land transactions in the Muriwhenua claim area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title change and Crown assumption acres</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crown grants pre-Treaty</td>
<td>20774 Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Surplus'</td>
<td>26621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown purchases 1850-65</td>
<td>280179 Notes 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>327574</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder from Crown purchases</td>
<td>10868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves onsold 1865-1908</td>
<td>12292 Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown purchases 1870s</td>
<td>63903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murimotu - Crown assumption 1878</td>
<td>2491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private purchase Mokaikai 1878</td>
<td>10923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Acquisitions 1880-1910</td>
<td>21305 Note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriwhenua</td>
<td>56628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Yates’ claim</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Land Court</td>
<td>1459 Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>180133</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>507707</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) Excluding grants to men with Māori wives.
(2) Crown assumed further 64,136 acres for Taylor, Muriwhenua East & Oruru valley without declaring surpluses.
(3) Access to Crown lands continued through gumdigging period.
(4) Excludes sales after 1908.
(5) Includes Manawatahi 1908 – 984 acres approximately.

Sources: Muriwhenua Land Claim Report and ‘Muriwhenua Land Claims Post 1865’²¹³

From a Māori perspective at least, and arguably in international law, the relationship between Māori and the government was much more than simply that of buyer and seller.²¹⁴ Under such an implied fiduciary relationship, adequate reserves should have been made, but were not. The Tribunal report for the Muriwhenua land claim argued that the government maintained a reserves’ policy in name, sufficient to satisfy the imperial government that such a policy existed, but failed to implement it, being

²¹² Muriwhenua Land, pp.298, 300.
²¹³ ibid, Stokes.
²¹⁴ Muriwhenua Land, pp.181-2.
prejudiced by a growing antipathy to Māori interests. This, the report said, was shown in a range of nineteenth-century opinions:

That land had no value in native hands, that only their cultivations should be reserved, that their other lands were not used, that Māori were a dying race so they did not need land, that Māori should be relieved of the burden of their lands so they might learn to labour for a living.215

These attitudes persisted in – and indeed pervaded – the entire period of this study. The purpose of the reserves’ policy had been enunciated at the start of the Crown’s 1850s land-purchase programme. Reserves were to consist of:

Blocks of land excepted by the Natives, for their own use and subsistence, within the tracts of land they have ceded to the Crown for colonization … Maori should not … be called upon to alienate any lands so reserved, it being considered essential for their own maintenance and welfare to retain them.216

Once reserves were set aside, local boards, comprising resident magistrates, missionaries and chiefs, were to administer them, but they were not to have any power of alienation. However, only small numbers of reserves were set aside, many of which were remote from the establishing towns, rivers or coastal routes, and poor in quality. None was sufficient for an agricultural livelihood for even a small hapū. In 1871 the Commissioner of Native Reserves reported that ‘the Rarawa of Mongonui’ was one of three groups of Māori who had the least ratio of land left to land sold in the North Island. A total of 24,296 acres of land was held for 1275 people, or 19 acres per head, compared with 40 acres per head for Ngāti Whatua, who were also considered in this bracket.217 Only one of the far northern reserves was ever gazetted; most reserves were sold, sometimes instantaneously, and often shortly after being set

215 ibid., p.328.
216 D. McLean to Colonial Secretary, 29 July 1854, no 41, Turton, Epitome, p D21, cit. ibid.
217 Report from the Commissioner of Native Reserves, AJHR, 1871, 2, F-4. For an overall analysis of per capita land patterns, see Figure 18.
aside. As examples, there were only two reserves for the Houhora Māori; both passed to influential traders in 1866, the circumstances suggesting they had in fact been ‘sold’ beforehand. Resident Magistrate W. B. White reported in 1864:

A piece of land situated at Ohoro [Houhora], containing 100 acres, reserved by the chief Brown [Paraone], when the Muriwhenua block was purchased, to be given to Captain Butler, in liquidation of certain debts of the tribe.

The second reserved Houhora property passed to the Subritzky brothers. In 1865 they had obtained grazing rights to 25,000 acres, establishing various activities, including gum trading.

The Butler Houhora sale correspondence lends credibility to the supposition that transactions transferring land to Samuel Yates, between 1863 and 1873 (and probably a flock of sheep in 1879), were, like Butler’s, in satisfaction of gum debts. Yates, the son of a London lawyer, settled first as a storekeeper at Mangonui in 1853. Together with Stannus Jones he extended his trading northwards in the 1860s to Parengarenga, establishing the only general store in the area, through which gum was traded. In 1865 Parengarenga was described as:

about 100 men women and children, but Brown [Paraone] states there are 300. They are digging Kauri gum, they have sold 880 tons of it obtained from this narrow tract from which they got 30s per cwt. They have been working for the last 10 years and still have not exhausted the supply, they support a trader a Jew named Yates, who is well spoken of, he keeps a store.

Yates joined the local Māori community through his child-bearing relationship (from the late 1860s) and his 1880 European-registered marriage to Ngawini Mare

---

218 BAFO 10852 2a, pp.314-5, ANZA; Muriwhenua Land, p.312; Stokes, p.30.
221 Entry for 25 April 1865, Richard Taylor’s journal, Taylor qMS 1833-73, ATL, cit. Muriwhenua Land, p.316.
(Murray), who was of Te Aupōuri/ Te Rarawa/ Ngāti Kahu descent. Yates presumed to have purchased ‘Paua’ (later called the Muriwhenua Block), on the Parengarenga Harbour, from local Māori in 1863, but as there was no right of private purchase until the operation of the Land Court became effective in the north in 1865, this arrangement would have been informal, in anticipation of the Court’s decision. Local histories generally state that Yates’ access to the land was through his wife’s family connections. However, these histories obfuscate the controversies. Ngawini was only about 10 or 11 years old in 1863, and she was not directly of the far northern line. There were three other contenders for the land (discussed in the next section of this chapter), but ultimately it was awarded to Yates.

Claimants in the Muriwhenua land claim submitted to the Waitangi Tribunal that ‘a type of bondage to the stores which the gum traders operated caused Māori to sell, or lease, more of such land as remained to them in an attempt to release themselves from both debt and servitude’. The claimants disputed the Crown’s view that Māori sold their land because gumdigging was more lucrative than horticulture. The credit-debt trap followed the general pattern analysed by Keith Sorrenson. He has shown that local storekeepers or publicans offered Māori liberal supplies of goods on credit and through debts, a hold was obtained on Māori and their land. A sitting of the Land Court was arranged and, if possible, certificates were obtained only for those willing to sell the land. Europeans could obtain a lease or freehold title. If freehold was not obtained immediately the credit-debt procedure was applied again until the final

---

222 Her biography gives her birth year as about 1852/3, see Armstrong.
223 Stokes, p.190.
224 Muriwhenua Land, p.356.
conveyance was obtained. Although legislation was proposed in 1869 to restrict this practice, the land speculators’ contra-lobby prevented the Bill being passed. The combined effect of the government’s post-Treaty handling of pre-Treaty transactions and failure to implement the reserves’ policy, the lack of promised benefits flowing from government purchases of 1850-65, and the new experience for Māori of monetary debt (as opposed to obligations under traditional gift exchange in goods rather than money), led to increasing disillusionment, doubt, dissatisfaction, and distrust on the part of Māori. One significant consequence was severe erosion of social capital between Pākehā and Māori. Further Crown purchases from 1870, and the operation of the Native Land Court, were even more destructive.

**Native Land Court Transactions**

Although most of the best lands encompassed by the Muriwhenua claim boundaries had at least theoretically changed hands before 1865, Māori still owned more than half the area (estimated 57%), of which some land was good, when the Land Court was instituted. By 1870, the government had achieved its objectives of obtaining large contiguous blocks of fertile land in the far north. Māori were being excluded from the main areas of European activity. Title to most of Victoria Valley finally passed to the Crown in the 1870s. But European settlers were less enthusiastic about the location of, and access to, this extremity of the island. Consequently, much of the land remained unoccupied, and the promised settlement benefits for Māori did not flow. Māori continued to access and use parts of it. Thus, the meaning of land sale remained obscured. It was access to resources, not ownership, that Māori most understood by the transactions.

---

In the 1870s Crown purchase agents acquired about 10% of the total Muriwhenua claim acreage under the various new Immigration and Public Works Acts. By 1909, the Stout-Ngata Commission estimated far northern Māori retained less than 20%, and that here, as generally throughout the country, Māori land interests had ceased to be of any economic significance.\textsuperscript{228} By these means, the operation of the Land Court facilitated alienation of about 30% of the Muriwhenua claim area; as much again as the Crown purchase programme of 1856-65.

Researchers for the claim could not obtain accurate or reliable figures for private purchases, but they identified the two largest privately purchased blocks as those bought by Samuel Yates and his Hawaiian financier Francis Sinclair. By far the greatest acreage affected by the Land Court process was the Muriwhenua Block. As noted earlier, there were several contenders for the block. The government claimed the land as surplus to Taylor’s transaction of January 1840 (Chapter 2); Taylor claimed he held the land in trust for the tribes to prevent its alienation; Yates claimed to have bought it from Māori in 1863, before it passed through the Land Court; and Māori ‘saw themselves as still owning the land, neither the government nor Taylor having taken physical possession of any parts or having otherwise asserted any rights on the ground’.\textsuperscript{229}

This last position is supported by oral history recorded in 1957:

… in 1865 the Maori leader Paraone had preserved the tail of the fish, from below Te Kao to the Cape, halting the sale of the top of New Zealand to the Government, and keeping this land in the hands of the Maoris for the time being.\textsuperscript{230}

\textsuperscript{228} Williams, ‘Te Kooti Tango Whenua’, p.15.
\textsuperscript{229} Muriwhenua Land, p.316.
\textsuperscript{230} Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.41. Unfortunately, the author, Henderson, does not consistently name his sources.
Yates had built a large home for himself, and three employees’ residences, on the property in the year he claimed to have bought it, which was consistent with tuku whenua allocation of land for habitation and use. Perhaps because of Yates’ presence, on 26 July 1866 Māori signed a reaffirmation that Taylor held the land on behalf of the tribe. The Land Court did not investigate title to the land until 1871, when Resident Magistrate White abandoned any government claim. He had previously advised the government that by so doing the land would pass to Yates. Taylor’s position was not considered, and the land was vested in seven Māori. The transfer to Yates was successfully presented in the year that Taylor died, 1873. In this transaction Yates acquired 56,268 acres, and through subsequent transactions, the family acquired a further 12,399 acres.

Yates monopolised the remote northern gum trade until the late 1870s, when a second trader, Joseph Evans, established a branch operation of his Waipapakauri-based gum trading at Te Kao. The interplay between the two was akin to a duopoly by 1908, motivating the local schoolteacher, Charles Ablett, to express his concern. ‘The Evans’ of Hohoura [sic] and Te Kao (this is strictly confidential), aided by the Yates of Parenga, simply do as they please with the whole area’.

---

231 Taylor to F. D. Fenton, 19 June 1873, GNZ, MSS 297, Taylor collection, folder 18, ACL, cit. Muriwhenua Land, p.317.
232 At this time, Ngawini would have been 20-21 years old.
233 Muriwhenua Land, p.318. In 1876 the Taylor family transferred 852 contiguous acres, which had been granted to their father through the Old Land Claims’ process; Yates’ Hawaiian financier acquired a further 10,923 acres in 1878, from the 10 Māori in whom it had been vested in 1871, which he transferred to Ngawini in 1907, after Sam’s death; and in 1889 Ngawini bought a further 264 acres from the five Māori in whom it had been vested by Land Court title in 1871. The resultant total of these holdings (68,667 acres) passed from the Yates family to a Pākehā family in 1920, following Ngawini’s death. All properties passed to the Crown between 1966 and 1973, and were formed into the Te Paki recreation reserve and Mokaikai scenic reserve in 1984.
234 Charles W. Ablett to Under Secretary, Native Department, February 1908, ACIH 16036 MA1/1 1906/1009, ANZW; Stokes, p.197 (emphasis original).
Ablett’s comment draws attention to an interesting aspect of the rules’ contest. In effect, several legal systems operated: formal British law, with British possessing a defined mode of enforcement in relation to personal and property infringements; its interpretation and implementation by officials; the understanding of non-English-speaking Māori, which was less explicit and usually dependent on verbal communication; and Māori ture and kaupapa. Another was a privatised law, the law of the frontier – the application by individual British of their own modified version. At times, British privatised law was supported or condoned by formal authority, further confusing Māori by its inconsistent application. As the term implies, frontier law operated in remote locations, beyond the purview of central government. An example was given in Chapter 2, where Resident Magistrate White exercised his own law through his conflicting official roles. Until the introduction of the Resident Magistrate’s Act of 1867, magistrates had a generous degree of autonomy. Lian argued that with the passing of the Act ‘in effect Resident Magistrates could now be mediators only of British law’, assuming incorrectly that magistrates would comply. No doubt some resented restriction and persisted in exercising their earlier freedom. Indeed, White had already clearly indicated that he would. As much as the frontier law might have caused confusion to Māori, it also sent a clear signal to them that the British law was to be trifled with. There was greater scope for choices than the official laws provided, but any meddling by Māori would not achieve the support of authorities.

The relevance of the Muriwhenua block series of negotiations to this thesis is not their legality, appropriateness or morality, but rather what the transactions reveal about the

235 For an Australian reference, see Butlin, p.201.
236 Muriwhenua Land, p.187; Stokes, p.19.
237 Lian, 'State and Tribal Political Development in a Settler Society', p.76.
238 White to Native Secretary, 10 January 1868, BAFO 10852 2a, p.563, ANZA.
relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy in this location, remote from the main
centres of Pākehā economic activity. In the first series of transactions, the Māori
custom of incorporation appears to have been practised, in modified form, to the
mutual benefit of the parties. Quite likely, Te Aupōuri/Ngāti Kurī were building on
their previous experiences of success with Jem the Tahitian from 1809, and their
missionary connections from 1835. The alleged sale in 1863 could indicate
willingness by both parties to step, or rather remain, outside the Pākehā legal system,
in the informal and traditional economic mode. Māori might have been coerced by
debt, but were exercising tuku whenua, and the right they believed they had, under the
Treaty, to deal with their lands. Yates was prepared to take the risk, believing he
could influence the situation to his advantage. Māori still perceived themselves to be
in control of their domain, albeit influenced less than comfortably by the outsider.
Nevertheless, Yates demonstrated a commitment to the community, through
procreation and marriage and his trading activities, which facilitated the relationship
of Māori to the Pākehā economy. 239

The second and more contentious series of transactions took the relationship beyond
the tolerance of Māori. In 1900, the Parengarenga and Pakohu lands comprised the
remaining living areas for Ngāti Kurī and Te Aupōuri, including Te Hapua and Te
Kao. Both had come before the Native Land Court in 1896. Ngawini Yates had
applied in 1891 to partition off the peninsula for herself and 30 others, against some
objections that her descent lines did not belong there. 240 The recounting of these
events can be taken as a Māori perspective.

239 This facilitation role corresponds to ‘bridging capital’, an aspect of social capital discussed in
Chapter 1.
240 Stokes, p.190.
It wasn’t long before certain Maoris came round towards the Pakeha viewpoint of land ownership …

Soon a woman of the Aupouri tribe … claimed and attempted to sell off the land at Te Kao. To back up her claim, she ordered a survey of this land, amounting to thousands of acres. This survey was made by the Government – a costly business for the tribe …

The Elders of the Aupouri tribe appealed to the Government for an investigation of the Te Kao land titles, and launched a counter-attack by claiming all the land, to the top.

The Elders knew such an investigation would cost them much money. To get this to fight the case, Dalmatians were allowed in, to dig gum, at the charge of about £10 a head. Three to four hundred Dalmatians made a rush … and the Elders had their ammunition for the legal battle looming.

To settle these claims, the Maori (Native) Land court began sitting at Mangonui, 60 miles south, in 1895.

“they had no Pakeha counsel to guide them along, they just used their own knowledge …”

the Elders, realising that they had to keep sober when giving evidence, purposely refrained from taking any liquor …

At the end of this long and tedious business the court awarded the Elders of Te Kao some 49,000 acres, and the woman who originally set out to claim the land got 200 acres.241

As a consequence of the Land Court process, survey liens were charged against some of the partitioned blocks. By the end of 1901, these liens had been transferred to Ngawini Yates. Elders of Te Kao had not authorised either the survey or her payment of the liens, and in 1902 expressed their concern to the Native Minister that the land was being put to public auction to pay off the survey money. In support of a petition by Te Kao elders, the chairman of the Māori Council for Mangonui and Hone Heke Ngapua, MHR for Northern Māori, intervened, arranging for the liens to be paid and the lands to be vested in the Tokerau Māori Land Council to administer them, by

241 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.41. Informant not identified.
leasing and other means, in order to pay off the survey debts.242 ‘Within a year the Te Kao people realised they had lost control of their lands, and any income that they might realise’.243 These were the only Muriwhenua claim lands administered by the Tokerau Māori Land Board, and this with questionable competence. Most of the land was leased to the Yates’ children, and then transferred to intermediaries for the predatory Parenga Gum Company.244

The Muriwhenua example demonstrates the economically devastating effects the actions of one or two individuals could have for the collective. More importantly, it highlights the belief and determination that Te Aupōuri and Ngāti Kurī Māori still had that they could, and would, take control of the process, and the disbelief at the adverse outcome of an apparent victory. Gum revenue, which could have been put to other potentially more beneficial uses, was absorbed in court costs, and still, at the conclusion of the court process, there was insufficient to pay the survey costs of approximately £900.

These transactions illustrate, rather than represent, those in the Muriwhenua claim area. But the series of events confirm Sorrenson’s analysis of land-purchase methods. In addition to the credit-debt trap mentioned earlier, here are examples of Europeans finding one or two people to start the claims’ process, in 1871 and again in 1891, the creation of a debt for the tribe in the process, and the use of unpaid debt to force sale or lease of land.245 The transactions also show the operation of the frontier law (informality that served the formalisation objective), which contributed to a process of wealth confiscation or transfer, discussed later in this chapter.

242 Stokes, pp.189-94.
243 Ibid., p.194.
244 See Appendix 5. The Board also received money paid out in compensation for claim of Motuopao Island for a lighthouse and did not pass it on to the appropriate claimants.
As noted earlier, alienation of land was not immediate; effective control of land did not pass with English law title, nor with Crown assumption, but followed events on the ground. Kaitaia mission lands continued to be occupied and used by Māori until the founding missionaries died between 1878 and 1895. When the CMS closed its New Zealand mission in 1882, its lands were passed to the Church of England and ‘surplus’ of these in Kaitaia were put up for auction in 1885.\footnote{246} In 1913, a son of one of the missionaries sold land to which he had succeeded, which was subdivided to become the township of Kaitaia.\footnote{247} These two transactions were significant to Māori because they departed from the original basis of the pre-Treaty agreements; on-sale to third parties was neither contemplated nor authorised under tuku whenua, but the Pākehā owners believed that they had the right under British law, which conveyed title, to dispose of the land as they chose.

Neither did other Europeans immediately occupy lands purchased by the Crown during 1850-1865; the promised settlement failed to materialise to the extent intended by government and Māori. Crown lands were extensively used for gumdigging, by Māori and non-Māori, from the 1860s to 1920s, but the requirement, under the Kauri Gum Industry Act 1898, to pay a licence to dig on government land reserved for gumdigging, did not apply to Māori. Thus, the meaning of land sale was further obscured. Confusion over the ‘Taylor grant’ at Kapowaiwai, which Māori continued to occupy, caused them surprise when they were evicted in the 1960s, over 120 years later. True alienation did not correspond with transfer of title.


\footnote{247}{Florence Keene, \textit{Kaitaia & Its People}, Whangarei, 1989, p.5.}
Contested and confused issues of control, compounded by leasing of Māori-owned land by the Tokerau Māori Land Board, intensified the shock of actual alienation. Between 1870 and 1903, inward migration of Europeans escalated, but immigrants were predominantly itinerant gumdiggers, rather than settlers, who offered few opportunities for Māori to develop long-term trading relationships, and who left the area even less attractive for settler occupation. By 1900, Māori comprised about half the far northern population, and held less than a quarter of the land, most of which was remote and unproductive. Figure 16 shows the scattering of remaining lands; it corresponds inversely with Figure 17, which maps the main European commercial centre.248

The number of acres of land that Māori lost was not the only issue. The quality of land lost, with that remaining fragmented into blocks and multiple titles, the disruption of access to traditional hunting and fishing grounds, and the fall in population, exacerbated Māori experience of acute loss. By the first decade of the twentieth century, geographic and economic marginalisation of far northern Māori had been effected.

248 Figure 17 neatly illustrates a microcosm of Johann von Thünen’s early nineteenth-century spatial economic theory of production circles arising from differential transportation costs to central markets. This theory has been developed more recently by Herman Shwartz to explain globalisation patterns, of which family farming was an important component of agricultural-led industrialisation (See Chapter 6). Herman Schwartz, States Versus Markets: History, Geography, and the Development of the International Political Economy, 2nd edn, New York, 1994; Christopher Lloyd and Jacob Metzer, 'Settler Colonization and Societies in History: Patterns and Concepts', paper presented at the 20th International Congress of Historical Sciences: Session of the International Economic History Association: Settler Economies in World History, Sydney, 3-9 July 2005, p.29.
Figure 16 - Land tenure c. 1900

Source: Muriwhenua Land Claims post-1865

Figure 17 - Far north's centre of economic activity

Stokes, p.72 Figure 11. Map drawn by Max Oulton, reproduced with permission.
Timing of land loss over 1834-1939 (Figure 18), combined with population change, shows a further lag effect in experienced land loss. In 1835, one estimate of the Māori population in the area equivalent to the Mangonui County was around 8000;\textsuperscript{250} by the first census in 1871 numbers had fallen to just under 3000. Whether the 1835 estimate is accurate or not, the population was higher in 1835 than in 1871, and it reduced unevenly with successive epidemics. In 1862, Kaitaia alone recorded 89 deaths from typhoid fever.\textsuperscript{251} A worse epidemic about 50 years earlier affected many middle-aged Māori. Survivors recollected that sometimes 20 to 30 died at a time.\textsuperscript{252}

**Figure 18 - Timing of loss of acres and per capita land in Mangonui County**

As the population decreased, a constant acreage of land translated to an increase in acres per capita. The effect of a steady population decline (from 8000 to 3000) exceeding the *rate* of land loss between 1835-71 was to increase the number of acres

\textsuperscript{250} Muriwhenua Land, p.379.
per person, although the average quality of the remaining land deteriorated. But after 1871, land loss outstripped population decline up to the late 1880s, reducing per capita acreage. Once the population started to recover, even though land loss slowed, per capita acreage further reduced. In 1835, land was reasonably evenly distributed between hapū at about 84 acres per person, and was used communally. But by 1940, sale and fragmentation of land blocks caused an uneven distribution between hapū, and an overall average of less than 29 acres per person still living in the area. Those who had migrated out of the area often retained ownership interests in multiple-titled land. Thus, the acreage divided by ownership would have been lower still.253

In 1870, when acres per capita had been 104, the true extent of land loss was masked, to some extent, and even in 1900 the level of 59 acres per person might not have appeared ‘unreasonable’. Because Māori continued to use some land that had legally changed hands, the combined effect of eventual loss of control and population recovery after 1896 pushed the actual experience of land loss even more severely into the twentieth century. It was then that the shadow of title took on its substance. By 1940 many far northern Māori had relocated. The distribution of hapū at that time is shown in Figure 19. Confusion caused by non-transparent legal processes, poorly defined policies with respect to surplus and scrip lands, and apparent duplicity of the government left Muriwhenua claimants, 150 years after the signing of the Treaty, with a dual sense of loss: loss of their land and the history of its loss.254

Figure 19 - Distribution of hapū in 1940

Source: Hapū names from map compiled by Hami Maioha for the 1940 Centennial historical atlas.\(^{255}\)

Land legislation

Stuart Banner accepted (whereas others might not) that some Māori losses were caused by fraud by the English, some were caused by an inability of Māori to bargain as well as the English, and some frittered away the proceeds. But he contended that much of what Māori lost in the nineteenth century could not be attributed to the actions of individuals, rather, the structure of the market itself impoverished Māori, independent of the action of any of the individuals working within it. He argued this on the basis that a market is nothing but a complex of law; there is no single ‘natural’ choice of the set of property and contract law that can serve as a baseline ‘free’ market; that the laws that establish a market are created in the political process, and that people who expect to be primarily buyers or sellers will attempt to influence the wording of the laws that construct the market. The colonial government continually adjusted the laws in ways that caused prices received by Māori to be lower than they would otherwise have been.

Ann Parsonson has suggested that the crippling legislative constraints on control and use of land could have been inevitable.

there was an essential conflict of interest between indigenous people and colonizers, for it may be argued that exercise of a right which in effect allowed Maori to control the speed of settlement, the price of land and the nature of their relationships with settlers was so deeply at odds with the colonizing imperative and the perceived role of a colonizing state that the government saw no alternative but to curb it. Implicit in this rationale is that ‘[e]conomic interest in a takeover [colonising] process must be recognised as a major determinant of the outcome’. However, Banner

256 Banner, p.90.
257 Including legislation, court decisions and informal norms.
258 Parsonson, 'The Fate of Maori Land Rights', p.186.
259 Butlin, p.205.
would challenge Parsonson’s suggestion of inevitability on the basis that a free
market is an infinite variety of structures rather than one. 260 While the government
might not have seen an alternative to curbing Māori control of the market, there were
options that need not have involved crippling constraints.

Nevertheless, politicians trod a troubled line between conflicting and competing
interests of parties, on ‘a course steered between settler pressure and Māori
resistance’. 261 Because settlers were stronger, and there was ‘greater respect for
settler prejudices than Maori needs and wishes’, McLean’s policy of the 1870s
followed Grey’s of the 1840s and 1850s, namely, ‘“managing” the Maori people to
permit the extension of settlement at the greatest rate possible short of provoking
renewed violence’. 262

Management of price through market structure was one device; another was
allocation of costs incident to the market process. That the process would be
expensive was inevitable. Some costs were inherent in the project, but many were
not. The organisation and staffing of the Native Land Court imposed substantial
costs. However, Banner argued, ‘the unavoidability of some costs … did not mean
that the way those costs were allocated was unavoidable. … the way the Court’s
proceedings were structured imposed nearly all the costs squarely on the Maori’. 263
Sometimes costs exceeded the price obtained for land sold, and sometimes land had to
be sold or leased to meet costs of the Land Court just determining title. As Wiremu
Te Wheoro, a Court assessor wrote:

260 Banner, p.91. This argument is similar to the one I proposed as a counter to Lian’s assumptions in
the earlier discussion of class and economic structures. Just as a free market can have a variety of
structures, so too can a ranked society reflect a variety of structures of economy.
263 Banner, p.71.
Behold there is the survey one, the Court two, the Lawyers three, the Native Interpreters four, the Crown grant five and the giving of the land to the other side.\textsuperscript{264}

Costs included not only unavoidable costs,\textsuperscript{265} but also avoidable costs due to error and carelessness on the part of officials, which occurred at a higher rate than could reasonably be expected. One cause of error could be attributed to institutional thinking.\textsuperscript{266} Colonial judges brought inappropriate English norms into the Land Court, despite its peculiarities distinguishing it from English courts, resulting in titles being awarded to wrong parties.

This institutional thinking applied also to accounting ‘experts’ who were instrumental in increasing the costs allocated to Māori. Exorbitant levies were subject to bureaucratic, rather than parliamentary, approval.\textsuperscript{267} Accounting was accepted institutionally as being ‘neutral, objective and calculable’ and as allowing ‘the corporation to be governed and administered according to the facts’.\textsuperscript{268} The influence of bureaucracy was not lost on one Māori.

Directly I saw the provisions of this Bill I found they were like unto a sea-monster. The whole of the Native people and their lands are to be swallowed up.\textsuperscript{269}

G. S. Whitmore responded:

\textsuperscript{264} Wiremu te Wheoro to Donald McLean, 1871, cit. ibid., p.89.
\textsuperscript{265} Survey fees, court fees, legal costs, travel, accommodation and sustenance in attending distant courts.
\textsuperscript{266} ‘Anyone working within an institutional framework for many years can, without reflection or even noticing, come to internalize the institution’s norms and accept them reflexively as worth upholding’. Banner, p.73.
\textsuperscript{267} Public Trust commissions on rents, government salaries and expenses, disbursement fees, and interest retained on undistributed balances. Hooper and Kearins, \textit{Walrus, Carpenter and Oysters}, pp.16-17.
\textsuperscript{268} ibid., p.9; P. Miller and T. O’Leary, ‘Accounting Expertise and the Politics of the Product: Economic Citizenship and the Modes of Corporate Governance’, \textit{Accounting, Organizations and Society}, 18, 2/3, 1993, pp.188-9.
\textsuperscript{269} Wi Tako Ngatata, NZPD, 43, 8 September 1882, p.868. The Bill under discussion was the Crown and Native Lands Rating Bill, the object of which was to enable districts with Crown and Native Lands in them to rate those lands. A second reading of the Bill had been moved. Ngatata spoke next.
We shall take the oyster by degrees out of its shell – we shall keep an account against the oyster, and when at last it is opened, the oyster will go up into the Treasury. We shall then say to the Natives, “The land is not yours; we have an account against it which amounts to its value, and therefore you get nothing for it”.  

In addition to low prices and high costs associated with land transactions, Māori landowners encountered further systematic economic disadvantages. Before the 1920s:

any Maori who wished to farm his land faced many obstacles. Even if the land had passed through the court, the individual Maori would merely be one of many part-owners on the title certificate. Credit or finance which the Liberal Government freely bestowed upon the European settler was not readily available to the Maori. His undefined or shared title was not acceptable security in the eyes of the lender, such as banks, or State lending institutions.

It would not be until most of the land had been transferred from Māori to European ownership, when Pākehā rules had prevailed to achieve that outcome, that the government could ‘afford’ to accommodate some Māori needs and interests. The restrictive approach became so institutionally entrenched that enabling changes in legislation came slowly, even when change could have served wider interests. But encouraging productivity from Māori lands, in order that financial contributions could be made by way of taxes, was a less effective form of wealth transfer than confiscating land for non-payment of taxes.

I have argued that Māori were not complicit in their marginalisation, although a stream of rhetoric supporting this notion developed amongst Pākehā, no doubt to assuage the consciences of those who had benefited from the system. Prominent amongst differences between Māori and Pākehā were attitudes to land-holding, which gave rise to confusion about title and succession; and differences with respect to land

---

270 G. S. Whitmore, NZPD, 43, 8 September 1882, p.868; Hooper and Kearins, Walrus, Carpenter and Oysters, p.29.

use, which gave rise to the ‘use it or lose it’ policies.\textsuperscript{272} Belief in the weakening and disappearance of Māori as a race persisted well beyond the contrary demographic evidence, and became entangled with debates about definitions of ‘Māori’. There were also differences over work ethics and acquisitiveness, which generated perceptions of Māori as ‘lazy’.\textsuperscript{273} As late as 1998, Hugh Kawharu expressed frustration that:

> Even a committee of enquiry a full century after the establishment of the [Native Land] Court failed to distinguish fractionation, fragmentation, and individualisation of title, and to show that the stigma [of ‘multiple title’] was not the result of some innate quirk of the Maori character, but was instead the inevitable consequence of individualisation carried on regardless of the line of descent or of occupation of the land.\textsuperscript{274}

While Banner’s arguments for the dominance of the effects of structure over the individual are well made, his analysis fails to recognise the joint effect of people acting as individuals in the land market. The market might be \textit{constituted} by a complex of laws, but it comprises both structure and activity. A market exists where there is trading activity, regardless of any formality of structure; buyers and sellers can devise and agree rules between themselves with each individual trade. But a market does not exist where there is structure without activity. Actors in the structured market for Māori land were not only buyers and sellers, but also administrators and adjudicators, most or all of whom were Pākehā. Furthermore, one person could act in several roles, or be socially connected with other actors in a way that enhanced their transactional capabilities.

\textsuperscript{272} Tom Brooking, ‘Use It or Lose It: Unravelling the Land Debate in Late Nineteenth-Century New Zealand’, \textit{The New Zealand Journal of History}, 30, 2, 1993.
\textsuperscript{274} I. H. Kawharu, foreword to Williams, ‘\textit{Te Kooti Tango Whenua}’, p.xvii.
A similar static/dynamic connection exists for social capital. According to Lin, Coleman sees social capital as comprising: an aspect of social structure, and facilitating actions of individuals within the structure. 275 ‘Social capital consists of resources embedded in social relations and social structure, which can be mobilized when an actor wishes to increase the likelihood of success in a purposive action’. 276

Pākehā not only drafted and changed laws, interpreted, administered and adjudicated in the market, but also manipulated the system to suit their purposes. Banner might be correct in stating that actions of individuals in the market were less instrumental in impoverishing Māori than the structure itself, but given Resident Magistrate White’s propensity to apply a law of his own over several decades (1848-1873), his effect was probably more profound in the far north than is generally observable elsewhere. One example was White’s action in the Yates purchase, where he advised the government that, by abandoning any claim it had, the land would pass to Yates – the government complied with his advice, and Te Aupōuri lost the land.

These social connections, or networks, comprised the Pākehā social capital, to which Māori had limited access. As noted in Chapter 1, social capital works by: facilitating information flow and reducing transaction costs; social ties exerting influence, particularly where they are strategically located; social credentials enhancing access

275 Coleman, *Foundations of Social Theory*, p.302; Lin, p.23. Within the theoretical approaches of those scholars who promote the collective asset, Lin makes a binary distinction. On the one hand Bourdieu represents social capital as a process of reinforcing and reproducing a privileged group that holds various forms of capital, a theoretical position that views social capital as class (or privileged) goods. On the other hand, the position represented by Coleman and Putnam stresses social capital as public goods, which depend on the goodwill of the individual members for support and not to be free riders. For this reason, norms, trust, sanctions, authority and other structural features become important in sustaining social capital. Lin suggests that it could be argued that the theoretical lineage of the privileged-good view is an elaboration of the social relations in Marx’s capital theory, and the public-good view derives from the integrative or Durkheimian view.

276 Lin, p.24. Lin was summarising the positions of Bourdieu, Coleman, Flap, Burt, Erickson, Portes and others, as well as his own.
to resources; and social relations reinforcing entitlement to resources.277 Where Pākehā-Māori, or their descendants, occupied strategic network locations (as would be expected of their bridging role), they appear to have had better access to Pākehā social capital than those of only Māori descent. Examples of this are expanded in Chapter 4. Quite likely, in the example referred to above, Yates was capitalising on his strategic network location.

Some historians have argued fatal impact, demoralisation and despondency akin to future shock, and while there is some evidence to support these views, to apply them unilaterally is to generalise from one stream of evidence and not to allow the diversity of responses that is human. That is not to deny that many did die and many were demoralised and disheartened, but when the winds of change blow, some build fences, others build windmills. Where there is life there is hope, where there is anger there is energy for change, and where there is mana there is resolutely staunch determination. Land claims could be argued, legislation could be challenged and changed, and rates could be negotiated, remitted and exempted. Far northern Māori pursued every avenue to contest rules that adversely affected them.

**Māori protest**

Far northern Māori had made agreements with individuals and the Crown. Generally they appear to have kept their side of the bargains, as they understood them, and they took a variety of steps to try to ensure that other parties to the agreements kept theirs. From the first challenges in 1843, through the remainder of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, they pressed for delivery on agreements and for redress for specific grievances at the local level. The first recorded declaration:

277 ibid., p.20.
That the sales of land around Kaitaia already made by Nopera [Panakareao] and his party to individuals should be acknowledged; but that any surplus lands (ie., those the Government does not grant to the claimants) will be resumed by the chiefs who sold them … 278

was followed by Panakareao’s insistence on burial in Victoria Valley in 1856. In 1867 a new wooden chapel was built in the valley, some distance from any kainga, with the deliberate policy ‘that the ground might not be sold to Govt.’. 279 Timoti Puhipi attempted to bind the Crown to a plan of settlement in the 1870s, and surveys were blocked in the 1880s and 1890s. Te Aupōuri and Ngāti Kurī battled in the court to retain Parengarenga and Pakohu blocks in the 1890s. The far north’s leaders took a prominent part in the pan-tribal Kotahitanga meetings of the 1890s, discussed earlier, as a form of protest against the Pākehā Parliament, which was not seen to be serving Māori interests. The Nakahi religious movement supported the Hokianga ‘Dog-Tax War’ of 1898. 280 The Whakarapa community refilled drains dug to convert mudflats to pasture land, as an act of protest in 1914. Northern converts joined the groundswell supporting Ratana’s capture of the four Māori parliamentary seats by 1943, and numerous petitions, from 1878 through until 1974 culminated in the 1975 Hikoi to Wellington.

At the national level, far northern Māori were represented in Parliament after the Māori seats were created in 1867. But their representation was not always as direct as Ngāti Porou possessed with Apirana Ngata, for instance. Ngāpuhi, not surprisingly, dominated the seat for Northern Māori, and the first and third representatives were

278 Godfrey to Colonial Secretary, 10 February 1843, Epitome, b7 cit. Moore, Rigby, and Russell, p.59.
279 Diary entry 30 December 1867, WGP, L&J, p.504.
280 The Whiowhio movement (also known as Te Huihui or Te Huihuinga, or by some Māori as Nakahi, after the cult of the earlier Hokianga prophet, Paphurihia) was a breakaway group of Wesleyans with Hone Toia as their religious leader. They came to regard themselves as having seceded from Te Kotahitanga, but shared the aims of governing themselves and their land.
sons of Pākehā-Māori in Hokianga. The far north’s most closely related representatives were Wiremu Katene (Ngāpuhi, Te Aupōuri – 1871-75, 1887), Eparaima Te Mutu Kapa (Te Aupōuri – 1891-93), Hone Heke Ngapua (Ngāpuhi, Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu – 1893-1909), and Tau Henare (Ngāti Hine – 1914-38). Henare’s northern connection was through his marriage.

The system of Māori seats had been devised partly to avoid the possibility of the greater number of Māori in some areas swamping the Pākehā vote, as would have happened in the far north. The four seats represented between 4.21% and 6.75% of the total seats in Parliament 1868-1919, and remained static at 5% for the remainder of the study period. When the seats had been created in 1867, Aperahama Taonui (Ngāpuhi, upper Hokianga) had protested: ‘what are these four to do among so many Pakehas; where will their voices be as compared with the Pakeha voices? … It will not do.’ He urged a system of tribal selection of candidates, but other chiefs did not support his suggestion. Alternatively, Māori men were allowed to vote for Pākehā seats, provided they met the criteria applied to non-Māori, although in practice, additional criteria were used to assess the eligibility of Māori to vote. Māori women were not permitted to vote in either system until universal suffrage in 1893.

281 Frederick Nene Russell (MHR 1868-1870) was the son of the timber trader George Frederick Russell, whose wife was a close relative of Tamati Waka Nene. Hori Karaka Tawhiti was the son of shipbuilder David Clark, whose wife, Parehuia, was daughter of the Ihutai chief Te Wharepapa, who joined Heke in the 1845 war. URL: http://www.teara.govt.nz/1966 (31 January 2006).
284 Franchise qualifications were those males of age 21 years and over who either owned property or had lived in New Zealand for at least one year and in an electorate for at least six months before registering as an elector. Māori who owned property on individual titles were, alternatively, eligible to register as electors in any European electorate where they were so qualified. Additional criteria were established during the 1879 Royal Commission of Inquiry into irregularities in the Bay of Islands electorate for the 1878 election (perpetuated by a competing candidate and the registration officer), and included provisions relating to multiple-owned land and housing. The Commissioner identified three classes of title to land held in common by Māori, who had claimed to be placed on the electoral roll as freeholders. The first class was land held under Crown grant, the second land certified to native
Choice of whether or not to vote was further hampered by location. Polling places for the far north for the 1881 election were at the centres of European settlements at courthouses in Hokianga and Mangonui, the town hall in Kohukohu, at a private European residence in Kaitaia, and the northernmost at Lambley’s Store at Oruru, near Mangonui. The Karikari and Aupōuri peninsulas were not accommodated, nor was the western part of Mangonui County in Te Rarawa territory around Ahipara.

In the 1879 Commission of Enquiry, Ihu Ngawaka of Whangape protested:

> There are many people in these districts who have votes – Whangape, Ahipara, Kaitahi, Awanui etc. and the only difficulty is that there are no polling-places in those districts. If polling-places were established in these districts it would be found that many votes would be recorded there. If the people are asked to go such distances to vote they will not go.

He thought there should be one at Ahipara: ‘all the people in our district would go and all people north of Ahipara’, where he estimated 100 would vote. Ihu’s request was not heeded.

Contrary to the opinion expressed by Maaka and Fleras that ‘until the 1890s at least, Māori were too preoccupied with their own politics and alternatives to political power to take parliamentary representation very seriously’, far northern Māori were keen to make use of every avenue available to assert their influence. The suggestion that owners under the Native Land Act, and the third class was land certified to a tribe. Of these three classes he dismissed the second and third as ‘not being freehold of a sufficiently definite character, as regards individuals, to confer a right to the franchise’. He saw the first class differently, holding that the position of owners was that of tenants in common, taking in distinct moieties and ‘is one therefore, as I believe and am advised, which entitles to the franchise if the freehold is of sufficient value’ to satisfy requirements of clause 7 of the Constitution Act – Electoral Roll of Mongonui and Bay of Islands District (Report of the Royal Commissioner Appointed to Inquire into Certain Matters Connected with), AJHR, 1879, H-8. A voter’s share was required to be in excess of £50 in value. In addition to the interpretation with respect to what constituted eligible freehold, the Commissioner attempted to interpret what constituted a ‘house’ within the meaning of the Act. A basic raupo whare was deemed to fall short of the definition.

285 It was not until after the study period, in 1949, that a woman, Iriaka Ratana, was elected to a Māori seat, and 1993 when the first Māori woman, Sandra Lee, won a seat in a general electorate.

286 Gazette 1881, 3 November 1879.

287 AJHR, 1879, H-8, p.76. Interview dated 26 March 1879 at Hokianga.

288 Maaka and Fleras, p.130.
‘Māori at the time were more interested in pursuing their own political aspirations than being minor players in a different ball game’,\textsuperscript{289} suggests an irrelevant dichotomy; it was not a case of ‘either-or’ but ‘both-and’. Far northern Māori engaged directly with parliamentary representatives of both the Māori and general electoral rolls, questioning and debating issues at meetings with them. But, adept as their understanding and questioning was – just as the efficiency of Māori agriculture had been a threat to settler competition in that market – the real problems and short-changing of Māori ‘began precisely when they looked like becoming too effective in their mastery of the techniques of government and administration and would use their skills’ to counter the government’s plans.\textsuperscript{290}

In effect, it was the Minister of Native Affairs who held power in Māori matters in Parliament. The only Māori to hold this position during the study period were James Carroll (1899-1912) and Apirana Ngata (1928-1934),\textsuperscript{291} but Ngata’s dealings with far northern Māori were often obstructive, as we will see.

Methods by which Māori asserted their ongoing claims changed over time. Claudia Geiringer’s analysis for the Muriwhenua claim focused on protest as evidence of a Māori understanding of land transactions, and especially how their understanding differed from that expressed by government officials. For her purposes, she included continued occupation and use of ancestral lands as a form of protest, ‘whether made in knowledge or ignorance of the Crown’s alleged claims’.\textsuperscript{292} For this thesis, however, the varying forms of protest are evidence of not only differences in Māori understanding of the agreements, but also the range of methods used to influence and

\textsuperscript{289} ibid.
effect change towards outcomes that would be acceptable to them. For this purpose it is important to distinguish between continued occupation as unchallenged understanding of an agreement, and occupation made in order to prevent access and use to others, representing conflicting understandings.

During the nineteenth century, far northern Māori asserted their general understanding through continued and unchallenged occupation and use. Where some doubt existed, they applied to the Native Land Court to determine customary ownership. When governments began to assert counter claims during the 1880s and 1890s, Māori obstructed surveys in disputed areas. When loss of land and control was experienced, fears were realised, and traditional kanohi-ki-te-kanohi discussions had failed, far northern Māori resorted to the Pākehā system of writing to the governing institution to record their complaints.

Researchers for the Muriwhenua claim isolated 41 petitions to the Crown over the period 1878-1940. There were fewer than one petition a year, on average, and a maximum of three in any one year, with a definite tail-off after 1923, no doubt when their ineffectiveness was realised. Some petitions were submitted by individuals, but most carried more than one signature and several had over a hundred. Frequently, petitions were accompanied by a campaign of letter writing to various government agencies. References to other letters and petitions, which were not located by the researchers, reinforced Geiringer’s conclusion that the amount of correspondence identified was probably only a fraction of what actually occurred.
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293 ibid., p.61.
294 Muriwhenua Land, pp.338-43. Sources were mainly AJHR and some Māori Affairs’ files.
295 Geiringer, p.33.
Complaints were mainly about land wrongfully taken (including the inflammatory issue of ‘surplus’ land), incorrect definition of boundaries and reserves and the subsequent administration of them, and the inadequacy of payment. Some were about timber cutting rights; others about the inadequacy of Māori representation during the transactions. General concern for landlessness and poverty often gave rise to petitions, which were, in these cases, responses to outcomes of the issues raised. Petitions originated from all parts of the region not a particular group. But characteristic of all was the persistent nature of grievances, and their call for redress through Parliament, the Land Court, or independent commissions of inquiry.

Generally, governments referred petitions to the Native Affairs’ Committee, which either made recommendations or referred them back to the government. However, the recommendations almost invariably took the form of ‘no recommendation’, and there was little or no follow up to those referred back to government. During the twentieth century, governments began to use the Native Land Court to resolve Māori grievances. Most of the petitions referred to this body were subject to series of adjournments over two decades, and were never considered. In response to Māori calls for commissions of inquiry, only two eventuated, one of which was the 1946 Surplus Lands Commission, which did not deal with the historical issues.

The few hard-won successes were celebrated. One of the more successful was passive resistance led by Whina Cooper in 1914, in which she mobilised the community to fill in drainage ditches as they were dug, in opposition to a Pākehā farmer’s attempt to drain mudflats at Whakarapa. Some participants were fined for trespass but, after

---
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representations by Whina’s father to the MHR for Northern Māori, the farmer’s lease was cancelled and the mudflats remained.298

Two forms of protest Geiringer did not discuss were democratic parliamentary electoral voting and denominations of dissent. The connection between the two, in Ratana’s case, was absolute. Parliamentary representation, as a forum for expressing protest, has been mentioned earlier. The manner in which far northern Māori used their votes to register protest was graphically illustrated in the bye-election of 1909, and the elections of 1911 and 1913. Denominations of dissent included indigenous politico-religious movements such as Papahurihia, and its successor Whiowhio, in nineteenth-century Hokianga, and Ratana in the 1920s. Catholicism can also be considered a denomination of dissent, in that it was not the church associated with British rule, and its personnel vocally opposed aspects of the Treaty of Waitangi, which, in their opinion, adversely affected Māori interests. American-originating sects of Latter Day Saints (Mormons) and Jehovah’s Witness claimed many Māori converts. While Jehovah’s Witnesses had little, if any, political effect, some Latter Day Saints were politically active. By 1890 Mormonism claimed about 3000 Māori members, spread mainly through the northern, eastern and southern parts of the North Island. Numbered amongst these was Hamiora Mangakahia, first premier of the Kotahitanga, and Te Whatahoro, first leader of the house and a later premier.299

Denominational divisions had arisen amongst hapū within Te Rarawa as a product of which missionaries arrived in each area first – Catholic, Methodist or Anglican.

Some reshuffling took place in the nineteenth century, when the Catholic mission

withdrew, and when tribal friction or reconciliation occurred. Twentieth-century choices often reflected disillusionment with church support, or feelings of dispossession and dislocation. The small, remote and isolated settlement of Whangape, under the leadership of Te Waru Puku, converted wholesale to Catholicism in 1923. This choice aligned them with others of their Ngāti Haua hapū on the opposite side of the narrow harbour mouth, at Pawarenga. They had been impressed with the support offered Māori by the Catholic Church, compared with their neglect by Anglicanism. The option of Ratana, whose movement was not well established in the area by that time, would have further isolated them from nearby hapū of Te Rarawa, both Anglican and Catholic. On the other hand, the Puhipi whānau, who had been staunch supporters of the CMS mission, converted to Ratana and built a temple at Pupepoto, aptly named Dominion. Ngāti Kurī at Te Hapua completely adopted Ratana’s ideals. But at Te Kao, the community and meeting house were split in two, such was the intensity of conflict between allegiance to the Anglican Church and disillusionment with government inaction. Traditional leaders, many of whose family members had been, or were, ordained clergy, remained with the Anglican Church.

Conclusions

The purposive and intentional approach far northern Māori took to the 1835 Declaration of Independence and the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi was perpetuated in their negotiations with Pākehā, 1860-1940. There were casualties. Many far northern Māori were demoralised, displaced and denied the opportunity to fulfil their potential.

300 It has been suggested that the cause was more personal. An Anglican man unintentionally insulted a Whangape woman and was not able to effect reconciliation. Manuka Henare, Ngawaka, Anaru Iehu 1872-1964, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 16 December 2003, available at: http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/ (24 September 2004).
301 As in having dominion over - authority, control, mana.
within or in relation to the Pākehā economy, through the study period. Therein lies the tragedy of lost opportunities. The triumph was that some endured to challenge dominating institutions through energy born of frustration and anger, solidarity born of kinship (bonding capital), and determination born of mana and tikanga – authority derived from steadfastly upholding what, to them, was correct.

What is evident from the written records throughout the period are continual attempts by far northern Māori to engage with the Pākehā system on Māori terms; the considered concepts that adapted Māori customary forms of decision-making and control to the ever-changing, ever-tightening British political and economic system. What is apparent is that, behind these Māori initiatives were many hui, much korero, planning, initiating, promoting, arguing, negotiating and implementing, which indicate strong decision-making processes that were not recorded in writing. Māori did not abandon rūnanga and other traditional decision processes in favour of forms modified to Pākehā purposes. They incorporated new ideas and experimented with new komiti as adjuncts to the traditional, expecting to retain their own laws and customs and anticipating that these new institutions would bridge to a parallel Pākehā system. That the new institutions did not fulfil this purpose was not for want of effort on the part of Māori.

The irony is that the assimilationist policies of successive governments achieved something radically different from their intentions, although such a relationship between resistance and that which is resisted is common. Had any of the sham committees and councils met some of the requirements of Māori, there might well have been sufficient congruence between the Pākehā and Māori systems to have
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302 Richard Hill criticises historians of the ‘lost opportunity’ school, referring to opportunities that the government lost. Here I refer, instead, to opportunities that were lost to Māori.
produced an effective merger. But, as Hill argued, ‘the fundamentals of colonisation and settlement *precluded genuine power sharing*. An autonomous indigenous political economy within a settler colony … would … have been … a potential or actual sovereign threat to the politico-capitalist order’.303 Instead, the fickle deceptions served to preserve the constancy of tradition. In this tradition lay a better chance for optimising group well-being within harsh economic conditions, because the kinship-based social capital inherent in hapū solidarity could facilitate economic action.304

The rūnanga evolved in response to, and reaction against, external and internal stimuli. Individuals with diverging ambitions challenged traditional protocols. Conflict arose between older, more conservative generations and younger, more Pākehā-oriented generations,305 and when women, who had been side-lined, reasserted their mana. Māori also borrowed from Pākehā methods, concepts and structures.306 Even the unsuccessful new institutions brought some influence, along with the experiences of individuals interacting with the Pākehā economy outside their local communities. The anti-tribal ideologies of Ratana brought more radical change to converts’ protocols. Clustering and connections between families whose male members were priests, police, and parliamentarians represent attempts to bridge between Pākehā and Māori institutions using the medium of the Anglican Church. Although the connections suggest nascent class relations emerging in a capitalist system, this is not the only explanation.

304 Merrill, p.407.
305 Ritchie, p.82.
Held to the light, the substance of far northern Māori decision-making remained within the traditional rūnanga, while its shadow played on the transient new institutions. Even in 1965, Ritchie would comment, ‘so-called Maori national politics have become a shadow theatre whose substance is thin and whose representativeness is more symbolic than real. Behind this world of political postures and puppeteering there continues the genuine political life of the Maori community with its own rules, norms and values’.307

The range and diversity of issues relating to land, and Māori responses to this aspect of their relationship to the Pākehā economy, were extensive and intensive. Principles for land transactions were established on traditional Māori bases before 1840. Then the Treaty set down Crown pre-emption rights; while the Old Land Claims’ process established the Crown’s principles for dealing with Māori, including assumptions associated with sovereignty – the right to grant title and to presume ownership – that were not communicated to Māori in the Treaty discussions. Pre- and post-Treaty transactions differed in Māori minds, but converged in the Pākehā system.

Māori had engaged proactively before 1840, and reactively to the 1850s Crown land-purchase programme, in encouraging European settlement as the basis for a new economy. In the post-1870 period, Māori in the west of the Muriwhenua claim area continued their policy of encouraging European settlement; the land in the east had already gone, but, in the north, Te Aupōuri and Ngāti Kurī fought strenuously to prevent further Pākehā encroachment. Change came slowly, but when actions on the ground did not match agreements, as Māori understood them, they asserted their claims through every avenue available.

307 Ritchie, p.80.
Demographic revival lent strength to Māori striving for autonomy, and some concessions were won by far northern Māori through protest and co-operation, conflict and compromise, but the countervailing force of government – the numbers of British, their social connections, political organisation, and will and ability to enforce their rules – prevailed. These rules would determine what would be classified as the ‘informal economy’. Increasing population had allowed gender specialisation and value differentiation in pre-European Māori history. The European population increase and an ethnically-based principle of ascendancy worked to constrain progressively the voice and choice of Māori, and devalue their role in the Pākehā polity and economy. By the close of the nineteenth century, the rules’ contest had been played out. English-based law was enforceable, but it did not entirely displace kaupapa Māori. A consistent thread of influence remained.

While the ascendant rules prescribed economic activities that were permissible, compliance was not inevitable. Further, where the legitimisation of the economic system did not accommodate Māori, a counter-culture could be induced. Constrained as their voice and choice were, and with most and the best of their land gone, far northern Māori still had their kin-based social capital and at least vestiges of their economic system to shore up their severely diminished economic position. How the economic systems were contested unfolds in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4 - Contested economies: money, taxes and gum

Earliest trade between Māori and Europeans had been conducted by exchange of goods, but by 1840 the British economic system was substantially money-based. No doubt most Pākehā assumed that English currency, along with English law, would accompany cession of sovereignty on the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.¹ Equally undoubtedly, Māori assumed their law and economy, based on complex social relationships and accepted norms of reciprocity, would be retained along with their tino rangatiratanga, in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.² Just as law and enforcement were employed to contest the ‘institutional rules of the game’, money would contest barter and gift exchange. War, words and wealth conspired to overthrow the pre-established order.

By 1865, in the Muriwhenua claim area (which covers a large portion of the far north) legal title, under the introduced legal system, had passed from Māori to the extent of 43% of the land, and by 1908 it was estimated that less than 20% remained in Māori ownership. All land transactions incurred survey costs, which had to be met in money by the owners. On some land remaining in Māori ownership rates had to be paid with money. From 1879, a tax was levied on all sheep owned; and to discourage the hindrance of dogs to expansion of sheep farming, a dog tax was levied from 1880.

¹ Hawke, New Zealand Currency, p.1.
² In effect, each was assuming a path-dependent trajectory based on their own cultural customs.
Although some coinage had been in circulation since the 1830s, it was not the
generalised medium of exchange in nineteenth-century far north; traditional gift
exchange and barter dominated. Thus, money to meet cash costs was scarce and
indebtedness accrued. The dog tax fell heavily on Māori because dogs were
important to them, for a variety of reasons. It led to what is termed the ‘Dog-Tax
War’ of 1898, the last armed Māori resistance in the north, and a significant moment
in establishing effective imperial governance. The conflict also heralded ascendancy
of the money economy over gift exchange. This chapter connects the needs for, and
the primary source of, money (gum) with Māori responses to monetisation of the
Pākehā economy.

**Money**

Although money became available from 1840, it was not equally accessible to all; it
was neither used nor useful uniformly across the country. Money held by Māori in the
1840s was more for ornament than utility,³ and in the 1860-70 decades, some Māori
reacted against use of money as a Pākehā evil. Indeed, the 1920s reminiscences of a
Waikato storekeeper indicate not only the lack of use and usefulness of money to
Māori (even disdain for it), but also the extent to which principles of gift exchange,
and the Pākehā storekeeper’s lack of understanding of these principles, persisted.⁴
Gift exchange is not peculiar to Māori; the principles were, and are, prevalent in pre-
monetary economies, and also in some sophisticated present-day economies, where
transactions are not devoid of personal interaction.⁵
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³ Firth, *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, p.447n2.
⁴ G. T. Roberts, *Kohikohinga: Reminiscences and Reflections of “Rapata” (Vernon Roberts)*, Auckland,
1929, p.133.
⁵ James Carrier’s *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology* covers theories of economic bases. Theories
of reciprocity were developed in Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in
An American economic historian described the monetisation process of West Africa.

As effective imperial governance was established in the interior, monetized taxation and monetized commerce proceeded together…

The collection of money taxes was the first step.

[It] began with paid … labor to build trunkline roads. Subsequent payments of money taxes had to be enforced …. If a household failed to pay its taxes, the police detachment … burned the[h]ir huts.

The second step was collecting money taxes in all crop years, even … when hunger might be severe… because taxation was the source of … funds … to build infrastructure projects, pay police and bureaucrats.6

The Aotearoa New Zealand experience differed in timing at least; while taxes required money payment, commerce was separable from, and preceded, taxes and money. Trade was established without the need for money, and a monetary economy was not spontaneously generated by the assumption of English currency, as medium of exchange or unit of account, when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840.

Like law and sovereignty, its permeation took time and met resistance.

Victorian civilisation based its market economy on money as a commodity (gold).7

Behind this decision lay the shared commitment of states and markets to founding the economy on impersonal money, which ‘maintain[ed] its value as a commodity across borders and made long-distance trade possible between people who did not know each other’8 – an obvious advantage or necessity between metropole and peripheries.

But, as a noted sociologist has argued, ‘without the legitimation and support of a social and political system … the economic system, based on its symbolic and
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generalized medium, money, simply cannot exist’.9 The utility of money as a
generalised medium of exchange in the far north was limited, when money was in
shorter supply than alternative exchangeables such as food, timber, flax, gum or
ambergris, and ultimately labour and land.10 Its utility as unit of account was dubious
when the measure of reciprocity was intentionally imprecise.

Consistent with the general lack of coinage in the 1850s,11 money in the hands of
Māori had diminished between 1848 and 1868. Few references to infrequent mission
collections of money provide evidence of the extent of money in circulation amongst
far northern Māori 1840-70. In 1841, money was collected to establish a Missionary
Society in New Zealand to support missions to other nations; in 1846, it was reported
that since the first collection, when Māori gave all they had, they had no more to give.
In 1850, in response to a CMS request for funds, the reply was ‘it had a great effect
upon the congregations although they were too poor to subscribe money ...’ and,
finally, in 1868, ‘it is impracticable’ to institute regular collections, even though in
1848 it had been reported that, ‘We now make it a rule to have a collection at the
sacrament. We collected, chiefly in produce ... ’12 Although the CMS tried to
encourage English-style collections of money from Māori, the system instituted in the
far north more closely resembled the Māori tradition of gift exchange, serving the
purposes of the local community. Just as they were recovering from one of the worst
typhoid epidemics, the situation deteriorated further in January 1867, when disastrous
floods completely destroyed crops, close to harvest, and seed for the following
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9 Lin, p.164.
10 Ambergris could be banked as cash in a bank account; its value was determined by weight and the
price fetched at the previous auction in Paris. The sample had to be certified by an expert recognised by
the bank, and the far north had a certified assessor as late as the 1950s. Bill Parkes, The Fair Beginning
of a Time, Whangarei, 2003, p.139.
Matthews and the Kaitaia Mission, Dunedin and Wellington, 1940, pp.180-1.
Because gumdigging was almost the only source of cash for Māori, their efforts were further diverted from food production as debts grew and dependence on store-bought food increased.

They have sold land and want to sell more to the Government, but there has been such a lack of money, that the sellers cannot obtain money of the buyers; again there is no near market for produce and the natives not only consume what they grow, but when they leave their inland stations to dig kauri gum to purchase clothes, etc. with, they expend a large share of their earning in flour and sugar. It is thought that the ‘Maoris’ in the north are poorer at this time, than they were twenty years ago. We have not been able to purchase a supply of wheat or potatoes from the natives for several years past, principally owing to the ‘Kauri’ gum digging.

Not only did Māori have little money by 1870, but also many were in debt. The Resident Magistrate’s Court returns for January 1860-October 1863 show that just over half the cases tried were debt cases and all but one of the defendants was Māori. Indebtedness arising from costs of obtaining title through the Native Land Court, from 1865, was the inevitable outcome of pre-existing poverty. The evident lack of money begs the question of what happened to proceeds from land sales. One explanation that when far northern Māori received money for lands they ‘spend it in necessaries’ is congruent with anticipation of further land purchases by the government agent ‘as soon as the Natives are short of money’. Long-term, potentially income-producing assets were traded for short-term commodities, an assured fast track to poverty.

Economic transactions were generally conducted by traditional gift exchange amongst Māori in the far north, and also between Māori and Pākehā. Gifts and monetary
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13 White to Undersecretary Native Department, January and February 1867, BAFO 10852/2a, pp.515-18, ANZA.
15 AJHR, 1863, D-11; O’Malley and Robertson, p.73.
16 Matilda Puckey to Grey, 30 August 1862, BAFO 10852/2a, pp.197-99, ANZA.
transactions both involve reciprocity, but the protocols of reciprocity differ.

Consistent, understood and accepted protocols of reciprocity are fundamental to building and maintaining social capital.\(^{18}\) Conversion to a monetary economy required negotiation of these fundamentals. Toon Vandevelde described the distinction between reciprocity based on gift exchange and money thus:

> The reciprocity required by the gift is [that] it is non-strict, non-immediate and unintentional. …Every gift incites a counter-gift, but only at the appropriate juncture: some period of time must have elapsed, not in order to mask interest calculation as the ‘objective truth of the gift’, … but rather as a sign of accepting that one enters into a relation with the donator. There is an art of giving, which means that one has to reciprocate in due time, at the right moment: not too early, not too late, and in a suitable way.

In contrast:

> Individualists reject all this. They do not want to owe anything to anyone. They try to get rid of the risks and vulnerabilities implied in genuine social commitments by paying as quickly as possible the market price for everything they need.\(^{19}\)

In his statement, Vandevelde takes the classical Western view and draws a stark distinction between gift/personal and commodity/impersonal. However, Katherine Rupp\(^{20}\) and James Carrier\(^{21}\) argue that this classic view is culturally bound, does not allow for a more integrated position between gift and commodity, and the terms are analytical tools rather than empirical descriptions. I would argue not so much about the distinction between the two but that, while individualism is compatible with a monetary economy, it is not necessarily, nor always, the dominant driver. The
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18 Classical theories of reciprocity have been enunciated by Mauss in *The Gift* (1925) and Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* (1944), and drawn into social capital theory by Svendsen and Svendsen, pp.38-9. Interestingly Mauss uses Māori practices of gift-giving, particularly the *hau*, to argue its personal nature.


primary function of the use of money, as generalised medium of exchange and unit of
account, is simplification of the exchange process and increasing the efficiency of
transactions, thus enabling a greater volume of trade. Such efficiency would not have
been lost on Māori for their transactions with itinerant traders, but efficiency was not
the dominant priority for settled trade; building and maintaining the social capital
basis for economic exchange was the underlying principle of the greater complexity
of gift exchange. If money improved the efficiency of increased volumes of trade,
entropy and removal of the complexity of social relations rendered the collapse of the
market place more efficient also, which would come as a shock to Māori.

Non-monetary contributions for far northern Māori applied even at a national
‘community’ level. For instance, during the First World War, the people of Te Kao
requested food aid from the Minister of Defence when they were financially
distressed, due to the loss of gum revenue when shipping was disrupted. To his reply
explaining the Empire’s need, their response was to make a donation of £5, promise a
further £30 from forthcoming lease money, and to plant potatoes, kūmara, and cereals
to provide further assistance.22 And, at the local level, in the 1920s and 1930s, when
the Mangonui Hospital Board constantly struggled to collect fees, particularly those
for maternity services, when one more mouth to feed further impoverished the
indebted family, the debt could be reduced by trading firewood, gum and ambergris.23

A range of sources indicates that most far northern Māori were poor, but it was not a
universal condition within the area. Native Schools’ reports between 1864 and 1905
recount appalling conditions – crop failures, lack of food, epidemics, children
compelled to dig gum so that the family could eat, and of their walking miles to

school without food. In stark contrast, Ngawini Yates was said to have become one of the first female millionaires in Aotearoa New Zealand, when she inherited her husband Sam’s property on his death in 1900. The measure is dubious and, as is referred to elsewhere in this thesis, some reciprocal benefits flowed from the Yates’ presence to the communities around Parengarenga Harbour.

Traditionally, whanaungatanga and utu involved sharing resources, and caring for family members with special needs, to the end that the group was uniformly well or poorly endowed. Thus, while the whole community might have been in a state of absolute poverty, there would not be relative poverty within it. Absolute poverty refers to the inability to sustain life and health, and relative poverty exists where there are distinct variations in standards of living between individuals and groups within a community. In Raymond Firth’s survey of ancient Mäori life:

…we find no extreme poverty, no unemployed desiring work that they might live, no leisured class removed by quantity of possessions to a state of blissful idleness where to maintain the social amenities constitutes almost their only obligation. For this the communal ideal, the emphasis on the claims of kinship, is largely responsible. So also in the absence of a money economy and even at times of a direct material reward for effort, the attention of the native to the standards set him by tradition and communal opinion sufficed to secure the performance of duties otherwise neglected.

Conditions described for gumfield living conform to a definition of absolute poverty, which applied to all its inhabitants. Mäori also experienced relative poverty within the gumfield community – their death rate was higher because children were particularly affected by swamp conditions, and generally only Mäori children lived on
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24 AJHR, 1864, 1903, 1905, E-2; Muriwhenua Land, p.365.
25 Odeda Rosenthal, Not Strictly Kosher: Pioneer Jews in New Zealand, Wainscott, N.Y., c1988, p.146. The claim to have become one of the first female millionaires is a bit dubious as the measure is not stated. That she became comparatively wealthy is more certain.
26 Brian Easton, Wages and the Poor, Wellington, 1986, p.3.
27 Firth, Economics of the New Zealand Maori, p.493.
the gumfields. High levels of disease in the Hokianga area resulted in medicine costs being 50% above the highest allowance of £40 a year for any part of the country.

Poverty amongst Māori resulted partly from the monetisation process – the emergence of a formal, state-defined money of account, symbolised by coins and notes of legal tender, the issue of which was tightly controlled by the state. Gum, tobacco, and other ‘currencies’ could be acquired independently from the state by digging and cultivating. But the state intended that money would become the sole legal means of exchange within the country and the required medium for payment of taxes. Wiremu Katene’s (MHR Northern Māori 1871-75) plea for an alternative fell on deaf ears. Explaining that many Māori in the north had no money to pay rates he proposed: ‘The Ngapuhi have a plan … they send, for instance, three drays and do three day’s work on the roads without payment, and that is their contribution to the road rates’. While commerce could be conducted without money, it became necessary to acquire money to pay taxes.

**Taxes, rates and valuation of land**

Although there were strong traditions of community self-sufficiency and distribution of resources within hapū, and inter-hapū and inter-iwi reciprocal gift exchanges, there was no direct equivalent of English rating in Māori society. By 1840 rating (a tax based on ownership of property) was a basic financial tool of British local
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28 Muriwhenua Land, p.365.
29 T. W. Lewis (Undersecretary) to Native Minister, 25 January 1884, in Reports of Native Health Inspectors, MA 21/19, ANZW.
30 English coins were able to be used in New Zealand while exchange rate parity remained, until the Coinage Act 1933 established distinctive New Zealand coins as legal coinage. Issuance of bank notes was controlled from 1840 by regulations drawn up by British Treasury, the same year that the first bank, the Union Bank of Australia, issued notes in New Zealand. Hawke, *New Zealand Currency*, pp.5-10.
31 Hart, p.169.
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government, used to fund community goods and services.\textsuperscript{33} English legal theory, that all land is ultimately held from the Crown, the doctrine brought to New Zealand by first settlers, provided the philosophical base for rates based on property values.\textsuperscript{34} On this basis Māori land that remained outside the Native Land Court system was largely exempt. Where Māori land came within the ambit of rating systems, it appears the policy was to value it in the same way as other land, despite contrary wishes of both Māori and Europeans; valuations were also manipulated for political reasons. Valuation policy did not consider that Māori might want to use land for other than European-defined ‘productive’ purposes. Differing approaches of Māori and Pākehā to land use and development were a recurring theme underlying rating issues.\textsuperscript{35}

Municipal and district governments were established after 1840 to reduce English expenditure on the new colony.\textsuperscript{36} Thereafter legislation flowed thick, fast and relentlessly, progressively encompassing more Māori land in rateable property and reducing exemptions. Between 1844 and 1930, in less than a hundred years, there were at least 33 pieces of legislation that had a direct or indirect effect on rating. On the ground, the interpretation and application of legislation was often ambiguous and arbitrary, although valuation and rating were standardised, through time, by centralised and independent processes. Nevertheless the sheer volume, complexity,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{34} Valuation was either capital, based on sale value of land, or the annual value of an income stream from the land. The Rating Act 1876 specified an annual value, the Rating Act 1882 changed from annual to capital value, and unimproved values were provided for in the Rating on Unimproved Value Act 1896, which also centralised valuation work to remove the potential for bias and corruption inherent in the former provincial system. Since 1970, legislation has provided for unimproved value to be gradually replaced by the capital value.
\textsuperscript{35} Bennion, pp.2-3.
\textsuperscript{36} ibid., pp.3-4.
\end{flushleft}
and differing interests made rating a particularly sensitive issue to Māori and Pākehā and, in the context of this thesis, to Māori in relation to the Pākehā economy.

Rates had originally been conceived as a means of funding colonisation, by colonisers for colonisers. However, Māori had agreed to European settlement on the basis that they were guaranteed the same rights and privileges as British subjects, and that matters regarding land were reserved to Māori.37 For Māori, among other purposes, the Treaty paved the way for a new economy based on settled trade. The infrastructure of roads, railways, ports, and communications was the means of facilitating the new economy. Māori had contributed both land (voluntarily and involuntarily)38 and labour, either cheaply or freely, to this infrastructure. Land had also been contributed for schools, churches and national parks for the colonisation process, and land tax and stamp duty had arisen from land transactions. But for the many thousands of colonisers who arrived consequently and subsequently, these contributions were invisible; what they saw were the equal rights and privileges, for which they expected equal shouldering of the tax burden: exemptions rankled.

The issues were economic to the core. Some common threads of argument, for both Māori and Pākehā, persisted across time periods. Pākehā saw that non-payment of rates by Māori meant bad roads, and inefficient development of districts. They argued that local bodies had to maintain roads in back-block districts, which were largely used by the ‘Native Community’, and if Māori were to be accepted as a

---

37 Third and second Articles of the Treaty of Waitangi, respectively.
national burden, in view of their Treaty rights, the nation should pay the price and not ‘the unfortunate pioneer who settles in his midst’.  

There were repeated Pākehā demands for Māori to be treated the same as Europeans in rating terms. This meant individualising land titles and making land revenue-producing; communal ownership must be abolished because it obstructed closer settlement. The National Efficiency Board of the First World War recommended that since settlement by individual Māori farmers was not constructive, ‘useless and unoccupied’ lands should be sold to Europeans for settlement, even if this left no other lands for their support. Others did not want Māori to lose their land but rather to lease good land to rate-paying Europeans if Māori were not using it ‘productively’. Disapproval, or lack of understanding or acceptance, of the Māori lifestyle and approach to land use, lay behind the complaints.

Despite Treaty issues, John Williams argued that for Māori ‘the issue of local rates was probably more important as an economic than as a political grievance’. That economic issue related directly to which lands went to European settlement and which Māori retained. Generally, retained land was poorer and therefore more costly to bring into productivity, but the Advances to Settlers’ scheme, which financed European settlement, did not extend to Māori. As one complainant questioned:

Can the Pakehas finance their country without the Government Advances to Settlers and all the other facilities that are granted them? I say no. Then how are we to finance these little pieces of land which remain to us?

---

39 Bennion, pp.29, 40-41.
40 ibid., pp.41, 60-61.
41 Williams, Politics of the New Zealand Maori, p.75.
42 ACIH 16036 MA1/407 (previously MA 1) 20/1/14, parts 1-6 Nap 547, 1920-37, ANZW; Bennion, p.60. The complainant was a Pākehā married to a Māori woman.
The unavailability of financial assistance through the Advances to Settlers scheme was exacerbated by difficulties in accessing finance from other sources, arising from multiple ownership of land, pre-emptive rights of the Crown to purchase and other legislative restrictions. Māori argued that, if they were freed from constraints not faced by Pākehā, they would be able to compete equally as farmers and could pay the necessary rates. They also complained that rating land that generated a low income would load the land and inhibit future development, as well as raise the danger of indirect confiscation for rates’ default. Ngata, in his time, emphasised continually that only successful farmers could bear rate demands.43

As much as there was a stream of argument about ability to pay rates, so too were there issues about benefits received; that is, to what uses rates were applied. In 1871, the member for Mangonui noted that Māori paid £40,000-£50,000 annually in customs duties and got little in return.44 John Stevens (MHR for Rangatikei) perceived the difference in value systems.

I cannot see the fairness of insisting upon a section of the community being taxed for that which we may consider to be a benefit to them, but which they look upon as a great injury.45

He gave, as examples, when Pākehā cut down trees in which a chief used to catch pigeons, or drained swamp for pastureland from which Māori caught eels. In 1888, speaking in support of spending native land rates in parts of the country where they accrued, G. S. Whitmore alleged that the practice had been to ‘include the largest possible number of acres of Native lands, and have them valued at a very high, impossible amount, and to spend the money as far away from those lands as

---

43 ibid., pp.28-30, 36, 46.
45 Stevens, NZPD, 1882, Vol 43, p.710.
possible’. Māori complained that they did not want or use roads, particularly those constructed through their land for the purpose of connecting European settlements. Money collected for roads was invariably spent on European settlers in or near urban areas. Roads and hospitals were built in European areas, to which Māori had little access. Repeating the 1871 argument five decades later, Judge Acheson argued that, of the rates collected for the far north to date (1920s), little had been spent on roading Māori areas and that the capital cost of roading had been loaded onto Māori land.

The third area of concern for Māori could be categorised as more political than economic. Because there was no Māori representation on roads boards, nor provision for Māori representation on local bodies, they had no voice in assenting to laws that affected them. They complained that they did not know, when the Native Land Court first came into operation, that by commuting their Māori tenures for grants from the Crown they were subjecting themselves to burdens they never understood.

Political and economic grievances converged in the discussion of rates under Carroll’s land reforms in the early 1900s. In the Legislative Council, Mahuta Te Wherowhero stated that Māori did not object to being rated:

But if you are going to rate us we demand that you should give us the power to deal with our lands, in order that we may be able to get some return out of the land with which to pay the rates.

Consistent with agreement in principle to paying rates, Ngata’s land consolidation schemes had contributed greatly to easing the levying and collection of rates on Māori-owned land. The schemes were not meant to be about rates but, for both Māori

---

47 Acheson to Native Minister, 19 February 1926, AATE A1003 986a 18/4/230, ANZA; Bennion, pp.7, 67.
49 Bennion, pp.7, 11, 18.
50 Mahuta Te Wherowhero, NZPD, 1904, Vol 131, p.810.
and Pākehā local authorities, this was an essential element of many of them. Gordon Coates, Minister of Native Affairs, advised the house that accumulated rates sometimes exceeded the value of land rated, implying a flaw in the valuation process. Up until 1927 first Public Works Acts (1860s) allowed native land to be taken for road or rail without compensation. The proposed Act of 1927 was to put Māori on the same footing as Pākehā; that is, they should be compensated for land so taken. Coates suggested that the proposed schemes were driven by the need to rationalise accumulated rates and survey liens by putting Māori in a position to pay them, or to dispose of land to those who would pay, or to give land in exchange for writing off unpaid rates.  

The King Country and North Auckland were deemed to be in greatest need of attention. Although Ngata’s actions in the far north did, at times, obstruct efforts of far northern Māori, he did negotiate remittances of rates for Māori land in the Mangonui, Hokianga and other northern counties. In Mangonui £3,986 (32.7%) of £12,194 accumulated to 1930 was paid with the balance remitted to 31 March 1931, and in Hokianga £5,816 of £30,396 (19.1%) was paid.  

By 1933, when the Government appointed a committee to look into the rating issue, because of the economic depression from 1929, most Māori speakers were not questioning the principle of paying rates, but did plead for exemptions based on much the same arguments summarised above – they had given land for roads, were not getting services (roads and other facilities) from councils, did not know they had to pay rates as they had never received notices, services such as drainage were only for Europeans – and a minority said the Treaty of Waitangi meant that rates did not have to be paid. Although the Treaty issue might have been more clearly articulated in the

---

51 NZPD, 1927, Vol 216, p.536; Bennion, pp.52-3, 55.  
52 AJHR, 1932-33, Vol II, G-10, p.4. These payments compared with rates ranging from 11.3% to 23.3% for the other northern counties. In other words, Mangonui paid the highest proportion of outstanding rates with the least remitted.
later period, for far northern Māori who identified more closely with it, and for whom it was a covenanted personal commitment,\textsuperscript{53} it remained a fundamental issue throughout.

Ngata’s schemes did not deliver uniformly well. In Hokianga, the schemes were not performing as expected by 1938, and the Crown had not taken up the lands sold to it under rates compromises. The County’s finances were embarrassed by unpaid rates on Māori land and other factors.\textsuperscript{54} In 1940, Michael Joseph Savage, as chairman of the Board of Māori Affairs, reiterated the government’s attitude to rates demands:

\textit{… the Government is reluctant to agree to the enforcement of rating charges by sale until such time as the particular Native … has had the opportunity of using his land to good advantage through the provision of financial assistance and expert farming guidance. In return, the State expects that the Maori should fulfil his obligations as a citizen, and pay his share of all taxation.}\textsuperscript{55}

Other forms of taxation included sheep and dog taxes. The Sheep Act 1878 prescribed a large number of regulatory requirements, including payment of 2/- for every hundred or part-hundred sheep or lambs owned, and penalties for non-compliance. This introduced administrative complexities and invoked resentment.\textsuperscript{56} While the Act’s principal intention was the eradication of a range of sheep diseases, there is no indication that it was aimed at the Māori farmer; disease appears to have been a general problem at the time of enactment.\textsuperscript{57} The sheep tax was used to pay the

\textsuperscript{53} Generally for those who had signed, their descendants, whānau and hapū.

\textsuperscript{54} Bennion, p.66.

\textsuperscript{55} AJHR, 1940, G-10, p.6.

\textsuperscript{56} ‘The Sheep Act 1878: Together with All Proclamations, Orders in Council and Gazette Notices, and Forms to Be Used under the Sheep Act 1878, Also, a Memorandum on the Parasitic Insects Which Infest Sheep’, Wellington, 1879.

\textsuperscript{57} AJHR, 1879, Session II H9, Sheep returns. G. Peacock, Chief Inspector of Sheep writing from Napier reported that Hawke’s Bay was ‘the most important and only clean sheep district in the North Island.’ His opinion appears to have been coloured by his ownership. He relinquished the position, as
inspectors and administration costs, and to that extent it was perceived by sheep farmers to deliver some benefits. Nevertheless, Māori resistance to encroachment of further regulations resulted in police action in the Doubtless Bay area in 1884.\textsuperscript{58}

In contrast to The Sheep Act, the dog tax was less complex and of unequal benefit. Local authorities issued owners with a licensed collar for each dog at 2s. 6d., and non-paying owners were fined or jailed. Conceived to prevent the hindrance of dogs to sheep, the tax aimed to reduce dog numbers by increasing the cost of retaining them. Dogs conferred mana on their Māori owners. The kurī\textsuperscript{59} was one of only two mammals introduced by Māori from their homelands; their pelts were valued for making cloaks (kakahu). Thus, the number of dogs owned reflected status and prestige, and also incurred higher taxes compared with dogs kept purely for utilitarian purposes. The tax was (deliberately) discriminatory in that Māori owned many dogs (or were perceived to). Strategies for responding to imposition of taxes and monetisation ranged from acceptance to rejection in varying forms.

**Resistance, negotiation, accommodation and engagement**

Tom Bennion argued that Māori complaints about rates did not manifest in demonstrations of the scale of the Dog-Tax War. They were instead presented in petitions or at meetings during parliamentary tours, possibly because the consequences were not so immediately felt, and some benefits were received. Rating was also not necessarily enforced to the extent that the law suggested.\textsuperscript{60} I would argue that the Dog-Tax War was not just about dog tax. All forms of tax, rates

\textsuperscript{58} For instance, in August 1884, three men were charged with breach of the Sheep Act in that they neglected to supply a return to the Chief Inspector of the numbers of sheep in their possession at Kenana. Mangonui Record book of Cases, 1878-1912, BAQS 4760 1a, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{59} A dog of Pacific islands origin.

\textsuperscript{60} Bennion, p.28.
included, heaped ‘straws on the camels back’, the dog tax was the one that broke it, or was the easiest to react to because of its visible lack of benefit to Māori, and its immediate impact. John Williams thought that some Māori feared the measures would be used not to raise revenue but to force Māori into waged labour, or to provide an excuse for confiscating land.61 The grievance was political, cultural and economic.

Resistance to dog legislation, as in the Mangonui area in 1880,62 was countered by unconvincing efforts at persuasion, through various media, including Māori language newspapers – for example, the extraneous report of 62,827 Parisian dogs bringing in £20,000 in licence money.63 The Dog-Tax War of 1898, although provoked by the taxes, was the culmination of resentment over Pākehā ‘invasion’.64 The first large waves of settlers to the Hokianga in the 1880s were predominantly poor and Irish. In their struggle to survive on difficult land, they competed directly with Māori in the labour market. Māori retreated to gumdigging, but numbers of European, and then Dalmatian diggers, increased during the depressed 1880s, putting further pressure on Māori access to resources.65

Specific grievances included seasonal restrictions on hunting native birds, the land tax (on land held under Crown grant within 5 miles of a public road), the wheel tax (on vehicles with certain tyre widths), and the dog tax. With 20/20 foresight, Hone Toia

61 Williams, Politics of the New Zealand Maori, p.75.
62 Four men were charged in March 1880 and six in September 1880 with breaches of the Dog Nuisance Act. In May 1883, eight were charged under the Dog Registration Act 1880 and in June 1883 eight Māori men ‘did wilfully obstruct Constable James William Moar in the execution of his duties’, for which parts of the fines were payments for dog collars. BAQS 4760 1a, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
63 *Te Korimako*, Vol 0, No. 38, 16 Maehe 1885, available at: http://www.nzdl.org/cgi-bin/niupepalibrary (July 2005), p.3. ‘Kei Parihi e tae ana ki te 62,827 kuri, a ko nga moni o aua kuri i runga i te ture-raihana e tae ana ki te £20,000’.
65 Harrison, p.46.
prophesied that if dogs were to be taxed, men would be next. Opposition to these impositions was widespread among Māori. In Hokianga it was intensified when the stipendiary magistrate at Russell decided to inflict the full penalty allowed by law, after Paki Wi Hongi of Kaikohe announced that his people would not pay. The previous resident magistrate, von Stürmer, had deemed it inadvisable to introduce the dog tax there, and Māori had petitioned against it at Whangape in 1893 and Kaikohe in 1894.66

The period was marked by a reaction against things Pākehā (including Christianity), and withdrawal into Māori-initiated religious movements, or denominations of dissent, such as Ani Karo’s millennium movement67 and Papahurihia in Waima. Papahurihia ultimately focussed resentment against Pākehā settler competition, the Native Land Court and government legislation designed to benefit settlers, culminating in the Dog-Tax War.68 Its concentration on the Hauturu gumfield around Hone Toia's store probably reinforced its adherents’ determination to resist the dog tax. Despite advice to adopt a conciliatory attitude, the Hokianga County Council issued 40 summonses to Māori non-payers. Resisters confirmed their intentions not to pay, and to take arms against the law if they tried to enforce payment or imprisonment. Fewer than 20 Māori congregated in the small settlement of Rawene on 1 May 1898, armed and stripped for war. The government responded by sending a force of more than 120 men armed with rifles, two field guns, and two rapid-fire guns, in two steamers. A British warship was also dispatched and anchored off Rawene.

---

66 Ballara, Toia, Hone Riiwi 1858-1860? - 1933.
67 A localised following of Te Whiti-ism in the upper Waihou Valley.
68 Harrison, p.46.
In the event, the local parliamentary member, Hone Heke Ngapua, negotiated the surrender of the men and some of their guns. Sixteen men were arrested and tried in the Supreme Court, Auckland, in July 1898, charged with ‘Intending by conspiring to levy war against the Queen in order to force her to change her measures and conspiring by force to prevent collection of taxes’. They were jailed and served sentences, which would appear to be true conquest. But the tax had been introduced 18 years earlier, and the resident magistrate had advised against its enforcement. Furthermore, the sentences were remitted, probably in response to a petition from over 100 influential leaders of Ngāpuhi, Te Rarawa and Te Aupōuri. And the law enforcers thought twice about taking precipitous action again. Misfiled amongst records 25 years after the event, a note from the Clerk of Court to the clerk Hokianga County Council, questioned whether to serve summonses on Māori dog-tax.

69 Toia and four others on 6 May, and eleven others later.
70 Ballara, Toia, Hone Riiwi 1858-1860? - 1933.
defaulters.\textsuperscript{71} Effective imperial control was tenuous. The representation in Figure 20, an example of the myth-making ‘necessary “last battle” when peace is made and falsely presented as complete submission’,\textsuperscript{72} is compromised by Hone Toia’s defiant stance.

One outcome of the series of events was a parliamentary visit shortly afterwards. Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa rangatira questioned the party in considerable detail about the dog tax, land legislation, and the release of those imprisoned.\textsuperscript{73} A viable option for Hokianga could have been that implemented in response to resistance in Mangonui County.

I will tell you what has been done by the Mongonui County Council. An arrangement has been made between the council and the chiefs to the effect that if any destruction of sheep or annoyance is caused by Native dogs, the Natives themselves will undertake to destroy the offending dogs, but if any annoyance is caused by the settlers, then the dog-tax will be collected. In other words, the settling of this question is left entirely to the chiefs. This is the arrangement come to between the local body and the chiefs, and though there is no authority in law for it, yet by mutual arrangement it is working most satisfactorily indeed. … The settlers tell me that since that arrangement was made they have never had any trouble with the Natives’ dogs.\textsuperscript{74}

This accommodation between Pākehā and Māori, for mutual benefit, suggests that either both communities needed each other, or were too much intertwined with each other’s interests to risk a confrontational approach, or that Māori were on a sufficiently equal footing to be able to negotiate. Māori had the numbers in the

\textsuperscript{71} Clerk of Court to the Clerk Hokianga County Council, 26 September 1898, Rawene Criminal Record Book 1909-1923, BADE 10735/ 1a (loose paper at end of 1923 case records), ANZA.
\textsuperscript{73} John MacKay, Notes of Meetings between His Excellency the Governor (Lord Ranfurly), the Rt. Hon. R. J. Seddon, Premier and Native Minister, and the Hon. James Carroll, Member of the Executive Council Representing the Native Race, and the Native Chiefs and People at Each Place, Assembled in Respect of the Proposed Native Land Legislation and Native Affairs Generally, During 1898 and 1899, Wellington, 1899, pp.66-72.
\textsuperscript{74} ibid., p.86.
Hokianga; possibly the Pākehā institutions felt the need of a show of power to establish their authority.

Just as sheep, wheel, dog, and land taxes had been problematic, so too had hospital rates. The two far northern County Councils had been reluctant and unsuccessful in collecting rates on land, and had agreed to remission. In Mangonui County the hospital rating issue was brought to symbolic closure, when Hon. J. A. Young, Minister for Health, opened a new hospital in Kaitaia in 1928. A Queen Carnival was held to commemorate the debt-free opening. The fund-raising effort of the region had been matched by a government subsidy. For the first time, the winner was a young Māori woman, from Whangape – Martha (Taari) Davis. Photos were taken in quaint colonial attire and Māori ceremonial kakahu; grand and fitting speeches were made (in order) by the Minister, the chairman of the Mangonui Hospital Board, chairman of the Kaitaia Town Board, chairman of the Citizen’s Committee, Mr Sam Busby (Puhipi) speaking on behalf of the Māori people, and the Carnival Queen.

Houston, Chairman of the Hospital Board commented:

and it says something for the contributions of the Maori race that a representative of that race should have been elected as Queen of the Carnival. In the future … No European will be able to question the right of the natives to enter and receive treatment in this hospital. The citizens in the Western area raised a sum for the hospital …

Puhipi expressed:

pleasure at the longfelt want supplied by the opening of this well equipped building in the Western part of the Mangonui County. We worked to make the Queen Carnival a success and it is indeed pleasing to know that our efforts assisted to procure the building….
Figure 21 - Kaitaia Hospital’s opening Queen Carnival 1928

Source: Far North Regional Museum, File PEO 219

Source: Far North Regional Museum File PEO 145
The Carnival Queen, speaking on behalf of her tribe and Māori in the western area, noted that ‘for nearly a century the health of the Maoris had declined but the last census showed that it had revived. This was due to the Department of Health’. 75

Resistance, negotiation and accommodation were some responses to the process of monetisation of the economy; other responses were various forms of engagement. Engagement with the ‘new’ economy could be part- or full-time, it could be on terms established by the instigators of that economy, or participants could forge their own terms. An example of the latter can be found in the informal or shadow economy.

A shadow economy is likely to emerge at that intercept or transition between an economy based on trade or barter and a monetary economy. Partly this shadow is a continuation of self-reliant practices, but also it can manifest as rejection of, or resistance to, increasing regulation. The former maintains the neighbour-help and gift exchanges practised by networks of relationships, especially marriage, within which social capital is built up and drawn down. The latter is likely to occur when individuals or groups consider the regulation is not beneficial to the community, or that it unfairly benefits one group over another, the resister feeling unduly prejudiced.

For the far north, the transition from non-monetary to monetary was mediated by the gum industry, the study of which, therefore, provides fertile ground for observing the differentiation of a shadow economy, in both its social capital and resistance forms. The transition process is summarised in Chapter 5.

75 All three speeches were reported in The Northland Age, 14 March 1928. Copy available Far North Regional Museum File No 420/24.
Kauri gum: a new cash industry

Peculiar to, and dominant in, Northland’s economy, straddling the turn from nineteenth to twentieth centuries, was the kauri gum industry. Approximately 80-85% of New Zealand’s gumlands were concentrated in Northland, and 25% of this region’s 6000 square miles was gumlands.76 A graph of tonnage extracted sits as a hat over the study period, with its crown standing tallest between 1888 and 1914, its brim flattening out before 1865 and after 1940, and a post-World War One price-spike representing a false feather in the cap.

Figure 22 - Graph of gum exports
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Source: AJHRs 1850-1950

Practically the whole of the industry’s market cycle played out within this period, its rise more gradual and steady than its decline, which was precipitated by the closing of

UK and German markets during World War One, and gum’s replacement by synthetics. Gum’s export value ranked from first to fourth out of Auckland over the five and a half decades 1861-1915, and third to seventh out of New Zealand for the four and a half decades to 1907. This hat partly sheltered Northlanders from the long depression of the 1880 to 1890s and, if the brim were tilted just so, partly obscured the increasingly serious economic deprivation of Māori through land loss. The hat blew off as the country tipped into depression following World War One. Gum was both blessing and curse, these attributes being managed more opportunistically by some than by others.

Pākehā initiated commercial extraction of gum; it was little used by Māori before European contact. Traditional use was restricted to fire-lighting, wood preserving/finishing for waka, tempering wooden weapons, strengthening muka (flax ropes) by waxing, a pigment for moko, and kauri mimiha (chewing gum), all in minute quantities.

The kauri gum had no other value to their tupuna, it wasn’t until the advent of the Pakeha and money that it gained prominence in the Maori economy.77

The industry introduced Māori to aspects of the Pākehā economy that were not so obvious in earlier activities. Its distinctive feature was clear separation of production and consumption. Māori had used wood for building, and fish for food, albeit on a much smaller scale, and continued to do so as Pākehā extracted for wealth creation. But extracted gum was entirely exported,78 not only out of the region, but also out of the country for uses – varnish, dentures and linoleum – that Māori did not have at that

78 Apart from the odd ton for varnish and curios in New Zealand; 95% of exports were to Britain and the US; Smith, 'Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry', p.89.
time. Export dependence exposed the industry to the full vagaries of external market forces, which could not be seen, foreseen nor controlled by its participants. Gum expanded the use of money in the north.

Although a small amount of coinage had been in circulation in the north prior to 1840, still in 1859 a sack of gum would be exchanged for one hundredweight of potatoes or similar equivalent of tea or tobacco. By 1890 gum could be sold to gum-buyers for cash, or money’s-worth at stores selling Pākehā goods. While barter trade was consistent with traditional Māori economic practices, the use of a medium of exchange departed from tradition.

Figure 23 - A hapū affair. Māori gum diggers ready for a day’s work, 1914.

Arthur Northwood, photographer, ATL 1/1-009777; G.

No-one in the far north was untouched by gum. It had a multiplier effect that spun off into associated industries and commercial activities. Māori engaged more intensely in

79 Henry Shepherd to Kauri Gum Commission 1893, IA 104/2, E (42), ANZW.
this industry than other groups. They were the first entrants and were involved as extended families – women and children participated much more than their Pākehā and Dalmatian counterparts. The manner in which Māori participated, and the uses to which the earnings were put also differed. Nor can the relationship of Māori to the gum industry be understood in isolation from land sales, access and use.

Gum was Northland’s gold, yet ‘a considerable number of our natives’ (mainly men) and ‘about one half of our European population’ went to the Thames goldfield in 1868.\textsuperscript{80} Some returned hoping to find the mineral in their own geological structures, going so far as to destroy valued rock in its pursuit.\textsuperscript{81} The gum rush similarly displayed a feverish character, albeit at a lower temperature. Gum lasted longer, was more accessible, less lucrative and had far greater Māori participation than any gold rush. Māori had a distinctive relationship with gum that they did not have with gold, nor with other economic activities. Over gum’s market life, Māori related to the industry in different ways as the industry conditions, their own economic conditions and experience, and the economy of the Northland region changed.

\textbf{Before 1860: independent gatherer/trader period}

Before 1860 the gum industry was conducted by surface gathering first and digging later, almost exclusively by Māori, who traded for Pākehā goods, and sometimes for cash.\textsuperscript{82} Storekeepers on-sold gum to captains of ships bound for New York, London, or Boston. The industry was unregulated by licences, taxes, royalties or similar;

\textsuperscript{80} William Puckey, Annual letter for year ending 31 December 1868, WGP, L&J, p.527. He reports that 17 letters were sent home to wives and families, who therefore clearly did not go with the men.\textsuperscript{81} Kereama (Hoeft), p.41. A syndicate of Te Aupōuri Māori of Te Kao blew up the large flat-topped rock that stood in the middle of the settlement, which took its name from the process of drying kau (small kumara) on the rock.\textsuperscript{82} In the 1850s the English market was paying £20 - £50 per ton, for which the collectors received £10-£12 per ton: William Swainson, \textit{New Zealand and Its Colonization}, London, 1859, p.199.
beyond the visibility of officials or local owners, prospectors roamed freely, probed, dug and burned off the vegetation with little regard for property rights or restrictions.

Gum was first gathered in the Bay of Islands, which was also the dominant port up to the mid-1840s, but the bulk of exports later transferred to Auckland. Consequently, gum gathering closer to Auckland became popular and attracted Māori into the region from as far as the Rotorua-Taupo area. The 1893 Kauri-Gum Commission of Inquiry recorded a shipment from Parengarenga before 1845, and by the time of the northern war gumdigging was becoming a significant occupation for far northern Māori.

Kawiti’s pa is at length taken … It has indeed been to us all a very trying time … Noble [Panakarea] has joined the Governor’s party …; but he could not prevail on more than fourteen of his party to join him – the remainder are very anxious to live in peace, and provide food and clothing for their wives and families. I think the Kauri gum speculation is very fortunate for this crisis. It gives them employment both for body and mind; for when they are not digging they are speculating on the profits they will receive for what they have dug.

… they are also a poor people, … they cannot provide their own families with all things necessary. It is true they grow wheat, corn and potatoes, and feed pigs. Yet all when sold is paid for in trade, which is mostly of the worst quality, and very high in price. The Kauri Gum too helps them, but they have to work very hard for it, and get at the rate of 7 yards of common print for 2 cwt of Gum. Then the Natives living far from the ports have to carry their produce for miles on their backs, and sometimes carry a very heavy burden … and thereby materially injure themselves.

War and gumdigging were juxtaposed as destruction against production. Because of the demand for European goods by the influx of settlers, values Māori received for crops and gum was low; conversely they were unable to sell food to Europeans due to

---

83 Smith, 'Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry', pp.41-54.
the settlers’ depressed state. Māori traded crops with sawyers, but settlers quickly became self-sufficient, having acquired the more fertile land. Gum’s advantage was that it was traded outside the settler community and was limited by neither the settlers’ economic position nor any finite demand, but its saleability came at the price of hard labour.

The relationship of Māori to the industry, prior to the study period, was as independent suppliers/traders exchanging gum for desired Western goods, with which to enhance their life-styles and their personal and community standings.

1860-90: differentiation, dependence and emerging shadows

Changes of scale, pricing, and volatility, and an influx of diggers of different nationalities, were characteristics of the expanding gum industry. Extraction volumes responded directly to price increases, and were not limited by demand. The country benefited from ‘the unfailing resource which it has provided for those who would otherwise be unemployed’ during the depressed 1880s-1890s. Trading became concentrated with new layers of specialist gum buyers, and Auckland re-graders and packers. Communication and information improved. Regulation was introduced, and working agreements made with owners and leaseholders of gum-land proliferated.

Over the three years following 1862, the export price nearly doubled, which, Smith concluded, made it possible for Pākehā diggers to earn a living on the gumfields. The implication of this conclusion is that Pākehā could previously earn better in other occupations, or that their ‘production’ costs were higher than for Māori. An

---

86 Diary entries, 21 September 1839, 6 June 1842 and 30 June 1843, WGP, L&J, pp.54, 69, 72 respectively. Māori gave up making their own clothing in this region around 1842, when missionaries told them to wear ‘shirt and trousers’ to church on Sundays, instead of their ‘sleeping garments’.

87 AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.4.
alternative and more plausible explanation is safety: ‘During time of Waikato wars 
may be taken as commencement of Europeans camping and working on the 
gumfields’. By 1875 the estimated 2000, mostly single and migratory, Pākehā gum 
diggers in Northland, probably did not yet exceed Māori. As the fields close to 
Auckland were exhausted, gum-workings drifted back northwards. The far north was 
active but something of an outpost of the industry as a whole until after the 1880s.

During the depressed mid-1880s to mid-1890s gumdigging furnished part- or full-
time employment for 10%-20% percent of Northland’s Pākehā population and the 
majority of Māori. Extremely few Māori came from outside the far northern area to 
dig, probably because the fields were, as yet, less active than further south, and they 
were far more remote. Average weekly earnings varied considerably, dependent on 
luck, industriousness, type of gum and market price. Some fresh foods were grown 
locally; otherwise food brought from Auckland bore cartage costs. Clothing was 
expensive but bought in small quantities, and improvised from freely available flour-
bag and sugar-sack cloth. Other living costs such as housing and fuel were minimal.

Smith concluded that store costs were not excessive, but northern evidence disagrees.

To the Natives the gumfields have been a curse. They have 
disregarded the raising of crops, as in the former years, with the 
exception of potatoes and kumaras. With all their earnings upon the 
gumfields, they are deeply in debt, and they and their families for 
the most part are badly clad. All over the gumfields the Natives are 
in a species of bondage to the storekeepers and it is to the latter’s 
advantage to keep them so. Gum at present is very low in price –

88 Henry Shepherd to Kauri Gum Commission 1893, IA 104/2, E(42), ANZW.
90 Smith, 'Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry', p.91.
91 Census figures show 12 outsiders in Mangonui electoral district in 1886, and three and six in 
Hokianga in 1874 and 1878 respectively.
92 Earnings ranged from about £2 a week at the beginning of the study period, to as high as £8 and 
down to around £1 at the end of the period (1940).
93 Smith, 'Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry', pp.55-93.
but such is not the case with provisions which are thirty percent higher than can be purchased anywhere else.\textsuperscript{94}

Although he did not need to know it at the time, Allan was enunciating the theory of ‘the curse of natural resources’, which would attract the interest of many economic historians at the close of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{95} This theory holds that economies endowed with abundant natural resources do not benefit in proportion to that endowment, for a variety of reasons that will be expounded in Chapter 5. Chief amongst these reasons is that the focus on natural (especially finite) resource exploitation detracts effort from other important economic contributions – for instance, manufacturing, infrastructure and education – creating a vicious cycle of underdevelopment.

As gum extraction volumes increased, the value chain extended with increasingly segregated activities, incrementally formalising the industry. Bullock teams replaced Māori carrying diggings on their backs. Storekeepers became trader-buyers, travelling to the fields to price and arrange carriage of gum. Landowners or lessees demanded a share, either fixed by digging grants or as royalties on extractions. Merchants bought, graded, packed and arranged exports separately from shipping. But self-employed digging remained informal.

Newspapers quoting gum prices became available in the 1870s.\textsuperscript{96} While the price of gum increased, the proportion received by the digger decreased. With other charges on the gum being either fixed amounts (licences), or set on a per ton basis

\textsuperscript{94} A. G. Allan, Head teacher, Te Kao, 1888, quoted in Henderson, \textit{Te Kao 75}, p.46.
\textsuperscript{96} Smith, ‘Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry’, p.86.
the digger bore the full brunt of price fluctuations, with one exception: storekeepers started speculating on gum prices. When prices continually rose, this was lucrative. Some might have believed withholding volumes could encourage increases, although none was sufficiently influential, and New Zealand did not have a monopoly on the international market. Kauri gum competed with products from other countries, although the quality of kauri resin had a competitive advantage. When prices fell, as in 1887-88, gum traders had to choose between taking the loss, holding the stock in the hope of a ‘correction’ (and reducing the amount bought once sheds were full), and/or transferring the speculative element to the diggers by offering lower prices. Destitute diggers in the unregulated (informal) economy had less choice.

In the increasingly segregated industry, some Māori successfully by-passed the middlemen, formalising their practices to some extent. At Ahipara, James Work Reid (son of James Reid and Ripeka te Huetu Whanaupo of Whangaroa) was buying gum in the early 1860s. Also at Ahipara, James Berghan (son of James David Berghan, sawyer, and Turikatuku, daughter of Ngāpuhi chief Ururoa) and his Lancashire-born wife, Elizabeth Frear, set up a store and hotel at Ahipara in the 1870s. Herepete Rapihana established a community-based store at Pupepoto in the 1880s.

However, the far north’s most significant Māori example of value chain integration would be that of Ngawini Mare’s relationship, from 1865, with Samuel Yates, a gum

---

97 There was a range of arrangements depending on control of land. The Crown owned large areas, some of which were leased for the purpose of farming; there were private and Māori owners. Land-owners or leaseholders might deem the gum to be their property and allow diggers to extract it and pay them effectively a wage or piece-work payment for digging. Other owners and holders might consider the gum to be the property of the digger, so that the gum itself would be sold as a commodity. Some owners and holders ran their own gum-trading stores, through which they expected diggers on their land to trade, others were happy for the diggers to trade with whomever they chose, gum buyers visiting the fields for the purpose.

98 Smith, 'Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry', p.86. Buying at the going price, then stockpiling to sell when the price was ‘right’.

99 James Work Reid to Kauri Gum Commission 1893, IA 104/2 E(38), ANZW.


101 Personal communication, Ross Gregory, great-grandson of Herepete, June 2005.
trader 20 years her senior. They purchased and leased about 150,000 acres of Māori land on the peninsula’s north-western tip, over which about 350 gum diggers ranged. Livestock and gum were shipped from a large trading store they built on the southern shores of Parengarenga Harbour. Ngawini was an active partner in the station (Te Paki) assuming a more prominent role as Samuel grew older. For the ten years following his death until her own, she managed the station and ran the store, keeping records and accounts and overseeing the local gum trade. Ngawini’s activities were facilitated by her husband’s access to finance (at that time generally unavailable to Māori), through his Jewish connections in Auckland and further afield, her access to tribal resources (kinship-based social capital), and his commercial knowledge, connections and experience. Thus, the marriage was a strategic bridge between two valuable social networks.

Ngawini’s marriage to Sam Yates followed earlier examples of Māori-Pākehā alliances in the region, but the Yates’ commercial presence in this remote territory conferred a different character of relationship on Te Aupōuri Māori to the Pākehā economy compared with other, less isolated areas. Sam and Ngawini’s eight children were not full participants in the local community; a governess was employed for their primary schooling, and their secondary school years were spent at a variety of boarding schools at Auckland, New Plymouth and Wanganui. However, local Māori continued to live on land the Yates’ family managed, and were employed in its many activities. At the turn of the century, there were 150 Māori, 150 Dalmatian and 50 other European gum diggers on their property.

102 Armstrong. Ngawini was born at Pukepoto, the oldest of 15 children of John Murray (Boradale), a European shipwright, and Kateraina Te Kone. She was of Te Rarawa descent, with Te Aupōuri links. Sam was a Jewish immigrant from London who had been educated in Liverpool and Paris.
103 Keene, p.127.
Resident Magistrate White reported on his visit to North Cape in January 1867:

At every settlement the people appeared to me to be living more comfortably than I have ever known them. They are principally engaged in digging Kauri Gum. Mr S Yates is the only trader resident amongst them. He pays them liberally for their Gum, and seems much respected.105

But by 1873 competing traders had moved in and White commented:

… though opposition is good, in these out-of-the-way places it results in impoverishing the Natives, for they get into debt far beyond their means of paying … I have often regretted that it cannot be in law that a trader could not recover more than a certain moderate sum from a Native debtor: this might have the effect of staying the reckless credit given them.106

Generally far northern Māori did not have access to financial capital to invest in business ventures, but some exchanged gum or other produce to accumulate assets. Even if they had access to finance, they did not have the commercial experience that Pākehā such as Yates, Evans and the Subritzkys had acquired.107 Māori, by comparison, were new to money, debt and regulations in the 1870s.

Far northern Māori made many attempts to manage their own affairs within this increasingly regulated environment, probably the most forceful being Tekau ma Rua (Chapter 3). Mangonui’s resident magistrate informed the Native Department that:

The chief cause of these un loyal proceedings is owing to the great aversion of the Natives to the Dog Tax and Sheep Tax which has lately been enforced upon them. Also their prohibition from digging

105 White to Undersecretary Native Department, January 1867, BAFO 10852/2a, p. 515, ANZA.
106 AJHR 1873, G-1, p.1; Stokes, p.34.
107 For example, the Houhora/Awanui-based Subritzky family had migrated to Nelson from Germany in 1843. When their land acquisitions fell through in 1845, they escaped to Adelaide, where one trained as a butcher, and then moved to the goldfields in Victoria at the start of the rush. They learned there was more money to be made in providing meat to the miners, and provisions to those en route from America from a store in Tahiti, once the easily accessible gold was exhausted and mechanisation commenced. They bought large tracts of land at Houhora and Awanui in 1860-75, charged access fees for gumdigging, set up a butchery, gum dealership, and coastal and ocean-going shipping lines, thus extracting value at strategic points in the value chain without digging themselves. The first generation traded with the tangata whenua, the second generation married them. Michael Subritzky, The Subritzky Legend, Auckland, 1990.
Kauri Gum upon the waste land of the Crown leased for depasturing purposes. This latter they feel keenly, as it involves seriously their chief means of obtaining a livelihood. For years they have been in the habit of paying these Leaseholders for the right to dig; this has recently been reported to the Auckland Waste Lands Board, and one of the leaseholders (through fear they believe of having his lease cancelled for such illegal proceedings) has lately prosecuted several of them for trespass.

In a subsequent letter of July 1880, George Kelly explained that the waste-land was leased to a European for depasturing, but that he made his living instead from gum trading and no cattle ran on the property.

It is a very great hardship that the natives when willing to pay, should be debarred from digging gum off lands, and one which is likely to prove disastrous in its results, not only towards the Natives but the district in general. The natives are now in a most disaffected state, chiefly owing to this prohibition. ...[When] several men were fined for trespassing, these men stated in their defence that they had paid ... large sums for the right to dig. They claim also, that when they sold these lands to the Government, they were distinctly told by the purchasing agents that they would be allowed the right to dig the gum.

Kelly suggested that all leases for depasturing held over the gumfields be cancelled, and licences to dig gum be issued instead, at the rate of 5/- per cwt for adults and 2/6 for children, thus indicating an acceptance of the inevitability of children working.

While he probably misread the nature of the grievances giving rise to Tekau ma Rua, his reading of the severity of the economic situation was accurate.

Although some aspects of the gum industry had started to be regulated in this second period, the standard of enforcement was low. Theoretically a licence fee was required on Crown lands. When diggers worked without licenses they were engaging in the informal economy, but the collection of fees and issuing of licences was neglected.

---

108 Kelly to Native Under Secretary, 11 June 1880, BAFO 10852 3a, pp. 269-72, ANZA.
109 George Kelly, an interpreter in the Mangonui Resident Magistrate’s office and, since White’s retirement from public service in 1878, effectively in charge of the district. O’Malley and Robertson, p.111.
110 Kelly to Tole, 6 July 1880, BAFO 10852 3a, pp. 269-72, ANZA.
because the expense of enforcement amongst the vast numbers of migratory diggers in these remote areas would have exceeded the potential revenue.\footnote{AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.3.} A proposed gum tax met strong protest from Bay of Islands’ Māori gumdiggers because they considered it was prejudicial to Māori, in that Pākehā economic activities further south, particularly sheep and cattle stations, were not similarly taxed, whereas gumdigging was one of the few sources of income and employment open to Māori in the north. They also objected to their four-year-old children being liable for the tax because they worked the gumfields.\footnote{Te Waka Maori O Niu Tirani, Vol. 11, No. 16, 17 August 1875, available at: http://www.nzdl.org/cgi-bin/niupepalibrary (December 2003), p.186.}

Lack of regulation did not mean that gumfields had the characteristics of a ‘wild west’, even though Māori were armed and could have been formidable up to 1898. Apart from drunkenness, an unspoken gumfield code appeared to restrain criminality.\footnote{B. W. Marshall, ‘Kauri-Gum Digging, 1885-1920: A Study of Sectional and Ethnic Tensions’, MA thesis, University of Auckland, 1968, p.211.}

Most differences were settled by fighting and then forgotten. The police were rarely called on to settle disputes ... they generally left things to the law of the gumfields. If you were guilty you got a thrashing and returned whatever property you had taken. If you re-offended you got a worse thrashing and could be banished from that field.\footnote{Tomas, ‘Gumfields of Lake Ohia’.

The relationship of Māori to the gum industry in this second period was characterised by a continuation of the digging, carrying and selling, adaptation of traditional storekeeping and Pākehā-facilitated diversification into new forms of commercial enterprises. But changes were accompanied by a reduction in independence as agreements for access to land and debts owed to storekeepers progressively tied

\footnote{111}
Māori into trading relationships in which their powers of negotiation were limited. Māori also saw clear examples of Europeans working outside regulations, one of the characteristics of a shadow economy, which must have raised questions for them about the integrity of the introduced legal system.

This same legal system demanded more money from them, as a result of the actions of the Native Land Court in the area from 1865, and newly imposed taxes. Even so, building Native schools and supporting teachers were high priorities. Neighbouring hapū competed to gain permission from education officials to establish schools in their communities. Families were prepared to move, or send their children to stay with Aunts and Uncles, to support their favoured school location. At least six schools had been established before 1879; a further seven were built between 1879 and 1890. Church building also received funding priority in at least ten communities. Schools and churches were considered important for maintaining social cohesion.

1890-1910: intensification, discrimination, boom-times

The gum industry was at its most intense in the two decades straddling 1900. Characteristics of the 1890-1910 period were: more regulation; significant changes in the ethnic and gender mix of gum-diggers; introduction of a new end-product for gum (linoleum), which utilised previously unsaleable qualities and sizes; introduction and increasing mechanisation of extractive processes; and boom years followed by the downside of the industry’s cycle. Māori engagement expanded into co-operative storekeeping, gum trading, mechanical gum cleaning and haulage by bullock teams.

115 Awanui, Pamapuria (relocated from Kaitaia), Peria, Pukepoto, Ahipara, Waihou – Native School files, ANZA.
116 Whangape, 1879; Motukaraka, 1881; Whakarapa, 1883; Te Kao, 1881; Pamapuria (new), 1884 – Native School files, ANZA.
117 Oturu, 1867; Kareponia, 1874; Awanui, Anglican, 1874, Catholic, 1887; Taipa, 1874; Parapara, 1890; Ahipara, 1874; Rangi Point, 1878. Sources: missionary journals, local histories, church commemorative booklets.
By the 1890s there was a view that the industry was not sufficiently regulated.

Good gum land is a veritable gold mine, but the Government does nothing to regulate the industry …, nor even to protect their own lands. Auckland exports more gum than gold, but though the most elaborate laws are made to regulate the gold mining industry, and every possible assistance is given to it, nothing whatever is done for gum.¹¹⁸

No doubt this discrepancy in regulations would have arisen because gum and its potential value were previously unknown, whereas gold was an internationally recognised, valuable mineral, and gold prospecting and mining were familiar colonial practices, with known problems and solutions. The Commission of Inquiry into the gum industry in 1893 acknowledged the comparison with goldfields but concluded that ‘The significance of … differences lies in the obvious difficulty which they present to any attempt to make regulations for controlling the ordinary working of the gumfields.’¹¹⁹ The Commission shared the concern, but made explicit their intentions that the industry be used to further colonisation.

…although kauri gum … to the value of £6,000,000 has been dug from the soil and exported, it has conferred comparatively little permanent benefit on the colony in the form either of roads or of settlement on the land.

Although the 1893 Commission of Inquiry claimed to ‘have done as much as we could … to bring to [the Government’s] notice … the leading questions which concern the welfare of the population connected with the gum industry …’,¹²⁰ it is evident by the absence of Māori from amongst those interviewed that they were not part of the population with whom the government was concerned. Further regulation was aimed directly at the influx of ‘Austrians’ to the gumfields.

¹¹⁸ Alderton and Wyatt, 'The Kauri Gum Industry', The Resources of New Zealand, Whangarei, 1897-1898, p.66.
¹¹⁹ AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.6.
¹²⁰ ibid., p.8.
The Dalmatian influx

The third ethnic group, Dalmatians, started to arrive on northern gumfields in the mid-1880s, but were not present in significant numbers until the 1890s. By 1893 there were estimated to be 4303 full-time British, 934 foreign (of whom 514 were ‘Austrian’), 832 part-time settler, and 3110 Māori part-time, diggers. Māori still predominated in the northernmost districts – Māori 780, British 200, ‘Austrian’ 3, and other foreigners 26 – and a small number of Māori came from outside the area. While Dalmatians did not at any time exceed 4% of the total population in the far north, this group was almost exclusively male and predominantly young adults. At their most numerous, in the 1916 census, there were 384 males and 18 females in Mangonui and Hokianga counties. The men represented approximately 13% of the 20-40-year-old male segment in the two counties, and more than 20% in Mangonui County. Called ‘Austrians’, they were mainly men from Dalmatia on the Adriatic coast of present-day Croatia who preferred to migrate rather than suffer poverty or serve as conscripts in the Austro-Hungarian army. They brought with them energy and work intensity born of youth and poverty, a gender imbalance, a different culture and language, and wine.

---

121 ibid.
122 Kauri Gum Commission 1893, F(1), IA 104/2, ANZW; Census returns, Department of Statistics – the 1901 census shows the greatest number of Māori from outside the area during the gumdigging era, the largest being a contingent of 18 males and 17 females from Whanganui. There were two from Ngāti Raukawa, four from Ngāti Maru, four from Arawa, two from Ngāti Whatua, and four from Ngāti Kahungungu. Females exceeded males in this group, which suggests marriage rather than gumdigging was the reason for inward migration.
123 Census returns, Department of Statistics. There are no figures for population by age, by birthplace within counties. The percentage is calculated by applying the national age spread of Dalmatians to the Dalmatian male population of Mangonui and Hokianga counties, and comparing the resultant 20-40-year-old age-bracket numbers to the totals for the counties, including Māori males from the Māori census. 65.3% of Dalmatians were concentrated in the 20-40-year-old bracket.
Anti-Dalmatian feeling ran particularly strongly in 1893,\textsuperscript{124} but the Commission of Inquiry of that year found that they were ‘honest, industrious and frugal’.\textsuperscript{125} These qualities invited allegations of overworking gumfields, and bleeding the economy by repatriating earnings. An 1898 Act excluding aliens from gum reserves was aimed solely at the Dalmatians; gumfields were for British, preferably settlers. Māori were more hospitable.

When the Dallies arrived from Yugoslavia with just the bare fare they had nobody and nowhere to go – the Maoris befriended them when they came here – they lived with the Maoris and ate fish and cabbages with them and the Maories helped them. And they were called ‘Tararas’ because of the way they talked. … So they were just called ‘Tony Tarara’ and ‘Jack Tarara’ and that and everyone knew who you meant. But the Dallies were hard, they lived a working man’s life, same as the Maoris. They survived by hard work and sweat in the gumfields and they got on because their lifestyles were similar. Most of the time they were best of mates, they trusted each other – if they were short of tobacco or meat they borrowed from each other, even money. The only trouble really between the Dallies and the Maoris was over women.\textsuperscript{126}

Young Dalmatian men met the daughters of Māori families working the gumfields and socializing on their evenings off, for both peoples enjoyed partying. ‘Wine, women and song’ combined on the gumfields, adding informal economy elements to the relationship of Māori to gum – intermarriage, gambling and alcohol. Beginning with the marriage of Anaru Kleskovich to Erina Kaka (Te Aupōuri) in 1892, intermarriages between Dalmatians and Māori increased, particularly after 1910, bringing mutual economic obligations. There were no impediments to marriage apart from racial and religious prejudices, which could be substantial but could be overcome or ignored. In complete contrast, sales of alcohol to Māori were restricted by a series of regulations and legislation for over a century, starting with the passing

\textsuperscript{124} Marshall, p.214; Andrew Trlin, \textit{Now Respected, Once Despised: Yugoslavs in New Zealand}, Palmerston North, 1979, pp.69, 74.
\textsuperscript{125} AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.7.
\textsuperscript{126} Tomas, ‘Gumfields of Lake Ohia’.
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of the 1847 Sale of Spirits to Natives Ordinance. These restrictions opened the possibility of exploitation of Māori demand, through a shadow economy.

**Wine growing and its part in developing a shadow economy**

The Kauri Gum Industry Act 1898, and the gradual exhaustion of the gum, prompted many Dalmatians who chose to stay in New Zealand, to turn to the vine-growing they had known at home. While the most successful of these settled on the western farmlands of Auckland, some stayed in the far north and established vineyards behind the Ahipara gumfields (Tony Yelash) and at Herekino (Posinkovich and Lunjevich), Waiharara (Babich Bros.) and Hukatere (Nicholas and John Silich). This new group of winemakers was first mentioned in an Agricultural Department report of 1896. ‘At Pahi (north Kaipara) a number of Austrians are beginning to cultivate the vine on an extensive scale.’ An industry visitor to the far north reported:

> At the Puhata Settlement, Herekino, a number of Austrian settlers are already beginning to profit by their industry and enterprise. A large area has been planted in vines and small cellars erected, which have been working well during the past year. An excellent wine was produced, and promises well for the future prospects of these useful settlers.  

Winemaking was not a one-way street from the gumfields; destruction of vines by uncontrollable disease triggered a return. Neither was winemaking a particularly profitable venture if customers were remote. Better prospects offered if the customer could be persuaded to come to the wine. As many as five wine shops were

---

129 ibid., p.105. ‘A father and son, Nicholas and John Silich, winemakers and wine merchants in their own country who had been driven to migrate by the Austrian authorities’ policy of importing Italian wines, had established a vineyard at Hukatere in the far north by 1900. When ten acres of vines in full bearing were later wiped out by phylloxera, however, they had to go back to gum-digging.’
130 ibid., p.137. ‘Joe Babich had crushed grapes with a manuka stick, tramped out the juice in a barrel with his bare feet and, as a boy on far north gumfields, had ridden sixty-five kilometres to a customer with a sack of half-a-dozen port wine each side of the saddle and then sixty-five kilometres back with £1 to show for his journey.’
opened on one gumfield. Typically on the Ahipara field, wine was sold until cash
gave out and then credit was given on a promise to pay in gum chips.\textsuperscript{131}

While wine was being sold in the late nineteenth century, the distillation of wine
spirits was illegal.\textsuperscript{132} As the gumfields were becoming depleted, the strength of the
prohibitionists had been growing. In 1905, the first North Island dry district was
added to the five no-licence areas won in the South Island. Vignerons felt their
occupation to be precarious and vineyard plantings declined.\textsuperscript{133} Illegality and the
prohibitionists curtailed, but did not prevent, production and sale, and did not reduce
demand. Illegal stills produced a range of products, perhaps the best known being the
Dalmatian Raki.\textsuperscript{134} Alcohol found a ready market on the gumfields, which one
prohibitionist tried to deter.

21\textsuperscript{st} January, 1914 …

We had a lengthy meeting in the hall tonight and a good many
Austrians attended. My blood is still boiling over some of their
misdoings – over the doctored wine some of them sell; over the
fearful orgies they cause among the men and women who are
drunk. Some of the women here become so maddened with wine
that they leave their children by the roadside while they return for
still more. From the stupidly drunk people the buyers get back the
money paid for gum. Full of these things I stood there, exhorting in
Maori these foolish people to cease making the fortunes of the
Austrians, and make their own instead. … One Maori man stood
up and told us that he had been digging hard for three years, and
had nothing to show for his work but his bag hut and the food he
and his children had eaten. I have been asked to return here on the

\textsuperscript{131} ibid., p.104.
\textsuperscript{132} ibid., pp.75-7. Sir George Grey failed in his first attempt to amend the law to allow the distillation
of wine spirits in 1888. The Bill to allow vineyards of 2 acres or more to install stills of 25-50 gallons
for fortifying wine up to an alcohol content of 40% was defeated in 1890, but passed the following year
when John Ballance, as prime minister, personally re-introduced an identical Bill.
\textsuperscript{133} ibid., p.109.
\textsuperscript{134} Raki - A Turkish and Syrian brandy, usually distilled from a mash of mixed wines, figs, and dates.
The chief care is bestowed on plums, from which is distilled a mild spirit known as raki or rakiya. The
favourite kind of raki is shlivovitsa (the slivowitz of Austria), extracted solely from plums. Quote
from northern imbiber: ‘Don't know about a mild spirit! The stuff the Dallies make will blow your
socks off!’
28th or 29th, by which time the Maoris will have had time to call in their leader.

28th January, 1914

Back in the gumfields! … the necessity for our work was driven home to us today by the sight of young children hopelessly drunk on wine.135

Convergence of resentment about regulations limiting access of Dalmatians to gum, and Mäori to alcohol, was a potent incentive for a thriving shadow economy, which was not confined in space or time, as other northern gumfields experiences reveal.

Nearly all transactions were by cash and everyone kept their money in little metal boxes with locks. People hardly ever took their money to the bank, and there was no stealing, but there was a lot of gambling. … Most of the [gum] sellers were Maoris and the buyers Dally.

… You weren’t allowed to gamble or drink … and the police used to come around to check, but there was a lot of sly grogging from the gumbuyers and only one policeman. …136

Twenty years later, Truth reported that inhabitants of the remote northern Te Hapua community were being plied with what was called ‘hooch’ – ‘a sort of home brew with tobacco and maize added, proving very fierce. Methylated spirits, with disinfecting crystals, and a dash of wine or brandy is sold to the Maoris for 6s. per bottle’. This, the journalist surmised, absorbed the better part of the community’s estimated income of £10,000 from sale of gum and cattle, and from unemployment relief.137 The comment probably reflected more sentiment than fact.

135 Florence Harsant, They Called Me Te Maari, Christchurch, 1979, pp.122-3, 127. A fluent command of Mäori had led to Florence Harsant’s appointment as Mäori Organiser for the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, in which capacity she was required to move among Mäori people forming local unions. She travelled on horseback through the far north at the beginning of 1914, before war broke out, with Kaa, a 30-year-old Mäori woman from Kohukohu, as her companion. On her travels she wrote a daily diary.
136 Tomas, ‘Gumfields of Lake Ohia’. This is supported by numerous cases in police and court records of charges and convictions of Dalmatians and others, for supplying alcohol to Mäori.
137 Truth, 10 February 1937, MA W2459, 1925/213, ANZW.
These illicit and illegal interchanges resonate with Dick Hobbs’ study of East End (London) entrepreneurs, and are supported by police and court records, although the number (and volume) of transactions is not quantifiable. Hobbs found that the permeation of the economic realm by social relations (social capital) was apparent at the margins of reputable commercial transactions, where the black economy was pervasive. There, transactions were not impersonal exchanges. People maintained personal repute or secured economic means of survival, and identified themselves as ‘trusted insiders as against the threatening outside’, so upholding the distinctive social and cultural identity of the group. Transactions of this type served to reinforce relationships between Māori and Dalmatians, and show clearly the connection between the informal economy and social capital.

At least two Māori families became involved in grape-growing and winemaking by association with Dalmatians. In one instance, four brothers from one family settled at the Puhata Settlement, where they jointly developed a substantial vineyard. Three followed the family custom of returning home to find a wife. The fourth chose to marry a local Māori woman. For the duration of this brother’s lifetime, grapes were grown, tended and harvested, but immediately following his death, his surviving brothers tore the vines from the ground and burned them. Thus they lost both capital and income. Whether the action resulted from racial prejudice, a perceived threat to quality or competition, or because Māori were not allowed to participate in any aspect of the liquor industry, the children of Māori descent, although as well trained as their wholly Dalmatian cousins, were barred from the viticulture sector of the Pākehā economy. But informal trade between the two peoples continued.

One illuminating example of the contest between enforcement of regulations and informal collaboration occurred when a group of Māori men asked a Dalmatian wine-maker’s wife to sell them some wine. She refused. They told her they would help themselves, as they knew where the cellar key was, and they would pay the wine-maker later, both of which they did. Police charged the wine-maker with supplying alcohol to Natives, which he refuted because he had not been present; the Māori were charged with theft, which they refuted because they had paid the winemaker. The wine-maker was, thereafter, required to secure cellar and key more effectively.\textsuperscript{140}

Co-operation between Māori and Dalmatians strengthened on the gumfields, as Figure 24 illustrates. After the industry’s peak, gumdigging was incorporated more fully into the seasonal cycle of the informal Māori economy than it had been earlier. This was partly due to the learned wisdom of not increasing costs of gathering gum by using store-bought foods in substitution for freely grown crops. Patana Matiu (Ngāti Kahu, Whatuwhiwhi) remembered his elders’ practices:

\begin{quote}
From November to March are the months of the year for fine weather. Then they would move to the gum. People would come here from Whangaroa and other places. They established a town for themselves at Waiporohita, the lake not far from here. There were many Dalmatians living here at that time as well. …

When the time was right to go back and work their gardens they would go back until all the weeding and everything else was done. Then they would return to gumdigging until the digging areas were too wet for them to dig.\textsuperscript{141}
\end{quote}

A change in the industry also facilitated seasonality. Lower grades of gum and chips recovered from old diggings by efficient mechanical washing processes met a new use, linoleum-making. Digging was carried out in the dry summer months, when

\textsuperscript{140} Entry dated 29 July 1915, Magistrate’s Notebook, 18 May 1915-12 April 1916, BADD 10815 1c, p.47, ANZA. (Restricted access.) The magistrate noted the Māori men were not drunk at the time.\textsuperscript{141} Matiu and Mutu, pp.119-20.
access was easier; washing was done in winter when water was plentiful. On the Ahipara gumfields, David Brass’s (Ngāti Moetonga, Ahipara and Ngāti Waiora, Whangape) gum-washing team provided a service to gumdiggers, using an elaborate system of dams and channels built by the gumdigging community.  

**Figure 24 - Gum sorting 1931**

![Gum sorting 1931](image)

Separation of functions allowed co-ordination with crop cycles of planting (spring) and harvesting (autumn), which neatly fell between digging and washing. With gum incorporated into the seasonal cycle of the informal economy, and kaimoana plentiful, in remote areas the gum buyer/storekeeper could be the only point of contact Māori had with the Pākehā economy, and even then, several storekeepers were Māori. Otherwise Māori could live independently from the Pākehā economy, unless store or legal debts exceeded gum earnings, when their lands could become at risk.

---

142 Personal communication Bruce Berghan, June 2005. The machine shown is not necessarily one that David Brass’s team used, but was ‘state of the art’ at the time the photograph was taken.
By 1890, Māori had been engaged in the gum industry for at least 45 years; their experience was building. Te Aupōuri of Te Kao employed a new strategy using the gum industry to protect their land ownership, when one individual challenged it. To pay survey and title investigation costs, they allowed Dalmatians to dig on their land at a charge of £10 each. Three to four hundred took up the offer. 143 Te Aupōuri lands were retained, but the defence costs could have been put to better use developing them. Where lands were not at risk, it was even possible to generate a surplus from gum, as another Te Aupōuri hapū achieved before 1899.

Māori gum traders

Matire Kereama told of the people of Pawarenga Te Aupōuri trekking several days via Herekino, Ahipara and Te Oneroa-a-Tohe to Waiharara: women and children on horseback, the stronger women and men walking, all going to the gumfields to raise money to build a church. They were generously hosted along the way by relatives, some of whom they had never met previously.

the local people showed our folk what to do, what to look for and where to dig. They also instructed them how to dive for the gum in the lake which was clear and so very beautiful. Some went off to dig for the stuff which they gathered in loads, each digger putting all he found into a common lot.

Soon the prospectors had tons of gum for which it was easy to obtain money. … My father who did not wish to look for gum, decided to buy it from his people. A Pakeha friend advised him exactly what to do and when he had bought a lot of gum he took it to the market at Auckland by the boat which called weekly at Kaimaumau. With the money he received for the gum he was able to buy enough goods to start a shop among his people.144

143 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.41.
144 Kereama (Hoeft), pp.27-9.
On another trip, Matire’s father used money from gum trading to buy a breeding mare and race horses, which won at the Waipapakauri races, further increasing the family income, although not necessarily their net wealth. ‘After a few years of free and easy life on the gum fields our people returned home for the opening of the Catholic church’.  

Kereama’s store appears to be of the co-operative kind referred to in the Kauri Gum Commission’s report of 1893. The Commission noted dismissively:

> … a new movement amongst the Maoris in the north, who have instituted a system of co-operative stores in connection with their gum-lands. … the particulars need not detain us here.  

Various sources mention other storekeeper/gum traders – Murupaenga at Te Hapua on the Parengarenga Harbour and Eru Ihaka at Te Kao in 1901, Wiremu Hetariki at Lake Ohia, and the more well known store of Whina Te Wake (Gilbert/Cooper) at Whakarapa (Panguru) in the 1920s, which took the place of the earlier-established, but unsuccessful, co-operative store there.

---

147 Witnesses referred to in Kaitaia Judge’s notebook, BADD 10815 1a, 27 April 1901, pp.32-3, ANZA.
148 Tomas, ‘Gumfields of Lake Ohia’.
149 King, p.89.
The eight co-operative stores, referred to in the 1893 report, operated in the four northern counties. Two were on land leased by merchants Molesworth and Saies, and the other six were on Māori land. Molesworth described them to the Commission:

The system is that a no. of natives of one tribe subscribe say £2 each. They come to us and expend that money in stores in consideration of which we give them credit if they require it for about half as much again. They allow us to examine their books & stock. We supply all their stores & buy their gum but they are not bound to sell their gum to us if they can do better elsewhere. We give more credit than I have stated when any of the stores seem to be carried on well.

The Maoris themselves take stock & share profits every 3 months as a rule. Some of them are able to keep accounts. Each shareholder gets credit for his share of profit either in goods, or in cash if that is available. Each man digs his own gum selling it to the store & getting payment for it. They call the stores “Companies” and usually appoint a managing committee of 6 or 7. The Tekau [sic, probably Te Kao] natives have a no. of Europeans digging on their ground & selling their gum to the stores, at which also they have to deal for their stores, which they obtain at the same prices as the natives. This system has been in force about a twelvemonth & is working so far very satisfactorily.

We have given the sole right to dig gum on two of our blocks to the maories who sell their gum at the two stores – of their 8 – which are on our ground. The committee of management consist mostly of the head men of the tribe.150

Another two stores had been operating since 1888-89, at Awanui and Waihopo. Additionally, Molesworth and Saies ‘appointed Hohipa Whare our agent on the Kauri Timber Company’s land at Te Whau’.151 This arrangement of stores and agents represents a comparatively complex hub-and-spoke type of system, through which Molesworth and Saies accessed the innate social capital of Māori communities.152

150 Kauri Gum Commission of Inquiry 1893, Judge’s notes of evidence taken Whangaroa Court House, 20 July 1893, IA 104, 3, p.183, ANZW.
151 Kauri Gum Commission of Inquiry 1893, Judge’s notes of evidence taken Whangaroa Court House, 20 July 1893, IA 104, 2, App.E (29), referred to at p.191 of the evidence, ANZW.
152 For a summary of their operations, see Subritzky, pp.208-9.
Probably, the stores performed a similar function to a Māori bank, like one at the pa near Parihaka in Taranaki, described by Maro Kopa in his evidence for the Royal Commission on usury on loans to Maori.

I know the custom of having a Maori Bank in the pa. Its object is to buy necessaries of life. The bank lends money at rate of 2/- in the £ for 6 mos but the borrower has to give security a horse or something of that kind.

The bank charges 4/- in the £ every 3 months [for a second loan] & borrower has to give security. It does not exist now. We used to draw rent from Fisher [the Public Trustee] but when Mr Bayley came he got our cheques & the Bank ceased to exist.153

Stores and bank represented communal engagement in an individualistic economy; they were, in effect, a nexus between two economic systems. Both attempted to manage the relatively new monetary system in traditional ways. Use of money as a medium had changed the nature of exchange, as McCully Matiu recalled of his elders’ times, at the beginning of the 1900s.

…some of the [old] people living here went to work … And what was the payment? A cow for slaughter, as payment for their work. They were not paid with money. In the time of our parents, that thing money was unknown here. The time it did come was in the time of gumdigging … then for the first time the people saw that thing, money. Before that, no matter what they got, like fish or anything else, would go to each family so that it would not be wasted. And that was the way my elders lived in those times.154

Co-operative stores and banks tried to contain Māori borrowing and keep profits within the community, in order to maintain community cohesion and prevent (or at least reduce) ‘leakage’ of cash and other resources from Māori to coloniser, particularly to those of a predatory kind. The Taranaki bank failed because an independent lender made unsecured loans at 5/- in the £ for six months (50% per annum interest rate) and obtained repayment ahead of other creditors. The lender

153 Minute book for Royal Commission on Usury on Loans to Maoris, 1906, MA77/1, ANZW.
154 Matiu and Mutu, p.122.
(Bayley) accompanied the Public Trustee (Fisher) when he paid lease rentals to land owners in the form of cheques, which were immediately passed to the lender, rather than debt repayments being apportioned amongst various creditors.155

Scant reference to co-operative stores suggests that they might have met a similar fate to the Taranaki bank, or simply faded away with the gum industry. One store was functioning at Te Kao eight years after the 1893 report, but it is unclear if this was the same, or a different store. The lack of interest shown in the stores by the 1893 Kauri Gum Commission is consistent with a lack of support or encouragement for containing Māori borrowing and spending. Given its recognition that ‘[t]he connexion of the gum-digging industry with the settlement of the country is one of the most important matters affecting the future of the district’,156 containment of ‘leakage’ from colonised to coloniser would have run counter to its imperative. Nevertheless, the concept of co-operative stores persisted and was employed again in 1926 by Te Aupōuri in Te Kao when their dairy scheme was established, following collapse of the gum industry.

As Elizabeth Rata found:

Regulations theorists … [argue that] it is not possible to maintain the existence of more than one mode of production within one social formation or regime because … the reproduction and regulation of the conditions of existence of a mode of production is the social formation itself. The political relations of domination, which exist in the social formation of the dominant mode of production, impose the reproduction regulations of the dominant mode upon the subordinate mode of production. Unless the subordinate mode is active within those political relations it is

155 The Commission found that the money-lending system did amount to usury, suggested three options – two legislating against the practice and one empowering the Public Trustee to administer payment of debts. Although he recommended the third he acknowledged the administrative burden, and considered that none would entirely prevent clandestine transactions: Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Alleged Usury on Loans to Maoris; Together with Minutes and Evidence, AJHR, 1906, II G-1, p.2.
156 AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.4.
entirely subjugated to them. Yet, if the subordinate mode does have a place within the political relations of the social formation … then this positioning mediates the mode into the relationships of the dominant mode, reconstituting and changing it fundamentally’.\textsuperscript{157}

Regulation of society was at the heart of the rule’s contest discussed in Chapter 3. However, in the time period of this study, the contest was yet playing out, and at the practical level of the co-operative stores, the two systems could functionally connect, but Māori initiatives were not supported by the state.

These Māori-owned-and-operated stores can be seen as an adaptation of the traditional storekeeping function within hapū, influenced by associations with some of the first Pākehā who became incorporated into Māori society. One such network comprised Pākehā who first arrived in Mangonui from 1831, and their descendants. Tracing their associations with local Māori reveals a geographically wide-ranging network of commercial activity, concentrated in the storekeeping, gum trading and accommodation/hospitality commercial activities. (For ease of reference this group is named the Eastern Network.) This network is an exemplar of social capital in action, illustrating how social relationships influence the type of economic activity in which people engage. It contrasts with the network of Māori families who found roles as priests, police, and parliamentarians in the Pākehā politico-economic system (Chapter 3). On the other hand, the Eastern Network displays a similar pattern to that observed in a New England commercial fishing fleet, where much of the fleet recruited crew and investment capital among family members at the expense of ships organised by impersonal relations.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{158} Carrier, p.195.
Social capital and the Eastern Network

Elements of social capital in action are evident in Matire Kereama’s description of her hapū’s migration to the gumfield – the group was hosted by kin whom they had not previously met; these kin imparted knowledge and skills; a Pākehā friend advised how to trade gum at the Auckland market. While friendship augmented, marriage and kinship underpinned Māori involvement in storekeeping, gumtrading and accommodation businesses. First sawyer/trader settlers who married Māori women were incorporated into the women’s families in anticipation of mutual and reciprocal benefit. The men gained protection and access to land and trees; the hapū gained knowledge and access to non-Māori markets – at least that was the principle. Following the commercial activities of those first sawyer/traders and their descendants shows how the principle worked. First the tribal incorporations through marriage are charted; second, the commercial activities of the kin linkages are mapped; and finally, the Pākehā presence is removed and Māori of the same tribal groups, who were involved in commerce without direct marriage connection, are added to the commercial map.

A group of sawyers and traders – James Berghan, Thomas Flavell, James Reid, Henry Snowden, George Thomas, and Stephen Wrathall – arrived in the Mangonui/Whangaroa area in 1831 or earlier. Marriage\textsuperscript{159} alliances were forged between Thomas Flavell first with Hēnihīkahe of Ngāti Kahu; then between Flavell, Snowden and Berghan and three daughters of the Ngāpuhi chief Ururoa of Whangaroa. Berghan, Flavell, Thomas and Wrathall entered into land agreements with Pororua Wharekauri (Ngāpuhi and Te Rarawa married to a Ngāti Kahu woman),

\textsuperscript{159} The term ‘marriage’ is used in its broad common-law or customary sense. It includes registered marriage, tomo, ma wahine, de facto and child-bearing relationships.
and Snowden with Ururoa, all initially for access to trees. Following his first wife’s
death, Berghan married Ruhihana Ihaka of Ngāti Kahu. Stephen Wrathall married
Maria Hinetoto, James Reid married Ripeka Te Huetu Whanaupo of Whangaroa, and
George Thomas married Ereere of Te Rarawa. A later arrival in Mangonui, Samuel
Yates, married Ngawini Mare (Te Rarawa/ Te Aupōuri).

Thomas Flavell kept ‘a sort of grog shop’ in Mangonui by 1848, having taken it over
from George Thomas. Flavell built the Donnybrooke hotel in Mill Bay in 1842. Yates
ran a general store at Mangonui 1852-63, then moved his trading to Parengarenga
Harbour.\(^{160}\) Henry Snowden established the Donkey’s Rest hotel in Onewhero in the
1850s, and Snowden’s Hotel in Kaeo in the 1860s.\(^{161}\) James Reid’s store and hotel at
Ahipara were operating by the 1860s.\(^{162}\) (Figure 27.)

Some offspring of these early marriages married within their own group, some
strengthened ties with local Māori families, and others bonded with new Pākehā
settlers (Figure 26). A significant inclusion in the latter category was the Evans
family, who arrived in Mangonui in 1865. The Evans and Yates families, together
with the Subritzkys,\(^{163}\) would eventually dominate gum trading in the north.

One of James Berghan’s sons established hotels at Ahipara and Kaitaia, as well as a
long-running and successful gum-trading business and store, which was maintained
through successive generations until 1986; another son (married to an Evans)
established another hotel at Mangonui. James Reid and Ripeka Te Huetu’s
descendants maintained their store, gum-trading and accommodation businesses into

\(^{160}\) Mckenna, pp.10, 67, 123.
\(^{162}\) Evidence to Kauri Gum Commission, 10 April 1893, IA 104/3, ANZW. Reid’s son James Work
Reid stated that he had, by then, been buying gum for 30 years; WGP L&J diary of 1870 refers to
conducting services at the hotel at Ototoiti (Ahipara), suggesting it had been there for some time.
\(^{163}\) Subritzkys did not ally with the easterners, having established themselves first at Houhora Harbour.
the 1920s. George Thomas and Ereere’s grandson, Herepete Rapihana, married to Ritihia Kaaka (Ngāi Takoto and Te Aupōuri), operated a general store at Pukepoto from the 1880s. Stephen Wrathall and Maria Hinetoto’s sons ran stores and accommodation businesses at Cable Bay and Mangonui. (Figure 27.)

**Figure 26 - Chart of familial relations of the Eastern Network**

While people outside this network operated similar businesses, the Eastern Network is significant because of the dominance of its families in far northern trading over the gum extraction period, and its origins in incorporation of Pākehā into the northern

---

164 Parker, p.226.
tribal structures. Another example of social and economic relationships between European traders and indigenous people has been found in a recent study of Saskatchewan Metis communities, which traces the impact relationships had on the way the Hudson’s Bay Company operated in the fur trade.

Conceivably, the Eastern Network’s business activities permeated tribal structures and stimulated additional businesses, as can be seen in Figure 28. The socially organised informal economy provided a ground for gaining entrepreneurial experience while stimulating the transitional economy. Network members did not restrict themselves to commercial ventures. Successful bridging to the Pākehā system is evidenced in Richard Theophilus Wrathall’s, James Noble Berghan’s and his son Ivan’s chairmanships of Mangonui County Council, and memberships of other local bodies. J. N. Berghan was also a member of the Masonic Lodge.

Common to priestly and trader networks, the familial path can be seen as a kind of ‘chain migration’ into the two different segments of the Pākehā economy. Each network chain also linked to different Pākehā civic structures. The election of members of the House of Representatives indicates a preference for church-based selection (Chapter 3), whereas in local bodies it was the Pākehā-Māori derived network who represented Māori. The distinction indicates alignment of rank with policy-making at national level, and entrepreneurship with implementing policy at county level – a strategic/tactical divide.

165 Another network could be constructed for the Dalmatian/Māori marriages, but this has not been completed for the present writing.
167 On Mangonui County Council, the only councillors of Māori descent came from the early sawyer trader network – James Noble Berghan, Ivan Berghan and Richard Wrathall. Harding Leef was a councillor for Hokianga County Council.
Figure 27 - Map of Eastern Network business activities

NOTEs:
1. Richard & Bill Wrathall are sons of Stephen Wrathall & Maria Hinetoto
2. Thomas Berghan is son of James David Berghan & Ruhihana Ihaka
3. James Berghan is son of James David Berghan & Tunkatuku Ururua
4. Thomas Flavell’s 2nd wife, Elizabeth, was mother of William Butler’s wife.
5. Herepete Rapihana is grandson of George Thomas & Ereere.
6. Joseph & Bill Evans are sons of Michael Evans.

Sources: Neva Clarke McKenna, Mangonui: Gateway to the Far North; Gwynyth Frear, The Snowden Saga; Florence Keene, Kaitaia & Its People; Keith Parker, Kaitaia: Portraits from the Past, 1900-1939.
Figure 28 - Map of Māori involvement in businesses

**Notes:**
1. Richard & Bill Wrathall are sons of Stephen Wrathall & Maria Hinetoto
2. Thomas Berghan is son of James David Berghan & Ruhihana Ihaka
3. James Berghan is son of James David Berghan & Turikatuku Ururoa
4. Herepete Rapihana is grandson of George Thomas & Ereere.

The relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy was affected by how Pākehā related to one another within that economy. Time-consuming though it is, finding evidence of familial connections between people participating in a commercial network is easier than for other social connections. It could be possible to interrogate school attendance, lodge membership and other lists, and still not have a comprehensive picture of voluntary associations. One interesting source was a photograph album presented to Joseph Evans at an ‘invitation-only’ banquet in 1904, on the occasion of his impending trip to England. The inscription recognised ‘the many benefits your commercial career in our midst has conferred upon these districts’.168 Invitees contributed photographs of themselves. As Joseph Evans was considered to be the ‘Gum King of the far north’, the album loosely represents his gum-trading social and commercial network. The album contains 50 photographs,169 all except two of which were named.

Of the 48 named photographs, five were of members of the immediate Evans family, and four were of other members of the Eastern Network – Sam Yates (deceased), C. Yates, H. Reid, and John Reid. Only two people were of wholly Māori descent – Mr Job (Hopa) and Riapo Puhipi.170 One other of Māori and Pākehā descent was Wiremu Hobson (Hopihana). Three missionary descendants were represented but all from one family (Matthews). Notable for their lone representation was the Subritzky family, and for their absence were the Berghans. Both were significant gum traders, but might have been in conflict or competition with the Evans. Absent altogether was any Dalmatian representation. The Subritzkys were not part of the Eastern Network, in

168 Photograph album, A68, Far North Regional Museum, Kaitaia, 1909.
169 Of individuals, couples or other combinations.
170 In 1880 Riapo married Miss Hardiman (AJHR 1880 G4), a descendant of two early Hokianga traders, Robert Hardiman and Frederick Maning, who had both married local Māori women. George Harding (Robert’s son) married Maning’s daughter.
that they established themselves first at Houhora rather than Mangonui. Although they were operating on the Aupōuri peninsula with Evans and Yates, and did ship a lot of gum for both, there does not appear to have been the degree of co-operation that there was between Evans and Yates. The first marriage between the Evans and Subritzky families did not occur until the 1920s. The Berghans set up their businesses in Kaitaia and Ahipara and appear to have had little commercial interchange with the Evans’ family businesses, although there was an early marriage.

Gum-trading, store-keeping and hospitality were not the only businesses carried on by members of the Eastern Network; like others they diversified. By the 1920s, the two main bullock teams that plied the later Ahipara fields were those of Nopera Arano (Noble Allen) and Ralph Berghan.

**Roads and rates**

Carriage was by bullock drays until the second decade of the twentieth century. The 1893 Gum Commission reported that Māori were hauling large loads with their bullock teams.

In the Maori parts of the district, the surface of the ground which is supposed to indicate a line of road is reduced to a state scarcely describable, but the use of bullock drays, which, in proportion as they destroy the roads, require the services of a more numerous team of bullocks, and by this means the mischief is continually augmented.

---

171 In Chapter 3 the closeness was likened to a duopoly. Charles W. Ablett to Under Secretary, Native Department, February 1908, ACIH 16036 MA1/1 1906/1009, ANZW; Stokes, p.198.
172 Personal communication Bruce Berghan (son of Ralph), June 2005.
174 AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.5.
Northland’s tracks in Māori-owned-and-occupied areas had deteriorated to an extent that ‘render[ed] nugatory any prospect for future settlement which the North might otherwise have’, inciting the Bay of Islands County Council to pass a resolution:

That this county suffers beyond any other County inasmuch as most of the gum traffic is carried on in wagons drawn by bullocks owned by Maoris. Six wagons with ten bullocks in each may often be seen in one train. Sometimes the number amounts to ten wagons. As the Natives do not pay rates, and have no interest in the County property …

It is unsurprising then that the Commission suggested rating of Native lands on the basis that:

---

175 ibid.
176 Copy of resolution passed unanimously by the Bay of Islands County Council, 9 January 1893, App D (11), IA 104 /2, ANZW.
it is impossible for any one to travel in the winter through those parts of the country – usually the best parts – which are in the hands of the Maoris, without feeling a strong conviction that it is very unfair that they should contribute nothing to the maintenance of those roads which their owners have had so large a share in destroying, whilst the burden is left to fall upon the scanty and inadequate rates extracted from a few scattered and struggling settlers.\footnote{AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.5.}

Money, taxes and gum were inextricably interwoven, but the priority for application of tax money was to build main roads ‘from Warkworth to Awanui, with branches … wherever most required’,\footnote{ibid., p.6.} such roads not being coincident with the gum tracks serving the mainly outlying Māori communities. Their remoteness and ‘underdevelopment’ affected how Māori were able to relate to the Pākehā economy.

**Housing and education**

When Matire Kereama referred to a free and easy life on the gumfields, she wrote about childhood memories, which might not reflect adults’ concerns of the time. She described living arrangements for their three-month winter camp at Whangape and those of the gumfields. For the winter camp:

> Houses of nikau palms placed closely together and warmly lined with hanging mats … to these, fire places with chimneys were added. Timber was cut in long and short lengths and placed closely together to hold the mangemange mattress. … flax mats were usually placed on the mangemange mattresses and special white mats were laid over the earth floor of the huts.\footnote{Kereama (Hoeft), pp.37-8.}

And on the gumfields at Waiharara:

> … each family found a new camping site, building their houses out of tents and other materials supplied by the Pakeha storekeepers. Building those houses was certainly fast work and lots of fun. By nightfall a brand new tent and sack village was in full bloom.\footnote{ibid., p.28.}
While these huts, shacks and shanty towns might seem rudimentary, they need to be seen within the context of the times and experiences of their occupants. In the first decades of the twentieth century, frame and corrugated-iron shacks gradually replaced the thatch and sack shanties that were once typical, indicating that diggers were taking a slightly longer-term view of their occupation, albeit that it would remain nomadic. Sites were selected carefully for access to the digging locations and the storekeeper and also for availability of fresh water and manuka for firewood, tent poles and windbreaks.\textsuperscript{181} Comfortable wooden cottages started to appear at Houhora, Waihopo and Waiharara.\textsuperscript{182} Small settlements of Pākehā families evolved out of some of the better-sited transitory camps, but settlements were few and far between; more isolated camp-sites were the norm, although standards varied. The Pākehā settlement process contrasts with the Māori pattern of moving to gumfield camps from older established papakainga.

Rev. Kahi Harawira’s (Te Aupōuri) experience before World War One was that:

\begin{quotation}
    The whole tribe moved together from one camp to another always to be handy to some good digging. It was a hard life but free. I
\end{quotation}

\textsuperscript{181} Smith, ‘Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry’, p.73.
\textsuperscript{182} The Mangonui Times, 2 January 1906, p. 3, cit. ibid., p.129.
suppose we were the poorest tribe in the country, but I believe it was our making, we had to maintain a certain standard of ethics. … The houses (or shacks I suppose they should be called) were made with sacks all round, galvanised iron on top and earth chimneys, and they were always spotlessly clean. Some of them used newspapers or ‘Weekly News’ pictures to paper the walls inside. … At one time we moved about so often that we were like the children of Israel on the desert. All this time of course the school went on at Te Kao, and wherever we were camped, the children went from there to school, sometimes we walked, sometimes we rode. During the winter months we used to leave for school before daylight, and arrive back after dark…

I am still amazed now that there was very little drunkenness [sic] in those days. There were special occasions of course, but not the systematic drinking of today. I often think too that we as a tribe were brought up the hard way, we had to work hard or sink, why not take advantage of the lessons we learned when we were nomads?183

Very young infants were taken to the gumfields where their mothers worked; some were born there. Rev. Herepo Harawira was one of these.

… in the desolate spot known as Ngataki … I was born [in] 1899. It was a place hardly fit for human habitation. Along the banks of [the] stream [running from a swamp] were the temporary camping grounds of my people … this was a district rich in kauri gum deposits. The whole area was almost roadless, and unless lucky enough to own a horse, everyone had to walk miles for their stores or for any form of communication with other people. … If it hadn’t been for the gumfields, my parents would have had a struggle to support us all.

I struggled through the lower classes. This no doubt due to the fact that my parents, like most others in the district, followed a nomadic life in search of kauri gum, which provided a good livelihood in those days. With my brothers and sisters, I would have to walk anything from four to ten miles each way to and from school – according to where we were camped at the time. There were no roads worth mentioning, only tracks over the gumfields. In adverse weather, wet clothes were a great problem … Our school lunches were meagre and could be anything. Sometimes we would gather some shellfish and watercress from the creek, or pick a few tiny mingimingi berries to take the edge of our hunger. Sometimes we had no lunch at all.

183 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.46.
My progress through the standards was slow, and I often just managed to scrape through my exams. This was mainly due to the long distances from where we lived to school.184

The standard of education achieved by Māori influenced how they could relate to the Pākehā economy. Gumfield living erected barriers to obtaining the standard of education available in established settlements. This had been a problem in 1879 when gumdigging had yet to see its richest times. Many Māori who had been resigned to a life of poverty and toil on the gumfields wanted more for their children. Te Rarawa chief Puhipi had informed the Inspector of Schools:

We wish to have our children taught Europeans works to enable them to get money. We do not care to send them to Auckland, lest they turn out like those children we sent to Auckland to school there, who returned to the village without obtaining Government employment. We greatly desire the work of schools, but it is only a waste of education, they go back again to dig Kauri gum, the only work for them. What is the good?185

Between 1890 and 1910, at least another ten Native schools had been built,186 but Puhipi had wanted a higher school along with the promise of government employment for suitably qualified applicants. He recognised the cultural value of education and its place in social capital formation. He had threatened to close schools, while in other parts of the district parents had simply withdrawn their children from school without engaging in correspondence.187 Thirty years on, education and employment prospects for gumfields’ Māori children were worse. Apart from what the people could grow or obtain from the sea or the beaches, gumdigging provided the only livelihood for Te Kao and Te Hapua inhabitants.188

184 Florence Keene, Rangatira from Aupouri, Whangarei, 1974, pp.6, 7, 10-11.
185 T. Puhipi to chief of School Inspectors [sic], 25 November 1879, BAFO 10852 3a, ANZA, p.188.
186 Te Kao, 1894; Te Hapua, 1896; Paparore, 1900; Peria, 1899; Parapara, 1894; Taemaro, 1908; Rangiawhiao, 1902; Pawarenga, 1909; Matihetie, 1890; Motuti, 1908 – Native School Reports, ANZA.
187 The police and court records for the period contain multiple references to charges against parents for not sending their children to school.
188 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.25.
The two decades straddling 1900 were the industry’s most intense. Population expansion and the sheer volume of activity pushed the county to its limits – ethnic tensions erupted, and roading suffered without reinvestment. It was a period of further diversification, in ethnic mix of population and gumfield-related activities, both industrial and recreational, formal and informal. The increased activity exported value as well as volume, with gum earnings being repatriated out of the area, and margins being extracted further along the chain by shipping and merchants, what Rosemary Ommer terms ‘theft of linkages’\textsuperscript{189} (Chapter 5).

For Māori, seasonal integration with crop cycles, temporary gum camps associated with more permanent settlements, improvements in camp-site dwelling structures, the ‘dancehalls’\textsuperscript{190}, billiard saloons and wineshops gave a (false) sense of permanence and security to the gum way of life. But health and education suffered, and alcohol abuse, gambling and debt enmeshment further diminished quality of life. Some Māori diversified into haulage, storekeeping, hospitality and accommodation businesses. Committed to a better way of life for their children, communities built a number of schools and another five churches between 1890 and 1910.\textsuperscript{191}

1910 onwards: Sunset

In the years leading to World War One, gum volumes and value extracted had started to decline; outbreak of war triggered curtailment of exports, which almost killed the gum industry. UK and German markets closed when shipping lanes were disrupted; the American market was over-supplied. Output also declined as diggers volunteered for war service. The New Zealand government intervened in the industry and changed


\textsuperscript{190} Often no more than a sandstone floor with gumchip fires piled in the corners.

\textsuperscript{191} Okahu, 1895; Pawarenga, 1899; Manukau, 1903; Oruru, 1905; Motukaraka, 1910.
its structure during World War One and the period following, when the country experienced its worst depression. This brought stability and more formality to the industry during what would otherwise have been a vicious and volatile period, and saved the government large sums of money that otherwise would have been paid in unemployment relief. A brief recovery in the industry in 1919 was followed by the final slump. Those who remained in the gum industry did so by choice, albeit that their choice was severely limited.

The government intervened at the start of the war to buy gum at half the pre-war price, with the balance payable when the markets returned. Fortuitously, markets recovered sufficiently for the initiative to break-even after the war. Controversy arose over Dalmatians’ potential monopoly of access to fields, as they were not allowed to join New Zealand troops, being considered technically of Austrian, and therefore alien, nationality. The controversy resulted in the closure of gumfields to them, some being interned and others ascribed drainage work at the same wages as British on similar work, which was less than they could otherwise have earned.  

The government intervened further, in 1916, by becoming involved in the industry as an employer. The state paid diggers wages to face-dig gum reserves, leaving the ground in readiness for conversion to pastureland. Māori who were not serving in the war, predominantly those with families, were amongst those employed as labourers.

Conversion of diggers to waged workers removed the entrepreneurial dimension that had enabled Māori to maintain some independence in their engagement with the Pākehā economy.


European markets resumed steady demand following the war, but America’s recovery was short-lived and smaller. Nevertheless, this brief recovery, accompanied by the introduction of powered washing-machines, sustained a viable contribution from the industry into the post-war depression. The powered machines were less portable, their use was disallowed on gum reserves, and they did not overcome costs of transporting gum soils from the fields. A machine was proposed for Te Kao in 1925, but the scheme was abandoned in favour of a dairying project.

Māori soldiers returning from World War One were not offered any of the rehabilitation assistance available to Pākehā; for most a return to the gumfields remained one of the few options. Herepo Harawira was in that situation.

Soon after the death of my wife [1920], I went gumdigging at Te Kao for nearly three years. It was a most profitable occupation at that time as prices were good. It meant that we always had plenty of money in our pockets – something that we all enjoyed after the many lean years that most of us had experienced in our early days.

The good times were directly attributable to a combination of market return and government intervention without monopoly, the latter having the effect of stabilising the market internally, and to some extent externally, introducing standardisation (quality reliability) and straight dealing with diggers. A tough portfolio of gum, cropping, and cattle enabled an independent existence for some remote families, as exemplified by the life of one young Te Hapua woman, Maro, told by her daughter, Te Kui.

By the year 1920 Maro had had four children, two of whom died as young babies. Te Mutunga [Hotere, her husband] was a man of
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194 Smith, 'Development of the Kauri-Gum Industry', p.143.
196 Keene, Kungata from Aupouri, p.21.
197 Report on the Kauri-Gum Industry, AJHR, 1921, II C-12.
considerable means and therefore a good provider. The planting of his kumara and potato crops and his fishing and gathering of sea and other foods were for family and community consumption. He had annual musters of cattle he had out on ‘the run’ which he sold to visiting buyers. The kauri gum digging industry was at its height at this time. It paid good money. With occasional stints on road works, these activities were the sole source of income for the family … Maro was involved in all these activities except for mustering.

Kauri gum digging was an all-season occupation, slotted in between mustering, the planting and harvesting of crops, and fishing. Gum digging for Maro meant working areas of endless tracts of gum digging land. It was a life of hard slog. Often she stood knee-deep in water to retrieve chunks and pieces of gum in holes she had dug that were three to four feet in diameter and three to four feet deep. She would flush clean what she had collected, and carry it to a nearby clearing to dry over several days. Sieving and sorting into sacks followed in readiness for sale.

Kumara planting was as demanding of Maro. … Fishing … was second nature to her. … Throughout the year Maro did much weaving, using flax, kiekie, kuta, hoihere, pingao, and toetoe. She wove fine mats … many kits annually for harvesting kumara and potato crops and for the endless fishing expeditions …

Maro was an elder of the Ratana church, acted as midwife, undertook other community responsibilities, and died giving birth to her eighteenth child at the age of 37.198

Independent self-reliance appealed to other remote far northern Māori communities. Following her father Heremia’s death in the influenza epidemic of 1918, Whina (Gilbert, later Cooper) and her husband were evicted from Heremia’s house by her brothers, as Heremia had failed to make a will to provide for her following his second marriage. She and her husband lived in a nikau whare on family land at Te Karaka in abject poverty, ‘hardship, misery and total uncertainty about the future’. Whina discovered her own source of income.

I went into the bush near Te Karaka and saw where years before people had been digging for gum, mainly Dalmatians. The holes were there. So I went and got a spade and started to dig near the holes. Well, what a surprise. I struck an enormous piece of gum, it weighed over twenty pounds.

She gave this piece to Father Kreijmborg, the first fruits for the church, and returned to the bush properly equipped. ‘I did that for about a year. It brought in quite a bit of money’. With added borrowings from Kreijmborg, she bought the Whakarapa store.

And then I got into exporting. I bought kauri gum from the Maori and Dalmatian diggers in the Hokianga, and sometimes went further north for it, to Kaitaia and Awanui.\(^{199}\)

On the Karikari peninsula, Wiremu Tomas (Te Aupōuri) was raised by his mother’s brother, Wiremu Hetariki, who was a gum-buyer and storekeeper near Lake Ohia. Wiremu Tomas lived with his uncle and aunt from the age of 1 until after he married Hinerangi Rapihana. They had a family, and were able to buy 300 acres of land, with a house, from the Lake Ohia Flax Company, with money earned from gumdigging and gambling. He left school at 13 to go gumdigging (1929) because ‘they were my home and I loved the gumfields and digging gum with my father and relations. There was hardly any work then anyway, and this way I was my own boss, not digging drains and chopping tea tree for another fulla’. As a worker with few skills that would be rewarded in formal work he preferred to be independent, an option that offered a measure of dignity and autonomy that a formal job might not.

There was a base camp at Werowero with more permanent dwellings made of corrugated iron. Here longer-growing crops of corn, kumara, marrow, pumpkins, watermelons and fruit trees were cultivated. On the parts of the gumfields only

\(^{199}\) King, pp.85-6, 92.
worked in summer when they were drier, smaller gardens were planted with fast-
growing vegetables like tomatoes and cabbages.

Old Heteraki never had any schooling but he did all his own figuring, bookkeeping, gumbuying, and his weights were always accurate. He dug gum now and then but he was usually too busy sorting, buying and carting. He was well liked and everyone thought he was a good man and a fair gumbuyer. But he was an ‘aroha’ fulla and sometimes he’d give people more for their gum than it was worth and then Aunty would get angry with him.\textsuperscript{200}

The good times were short. Some storekeepers changed their businesses; there were seven bankruptcies including one Mäori; others simply faded away.\textsuperscript{201} Activity persisted through to the Second World War, but fewer people were involved in the industry. Even so, when hilltops were bulldozed to form a new aerodrome during World War Two, Mäori women followed behind the heavy machinery gathering gum that surfaced.\textsuperscript{202}

The 1914-25 period was a particularly low time for Te Aupōuri people at Te Kao and Te Hapua. Many of their young men had volunteered for World War One; many more people had died in the influenza pandemic of 1918. Following Ngawini Yates’ death, Te Aupōuri lands that had been leased to the Yates family fell into the hands of unscrupulous traders. Te Hapua’s respected Native School teacher reported:

The Hapua people can dig in their papakainga in the summer time, but this is not possible in the winter, as the ground for the most part is under water, consequently they have either to dig on the leased ground or starve. The estate was originally held by the Yates family, who sold to Mr. R. Keene, of Wellington, who in turn sold part of the freehold and all the leasehold to the Parenga Gum Coy. … During last year there was a change in the gum Coy. and Mr. C. E. Keene became the possessor of the store, and apparently manager of the gumfields. After the Coy. started operations here, one of their directors, who was visiting the estate, said that they

\textsuperscript{200} Tomas, ‘Gumfields of Lake Ohia’.
\textsuperscript{201} Bankruptcy Minute Books 1873-1937, BBAE, 5628/9-13; Bankruptcy Registers 1887-1937, BBAE 5639/1a-4a, ANZA. Three speculative companies registered in Wanganui and Wellington in 1920-21 and bought land, but eventually went into voluntary liquidation, two after only four to five years; the Ohia Gum Co lasted until 1939. Te Kao Kauri Gum Co Ltd, CO-W W3445/243; Ahipara Gum Co Ltd, CO-W W3445/236; Ohia Gum Co Ltd, CO-W W3445/245, ANZW.
\textsuperscript{202} Personal communication, Daniel Jones (Ngäi Takoto), June 2005.
would soon have the Maoris off the place and the school closed. The first managers that the Coy. [had] here were fairly tolerant, though they made things fairly stiff for the Maoris, but still they were able to make a living. Since the present management have had charge, it has become impossible for the Maoris to live. Some of them who were digging were sending their gum to the Govt. store and getting a good price for it. Others were selling to Mr. Cheeseman and getting as good a price as could be got from a private buyer. The rule was then made that anyone digging on the ground held by the Company was to pay a royalty of 15% – a rise of 5% over what they had been paying previously, and they were absolutely prohibited from selling to anyone other than the Company’s representative.... That would not have been so bad, but they dropped the price considerably. For a certain class of gum, Mr. Cheeseman has lately been offering – I am told – £2.6.0, a sack. The Maoris report that Mr. Keene has been offering them 8/- for the same gum.  

In 1925 Te Kao Māori were unable to sell even their best-quality gum and they were being officially advised to give up gumdiking.  

Just as British had first entered the industry when gumfields offered a better alternative to other occupations and locations, so they exited when farming offered a better living. A large number of Europeans departed from Hokianga County, but Mangonui retained them. Dalmatians left the country in droves following the end of World War One; by 1921, 71% of those who had arrived in New Zealand between 1896 and 1920 had returned home, although some emigrated again. But staunch to the end, they were also among the last remaining on the fields.  

The 1921 reports of the Kauri Gum Department and the Kauri Gum Industry Commission recommended further regulation and, for the first time, funded research. It was too little, too late for the industry. Paucity of regulation over the industry’s cycle did not result in inefficient extraction of gum, as happened with the massive waste of kauri logging, but  
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206 Sale, p.74. The sole exporters in the 1970s were M. and R. Jurlina at Sweetwater, and Tony Yelash continued his gumland vineyard on the windswept wastelands of Ahipara.
better regulation might have limited the degradation of already poor gumlands. Instead, while the far north’s dairy industry was starting, Māori land lay undeveloped and the only source of income for those in remote areas was gumdigging, until money started to be made available for development in 1924.207 When Māori were at last enabled to develop their lands, what remained after the gum rush was less in both quantity and quality. Māori lost quantities of land through gum trading and Land Court debts, they lost land quality through gumdigging – potholing, burning, leaching and sand drift.

Māori had a distinctive relationship to the gum industry, both phenomenologically and ideologically. Māori were first to work the gumfields by surface gathering and prising from branches and roots of kauri trees. Only when prices rose, and the volume of demand exceeded gum available by surface gathering, did numbers of other people come to the fields.

Gum was contained within ancestral land, which the Crown had been progressively buying or taking from Māori since the 1840s. If Māori had vacated these lands (often they were unaware that the land had been ‘sold’, and even if they were aware, they continued to live there without hindrance), they usually moved to a community close by. In contrast, Dalmatians came from the other side of the globe specifically to the gumfields. Other nationalities participated as they did in gold rushes. Some far northern Māori men went to the goldfields in Thames, in contrast to whole families to the gumfields. Although far northern Māori moved temporarily from their papakainga to the gumfields, they were still on ancestral lands. The use of a papakainga base and gumfield camp was not a departure from tradition; Māori were

207 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.41.
seasonally mobile in pre- and immediately post-contact times over the same area. The ‘base and camp’ arrangement was not distinctive of Māori. What was distinctive was that the papakainga pre-dated the gumfields, whereas Pākehā gum settlements post-dated, and were a consequential development from gum camps, and were deserted when the industry declined.

Māori worked as families and communally. Women and children carried out the same type of work as men, but some functions were allocated according to comparative competence. Older women cared for the youngest children, or babies might be pikaued on their mothers’ backs or cradled in hollowed-out earth near the diggings.

The older or less physically able attended to washing and scraping gum. By comparison, British settlers often worked the gumfields part-time, leaving families at home and returning when required for farm work. Dalmatians worked the fields as single men, or married men who left wives and families in their homeland initially. They worked as efficient teams comprising members of family and their home community.

The standard of education Māori received distinguished them adversely from others their own age seeking employment as young adults. Māori children living on

Figure 31 - Gum scraping, c 1910

Northwood, photographer, ATL 1/1-006278.
gumfields missed school, if too far away to attend; or attended irregularly, due to ill health, economic necessity to contribute to gum collection, or truancy. They often travelled large distances with little food, thus diminishing their attention and learning abilities.

Māori did not keep to themselves; they engaged with Pākehā and Tarara on the gumfields. Local knowledge of ancestral lands was shared generously with newcomers, whether Māori, Pākehā or Tarara. While dance halls, wine bars and billiard saloons were set up on the gumlands, and drunkenness and orgies have been reported on some, I have not found evidence of the prostitution that was legendary on goldfields. Tensions did arise over the interests of Dalmatian men in Māori women.

Marriage alliances were forged between Māori (usually women) and British or Dalmatian, either against parental wishes, with their blessing or with a degree of compulsion: the latter where hapū sought to incorporate economic advantages as kin-based social capital. The Eastern Network illustrates how social relationships influenced the type of economic activity in which people engaged. While one example of Māori association with Dalmatian wine-making was demonstrably unsuccessful in facilitating ongoing Māori involvement in the wine industry, Māori-Dalmatian alcohol trading demonstrated collaboration in the illegal sector of the informal economy.

Māori were concentrated in the exposed first (digging) and the second (cartage) links of the value chain – the less formal part of the economy. This could have reinforced perception of them as unskilled labourers, even though they worked independently. While there were many Pākehā diggers, the functions of buyers, storekeepers, shippers and merchants and other auxiliary businesses were predominantly, but not
exclusively, Pākehā; there were some Māori and Dalmatian storekeepers and gum-traders.

Whereas Pākehā settlers generally worked the gumfields part-time through the winter to reinvest proceeds in farm development during the industry's peak, much Māori farm development started later, as the gum industry was tailing off. Some Māori used earnings from gum to improve longer-term earning prospects – with bullock teams, individual farms, stores, schools – but in the early periods they tended to use gum proceeds as subsistence income, to pay debts associated with land, and to contribute to community needs and facilities. Even individually-owned and managed stores and bullock teams were often worked for community benefit. Nevertheless, what was informally earned was spent in the formal economy. Dalmatians usually took or sent gum earnings home to family, or invested in farms or other commercial enterprises.

Māori stayed in the region longer than others because the far north was their ancestral home and they were less willing to move. They were, thus, less able or willing to relocate themselves or their economic activity outside the jurisdiction of the regulated economy. On ancestral land, they were better able to support themselves with a mix of formal and informal economic activity. Māori stayed in the industry because of the attachment to land combined with several other reasons: they could retain a sense of independence and dignity compared with labouring, or earning potential was greater than in alternative employment, or alternatives were scarce and unemployment relief was not available.
Conclusions

On first contact there was a deceptive commonality between European and Māori ‘border’ trade practices, which led each to assume that their own systems and protocols would hold sway. At the border, exchange was reasonably straightforward and efficient. In the period 1769-1840, as Schaniel argued, ‘European technology and relations with Europeans were valued and integrated into Maori society within the context of traditional rules’.  

As settled trade developed beyond 1840, the two economic systems came into closer encounter and collided on the protocol front between gift, barter and moneyed exchanges, and redistribution systems. Whereas sheer volume, availability and centralised control of British troops suppressed Māori resistance to institution of effective imperial control, volume, availability and centralised control of money overcame attempts by Māori to maintain the social capital basis of their economic exchanges with Pākehā. Political co-operation and resistance were mirrored in the economic relationship. Although, on the surface, Māori strategies for dealing with money appear to have been less effective than their strategies of warfare and adoption of the musket, in the end, Māori were disarmed. However, in the far north at least, they retained an economic presence. The armed resistance to the imposition of dog tax, although an apparent victory for Pākehā, had an ameliorating effect for northern Māori. Some accommodation and negotiation with Pākehā institutions was effective in dealing with dissatisfaction over the redistributive effects of taxes and rates.

Some far northern Māori engaged with the Pākehā economy by diversifying into Pākehā-style businesses, which could also be seen as adaptations of traditional
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practices like transport, storekeeping and hospitality. Where engagement was facilitated by the strategy of incorporating Pākehā into hapū by marriage, the results were mixed between sharing with hapū and individuation. Many sought a middle ground that incorporated benefits but retained most-valued traditions, although opinions varied within and between hapū; incorporation of gum into the traditional lifestyle through seasonal working is one example. A portfolio of formal and informal (ranging through household, voluntary and small-scale entrepreneurial, irregular and illegal) economic activity typified the hybridising strategy.

Requirements to pay taxes in money, and central control over the availability of money to Māori, impelled the focus of their economic activities to the few sources of money in the north: gum and land sales. The far north was too far removed from a sizeable market to sell agricultural produce, the local market was small and increasingly self-sufficient, and local exchanges had been by gift or barter, rather than by money. The gum industry straddled the informal and formal economies, practically and chronologically. By the end of the industry’s cycle, a monetary economy had been established, as well as a higher degree of dependence on the Pākehā economy than had been the case at the start.209 As gum and taxes monetised the economy, the shadow economy became differentiated both as the continuation of rural sustenance and as a form of resistance to regulation (particularly of transport, birding, fishing, alcohol and gambling).

The gum industry masked the economic effects of land alienation, which might otherwise have been evident earlier. But even if unmasked, would the outcome have
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209 Increased dependence was in part due to changing uses. For example, European clothing replaced traditional clothing in mid-1840s; metal fish hooks and implements replaced shell and wooden tools; but flax kits and ropes continued in use and were adopted by Pākehā through to the end of the study period. Harry Hawthorn, *Whatawhiwhi Sketches*, Vancouver, 1991.
been any different, or was gum simply one of the ‘tools of choice’ to facilitate land alienation? It is evident from the various official Kauri Gum Industry reports that the government’s principal interest in the industry was as a means of funding colonisation – building roads, attracting settlers, smoothing economic cycles by absorbing the unemployed. Mentions of Māori in government-commissioned reports are scant and derogatory, despite their comprising a substantial proportion of diggers throughout the industry’s cycle. This suggests that the primary relevance of Māori involvement in the gum industry was wealth transfer to the colonisation process. A northern settler acknowledges more.

The presence of these hospitable people must have been of great advantage to the vanguard of gum diggers, their local knowledge, their ability to live off the land, and above all their acceptance of strangers roaming at will over ancestral lands was undoubtedly a major contribution to the establishment and development of the industry. 210

Māori involvement in the gum industry was distinctive; their presence was the alpha and omega. Initially, they engaged enthusiastically because it was a source of cash that was independent from the local settler economic conditions. Secondly, they thought that they could exercise better control over their engagement with the Pākehā economy as independent entrepreneurs than as waged workers, thereby maintaining equal standing. Thirdly, the net outputs of their engagement were some community facilities, but more substantially their gum proceeds funded a substantial portion of the survey and land registration process of European settlement of this remote district. Payment of rates and taxes, without proportionate and reciprocal receipt of infrastructure and services, subsidised European settlement.

As much as Māori had a distinctive relationship with gum, the industry had a distinctive impact on their economic engagement. It heralded the start of an incomplete move from gift-exchange to money, from relationship- to market-based economy, from independent, self-employed entrepreneurs to labourers, and from informality to more formalised economic engagement. Gumdigging, as an occupation, ran the gamut. 1840-60 surface-gathering and trading was unregulated, unrecorded and non-monetary (informal). Volume increases post-1860 differentiated trade on the basis of scale as more formal in character, and merchants recorded volumes and values of transactions. Licensing and its avoidance differentiated digging, on the basis of legality, as informal or irregular sector activity. Breaches of laws forbidding Dalmatians digging Crown land resulted in illegal digging, which could be legalised if Dalmatians became naturalised.

It could be argued that Māori had been assimilated into the Pākehā economy by the end of the gum industry, albeit at its lower echelons of unskilled labour, with some exceptions in storekeeping, transport and hospitality. The opposite, that gum and money had been incorporated into the Māori economy, would be true if gum and money were not the substantial base. As long as Māori remained on their land, maintained their hapū connections, and a degree of economic independence, it could be said that gum and money had been incorporated into the Māori economy rather than Māori being incorporated into the Pākehā economy. In actuality there was a continuum. Some Māori assimilated, by choice or impulsion; remote, better-resourced hapū retained a traditional economic base, to a modified extent. Between these two poles the two types of economic base melded, as Chapter 5 shows.
Chapter 5 – Blessing or curse?

The natural resource economy and World War I

To some economic historians, institutions explain nearly everything about a country’s economic development. However, I concur with some critics that the role of geography, resource endowments and social relations should not be underestimated.¹ The far north had natural resource wealth, although sustenance was hard earned. Flax, timber, whaling and agriculture had dominated Māori engagement with the early Pākehā economy in the far north. Whaling declined from the 1840s, flax exports peaked in the 1870s and timber in the 1880s. The new extractive industry, gum, eclipsed all others 1860-1914. The First World War marked a shift in the region’s economy. As the gum industry faded, dairying emerged as the far north’s economic ‘saviour’ from its origins in pastoral farming and a long tradition of agricultural land use.

Chapter 3 was concerned with changing institutional arrangements in Aotearoa New Zealand. Chapter 4 dealt with changes to the exchange basis of the economy by examining the gum industry’s part in the monetisation process. It noted that despite the high value of exports of this natural resource over a protracted period of time, the far north, and Māori in particular, did not appear to benefit economically as might

have been expected. Such an outcome was not peculiar to New Zealand. In the last decade, economic historians have devoted attention to what has come to be termed ‘Dutch disease’, or the ‘curse of natural resources’, in an effort to understand why resource endowment does not necessarily lead to economic growth; often, in fact, the reverse is the case. Generally, extractive industries tend to lead to neglect (‘crowding out’) of such aspects as roading and education, while sustainable industries rely on efficient infrastructure. Hence, Chapter 5 considers changes to the natural resource-based part of the economy; and finally Chapter 6 will consider new institutional arrangements, and whether or not a rural Māori renaissance occurred in the north.

Māori accommodated, resisted and adapted to changes in the ways natural resources were used, exhibiting a broad range of responses to Pākehā demands. By participating in the increasing scale of extraction, they became involved in destruction of traditional food and other resources. New Zealand’s move from being a net importer to a net exporter reflected the transition from extractive to renewable resource use, enabled by access to Britain’s meat and dairy markets by means of refrigerated shipping. Gary Hawke suggested that refrigeration caused a form of Dutch disease as it narrowed the product and market mix and squeezed the available resource base.

The long depression (stagnation) of the 1880s and 1890s was New Zealand’s period of transition. Like Taranaki, Waikato, and other parts of Northland, the far north sustained a combination farming system of meat and dairying between 1900 and 1920. Within these two decades, World War One stands almost as an hiatus between meat farming and the dominance of dairying. Dairy factories had been built at the
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beginning of the century, but roading and transport improvements after the war facilitated expansion of suppliers. The industry serviced Britain’s increased demands, following that nation’s altered position of global power after World War One.

The phenomenon Belich described for New Zealand in the 1880s to 1920s – secondary industry gradually disentangling itself from its key partner, the progress industry, and entwining with the protein industry – is also observable in the far north. The changes took place in a context of a second industrial revolution, represented by energy changes from coal and horsepower to oil fuel and electricity, and were accompanied by changes in the far northern Māori population from shrinking to expanding. Although population recovery is generally attributed to developing immunity to introduced diseases and advances in public health measures, pastoral farming and energy efficiency changes might also have contributed. Energy enhancements could have compensated for reduced numbers of workers. Nutrition, health and immunity would have improved where efforts were applied to renewable land use (for example, sheep farming) rather than extractive industries, and workers consumed some production.

The popular writer Gordon Mclaughlan argued that Māori ‘were subsistence farmers because they had a narrow range of crops available, no draught animals, limited access to meat, a Stone Age wood-dominated technology and limitations of storage. To gather or produce too much food was to waste the effort.’ Mclaughlan stated that:

Subsistence farming means producing what you need, what you can use. Modern commentators so often qualify the term with ‘only what you need’, suggesting an ethical stance, a choice of abstinence an exacting morality of self-denial for some higher good.
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Or subsistence farming may imply a way of life made fragile by stupidity, a dull day-by-day grappling with the skinny spectre of death from starvation.  

The term ‘subsistence’, often used to refer to the pre-contact Māori economy, is misleading. Māori did produce more than they needed in order to offer generous hospitality to manuhiri (visitors), to exchange with others for items they lacked, to build canoes and pa, and fight wars. I shall therefore use the term ‘sustenance living’ to distinguish a planned system (of cultivation, trading and storage for off-seasons) from ‘subsistence’, which implies a meagre hand-to-mouth existence. Likewise, specific meanings have been attributed to the terms horticulture, agriculture, and agricultural and pastoral farming to differentiate each along a continuum of scale and capital intensity or technological complexity. The continuum has been used historically as an indicator of ‘progress’ towards ‘civilization’ in the course of colonisation; that is not its intended use here.

Although literature on the connection between natural resource abundance and economic activity has concentrated on the oil and gas industries, W. M. Corden argued that the analytical approach can also illuminate many historical episodes of sectoral booms, including the effect of Australia’s 1850s gold discoveries on its other industries. Indeed, John Elliott Cairnes’ 1859 article is remarkably perceptive. If
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7 Horticulture refers to the practice that pays attention to individual plants in their propagation, cultivation and harvest; this is also referred to as gardening. Instruments used would be the handheld instruments such as digging and cultivation sticks, spade, fork and hoe. Agriculture is differentiated as a practice of dealing with large numbers of the same plants en masse, such as cereals and grains, or vegetables grown in bulk (referred to as market gardening). Horse- or tractor-drawn ploughs are employed for this scale. Agricultural farming refers to larger scale whole farms devoted to growing crops, typically grain such as wheat, either for further processing into flour or for feeding to livestock and domestic birds; technology expands to combine harvesters. Pastoral farming is the conversion of farmland to pasture exclusively for feeding livestock for meat, dairy products and wool production (beef, dairy and sheep farming). Helen Leach, *1,000 Years of Gardening in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1984, p.6.

paralleled with the gum industry, the theory offers a more comprehensive explanation than either of the oppositional views posited in the Muriwhenua land claim – that either Māori gave up horticulture because they could make more money from gum, or that they had to dig gum because they had lost land.  

There is not a universal theory of the ‘curse of natural resources’. To the extent that Dutch disease resembles ‘failed staples’, the ‘curse of natural resources’ can be seen as an extension of staples theory. R. M. Auty’s explanation points to political processes being captured so that the predatory state eclipses the developmental state. In one extreme, where natural resource rents are concentrated and easily appropriable, government officials can be tempted into rent-seeking and possible corruption rather than pro-growth activities; lower innovation, lower entrepreneurial activity, poorer governments and lower growth result. Natural resource abundance can also crowd out other entrepreneurial activity or innovation if earnings from natural resources rise high enough to encourage potential innovators and entrepreneurs to work in the resource sector. Additionally, education might be neglected because earnings from the resource boom match or exceed any premium from education, thus human capital accretion suffers.

The effects of political processes’ capture are a persistent theme in Waitangi Tribunal and some forest history literature, which describes progressive outlawing of traditional methods of resource use in favour of arrangements that benefited European
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settlement and settlers. This theme is consistent with Stuart Banner’s analysis of the legal structuring of the market in Māori land, which resulted in wealth transfer from Māori to Pākehā (Chapter 3). Similarly, the education of Māori children working on gumfields was adversely affected, although the reasons were more far-reaching than neglect or whether or not education earned a premium.

Countering the explanatory focus of the literature, Jean-Philippe Stijns argued that some countries’ economic growth did benefit from natural resource abundance, and ‘curse’ or ‘blessing’ depended critically on the nature of the learning process involved. That Cairnes was writing about the Australian gold rushes’ impact on its economy contemporaneously with the start of the kauri gum boom is a strong indicator that New Zealand’s government was well placed to have learned from Australia’s experiences.

Stijns’ is not the only counter-argument. Staples theory, as first developed by Harold Innes, and its development and criticisms concentrate on economies that rely on natural resource exploitation to generate economic growth in the producing region. Its concepts of forward (for example, financial), backward (for example, transport) and final demand linkages help explain not only the region’s economic growth (or lack), but also opportunities that were potentially available for Māori to participate in that growth. As we will see, far northern Māori were active transporters in the medium-linkage-level timber industry and high-level gum industry, their activity diminishing

---

13 Banner.
in high-linkage-level dairying. Rosemary Ommer’s contribution of the concept of mercantile theft of linkages further explains how value from resources was diverted away from resource regions and workers, as happened in the gum industry.\textsuperscript{16} Space does not permit further exploration of these various theories but they serve to caution against hasty conclusions that would oversimplify an analysis of historical data. Conversely, ‘theoretical over-determination can rob nations, regions, and localities of their true histories’\textsuperscript{17} Both the general and the particular require attention.

**Changes to traditional resource use**

Extensive and convoluted coastlines, forming the ‘much-bitten tail of Maui’s fish’, had always provided a balance of sustenance with the land; a balance that varied with seasons, climate, fertility of soils, fish and shellfish stocks. Seafood was also traded between coastal and inland inhabitants. Māori did not object to access to beaches and sea by non-Māori provided their use did not interfere with Māori fishing activities, but up to and beyond 1840 non-Māori lived on Māori terms and Māori considered that they retained authority over the seas\textsuperscript{18}

Far northern Māori became involved in European whaling operations in the late eighteenth century as crew on whaling vessels and, in a second phase, as owners and operators of their own whaling boats\textsuperscript{19} Mangonui was used to rest crews and replenish provisions from Māori traders, but it was not a whaling station. Māori pilots guided ships to safe anchorage there for a pilotage fee. Crews were recruited at Mangonui to replace deserters and those who had died on the voyage to New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{16} Ommer, p.198.
\textsuperscript{17} Christopher Lloyd and Jacob Metzer, ‘Settler Colonization and Societies in History: Patterns and Concepts’, paper presented at the IVth International Economic History Congress, Helsinki, 21-25 August 2006, p.27.
\textsuperscript{18} *Muriwhenua Fishing*, p.201.
\textsuperscript{19} Information about whaling was sourced from ibid., pp.58-61.
Zealand. Although the conditions for prostitution existed at Mangonui, as they did in the Bay of Islands, I have found no evidence of prostitution before or in the study period. From 1840 William Butler had been authorised to act as magistrate to control the behaviour of whaling crews in port and to apprehend deserters. He had also been appointed Surveyor General of Mangonui and chaplain by Hobson, who had been alarmed that a dissenting minister was holding church services there. In 1848, Butler took pains to assure masters of whaling vessels:

There are no grog sellers in the place and no fears need be entertained of the crews leaving vessels. This being the Headquarters of the Police for the district of north Auckland, a Superintendent with detachment is always on the spot to prevent desertion of crews and other irregularities.

However, there were deserters and a bounty to be earned (usually by Māori scouts) for their capture and return. Hotels selling alcohol were built, ships using Mangonui increased, and ‘other irregularities’ would have become less controllable.

As whaling started to decline from the 1840s, Māori came to dominate in the far north by establishing shore-based whale processing plants at several places, including Hokianga, Te Oneroa-a-Tohe, Parengarenga, Manawatawhi (Three Kings Islands), Karikari peninsula, and Whangaroa. Although the extent of boat ownership cannot be ascertained, due to paucity of data, it is apparent that Māori ownership of sizeable craft was not uncommon in the 1850s. In 1885 the resident magistrate for
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21 As for all forms of informal economic activity, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.
22 Mogford, p.7.
23 *The Southern Cross*, 7 October 1848; Mogford, p.19. Butler might have been referring to the inner harbour, where his store was located, rather than the main port, because William Bertram White referred to ‘a sort of grog shop’ being kept by Thomas Flavell at Mangonui in 1848. However, distinction between the two sides of the harbour seems unlikely given the reference to Police Headquarters, which were at the main port.
24 In 1856, William Puckey recorded having taken passage on a small vessel of 10 tons sailed by natives. When it capsized he and the crew were rescued by another boat within 20 minutes. WGP, L&J, p.344.
Mangonui reported ‘Whaling is carried on with great enthusiasm … The equipment of the several boats is very complete, and must entail considerable expense.’

**Figure 32 - Whalers at Te Arai nr Maunganui Bluff, Te Oneroa-a-Tohe**

Records show Māori conducted whaling operations into the 1890s, with last efforts as late as 1940. The whaling activities of Māori, described here, indicate a desire to secure trade and to establish their own businesses. The decline of the whaling industry after the 1840s, combined with market reduction following the relocation of the seat of government to Auckland, also led a return to traditional fishing in the far north. These traditions included large-scale, multi-community shark fishing in the Raunganu Harbour, which was reported as active in 1855 and 1875, but much
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25 H. W. Bishop to Native Under Secretary, Resident Magistrates' Reports, AJHR, 1885, G-2, p.3.
26 Captain J. Thoms, of mixed Maori and Pākehā parentage, whose enterprise continued into the 1890s, led considerable Maori whaling activity in the region.
diminished after 1885. It had largely ceased by 1910,\textsuperscript{27} probably crowded out by the
gum, timber and other introduced industries.

\textbf{Figure 33 - Staff of Toheroa Canning Factory, Awanui, ca 1930s}

Mäori did not immediately adopt European fishing technology, as they had with
whaling; they regarded their own to be superior. Before 1840 foreigners dominated
whaling, but there was no non-Mäori commercial fishing in the far north.\textsuperscript{28} Some
Mäori levied fees for commercial fishing and access to harbours up until at least
1879. Rights to levy fees were contested between Mäori and Päkehä following the
Treaty of Waitangi, the contestation fuelling the 1845 war of the north. Despite the
introduction of a succession of fish laws from the 1860s,\textsuperscript{29} far northern Mäori
continued to dominate fishing for the remainder of the nineteenth century, supplying
as well as working in mullet and toheroa canning factories at Unahi, Rangiputa,

\textsuperscript{27} Address of R. H. Matthews given to the Auckland Institute in 1910 (\textit{Transactions and Proceedings
of the New Zealand Institute} 43, 598) quoted at length in \textit{Muriwhenua Fishing}, pp.68-74.
\textsuperscript{28} Whaling is not technically fishing because whales are mammals rather than fish.
\textsuperscript{29} Starting with the Oyster Fisheries Act, 1866.
Awanui, and Houhora from the 1870s. However, the efficiency of their nets was sufficient to induce the government to introduce regulations based on non-Māori mesh sizes,\textsuperscript{30} which effectively outlawed Māori nets and redistributed the balance of commercial mullet fishing to non-Māori.\textsuperscript{31} This restructuring of the market is an example of the principle underlying wealth transfer, which has been discussed in Chapter 4.

Fishing boats were required to be registered under The Sea Fisheries Act 1894 and The Fisheries Act 1908. Until 1929, boats registered in the far north by Māori and Pākehā maintained rough equality, at 52 and 56 respectively; Dalmatians registered a further five.\textsuperscript{32} Pākehā registrations had increased in the period preceding the First World War, but Māori were more active after the war, possibly due to restricted alternative sources of income and the lack of rehabilitation assistance for returning Māori soldiers.

Boats registered by Māori and Dalmatians were on average 3 feet shorter than those registered by Pākehā. The longest of the Pākehā, Māori and Dalmatian registered boats were 30, 27 and 21 feet respectively. The range of motive power (rowing, sail, oil and sail, oil, petrol) was evenly distributed amongst Pākehā and Māori registrations, but Dalmatians used only sail and rowboats. There was no distinction in use of lines and nets. Amongst Pākehā all boats were registered by individuals, whereas both Māori and Dalmatians registered some joint owners.

All boats registered were based on the east coast between the harbours of Parengarenga in the north and Whangaroa in the south; their owners were mainly

\textsuperscript{30} The Sea Fisheries Act, 1894, introduced 21 December 1896.
\textsuperscript{31} Muriwhenua Fishing, pp.91-4.
\textsuperscript{32} The following analysis is drawn from the Register of Northland Fishing and Oyster Boats, 1904-1955, BAAD 10531/1a (previously A386/260a), ANZA.
from iwi of those areas – Te Aupōuri, Ngāti Kurī, Ngāi Takoto, Ngāti Kahu and Te Paatū. The west coast was more dangerous for boating, and the preferred methods of fishing there would have been shore-based line, net and spear. In-harbour boat-fishing at Herekino, Whangape and Hokianga was probably domestic rather than commercial.

Registrations by Māori and Dalmatians came close to an abrupt halt in 1929. Two men of Pākehā-Māori descent, Richard Wrathall and David Sherman, continued to register their fishing boats annually after 1929. Only Pākehā registered after 1939, including 36 new registrations. In the depressed interwar years it might have been difficult for Māori to maintain the registration fee, and probably costs outweighed benefits. Additionally, Māori landowners were being encouraged to participate in farming schemes. Owners who brought their land under the Native Affairs Department’s schemes were required to apply their energies to the land, and forego fishing. The effects were to divert (crowd out) Māori efforts from their field of competence and local knowledge, thus precluding access to supplementary income during the start-up phase of farming, to remove competition in commercial fishing, and to open the opportunity for Pākehā to dominate that part of the economy.

![Figure 34 - Boat registrations 1904-1928](image)

Source: Register of Northland fishing boats
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33 Register of Northland Fishing and Oyster Boats, 1904-1955, A386/260a now series 10531/1a, ANZA.
34 Matiu and Mutu, p.201.
If Māori and Dalmatians continued commercial fishing after 1929, they would have been participating in the informal economy. No cases of fish sales from unregistered boats appear in the court records over the years immediately following, which is anomalous alongside the many cases brought for a wide range of breaches of other types of regulations. Therefore, unless such activity passed undetected, fishing would have been part of the ‘household’ or ‘informal’ (casual/small scale) sector rather than the ‘irregular’ sector of the informal economy.

Flax

Timber and flax were the earliest items Māori traded. Europeans used timber for ships’ spars, and flax for rope or cordage. The flax industry in the far north extended from the 1760s to the 1950s. The early period was a proving ground for trading relations between Pākehā and Māori, each needing to get used to the products, customs and requirements of the other, which tested their ability and willingness to adapt, adjust and accommodate.

Pre-industrial flax production peaked simultaneously with whalers frequenting Mangonui, and exports peaked in 1873 as a result of demand for the superior products and difficulty in obtaining supply from British traditional sources. Māori had not cultivated flax in plantations as sufficient grew naturally to meet their needs. As European demand increased Māori contested rights to proceeds from ownership of resources as well as rights to trade with Europeans.35 Flax could be propagated either by seed or lateral root budding, but slow growth in the early stages did not justify the work at the prices prevailing in 1891. Also, flax seeds germinated spontaneously where swamps had been drained. The right to cut was contracted by mill-owners for
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a royalty paid on finished produce. Work was mostly let by contract and accomplished by Māori labour carried out by family groups.\textsuperscript{36} It was the task of a hapū chief to negotiate and arrange contracts, because the production of such large quantities as Europeans demanded required the combined efforts of the hapū, which only the chief could direct. To him also fell the task of redistributing the proceeds.\textsuperscript{37}

Mangonui Māori hand-dressed flax until 1860, and were operating a mill south of the village by 1869. For one musket, a ton of dressed flax brought £18-£25 in England.\textsuperscript{38} Māori who chose to participate in these new forms and scales of trade adjusted their cultivation and socio-religious traditions if they saw enhanced benefits. There were also some instances where Māori became indebted, for acquisition of European goods, and were then obligated to work full-time to repay these debts.\textsuperscript{39}

Industrial scale production was organised by settlers,\textsuperscript{40} and expanded from 1869, when economically practical mechanical means of dressing raw flax were found. That this occurred in slump times was a boon to farmer and merchant alike.\textsuperscript{41} Flax, timber and gum carried Northland through two Australasian-wide recessions, while also involving increasing numbers of Māori in non-traditional scales of activity. Hokianga’s resident magistrate reported a four-fold increase in customs’ revenue in the two years to 1870, which he attributed to a sign of progress from flax milling.\textsuperscript{42}

A brief diary entry in 1870 records: ‘Took my daughter to the Awanui to see the first steam engine that has ever been seen in this part of the island. It truly is a wonderful

\textsuperscript{37} Wigglesworth, p.235.
\textsuperscript{38} McKenna, p.6.
\textsuperscript{39} Wigglesworth, p.215.
\textsuperscript{40} McLauchlan, p.57 plate 71.
sight. All the natives are much astonished’. But the steam engine that hailed the step change in flax production was also its death knell, as sail gave way to steam, which used neither canvas for sails nor large quantities of cordage. Nevertheless, other uses supported many large-scale operations throughout Mangonui and Hokianga counties, which provided the dying market into the twentieth century. Mills were located at Lake Ohia, Houhora, and south of Mangonui, and there were seven in the Hokianga County. Flax enjoyed a brief Indian summer during World War One before its final slump.

Around 1890, the yield from traditional hand-dressing (using a shell) was 1 ton of fibre from 40 tons of green flax (2.5%), which realised a price of £70-£100 per ton. Production was at the rate of 2-3 pounds per day per person. By comparison, industrial dressing by mechanical beating, the skutching method, achieved a 24% yield and prices of £20-£27 per ton on the British market.

Figure 35 - Commercial flax gathering, Lake Ohia

![ATL 1/1-010559, Northwood collection, ca 1915](image_url)
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Market, with a production cost (excluding transport) of £12 per ton. The chemical process of saturating in sulphite of soda yielded 26.41% and an equal yield of the by-product, tow.\textsuperscript{44}

**Figure 36 - Flaxware c.1911-1919**

Different end uses favoured large-scale production, and Māori labour was diverted from skilled but tedious hand-dressing to unskilled and tedious cutting and hanking processes, thus crowding out traditional skills (human capital). Many smaller-scale operations supplemented farm and gum income, while the market was too small for pastoral specialisation. Draining of swamps to facilitate gum extraction and establish pastures promoted growth of flax, which could be milled and then burnt and grazed as cattle herds were built up. As with gum for the people of the Aupōuri and Karikari peninsulas, and timber for those living close to the Maungataniwha forests, the flax

\textsuperscript{44} Wallace, p.250.
industry was one Māori could usually engage in without migrating from their papakainga. Absences could be temporary and community life could be sustained.

In addition to industrial applications and export, flax fibre continued to be used domestically. Kete and mats were woven for the household economy, for gift exchange in the informal sector of the informal economy and for sale in the formal Pākehā economy.

In 1842 it was reported that Māori near Kaitaia ‘have left off to make native clothing’.45 Import substitution of European-style clothing spread more rapidly than English law or money. Pressure came from missionaries to adopt European clothing, and from the late 1860s, Native schools taught girls a range of home economics, including European garment-making, while boys learnt trades such as carpentry.46 Notwithstanding this pressure, some Māori who lived further from ports and mission stations from which European-style clothing was sourced maintained the fine arts of weaving.

45 Entry dated 6 June 1842, WGP, L&J, p.69.
Timber

From the late eighteenth century, Māori interests in maintaining the traditional forest economy were challenged by the opportunities of a world market, as some hapū recognised the value of forest timbers to British maritime and merchant interests. By 1840 many hapū, while prosperously engaged in a dual economy, maintained their interest in the self-sustaining lowland forest, which they continued to harvest until the productivity was lost with deforestation, land loss, grazing, swamp-drainage and introduction of exotic species. 47

Large quantities of timber were exported through the ports of Mangonui and Hokianga. Hokianga started earlier, shipped much larger quantities and was exhausted earlier.

Figure 38 - Timber Exports from Mangonui and Hokianga

Source: Statistics of New Zealand, Part II, Registrar General, 1868-1887.

Mangonui’s shore-based activities started in 1831, with the first sawyers mentioned in Chapter 4. For shipping merchants, having a small, settled labour force in littoral

47 Pond, pp.2-3.
places made better commercial sense than using a larger crew to fell timber while a ship was docked.\textsuperscript{48} The sawyers became self-sufficient, between ships leaving and returning, by engaging in the ecological pluralism of extended kin groups with whom they settled. Sawyers traded timber themselves and mediated Māori trade when ships arrived. Sawyer-settlers could also train and employ Māori bush gangs to increase their scale of production, if demand required. By 1885, Māori were perceived as ‘splendid bushmen … in demand by contractors. Very fair wages are paid’. But they did not work only as labourers. ‘Some enterprising individual at times essays to take a large bush contract … but soon the want of capital bears down’.\textsuperscript{49} Bullock teams used on gumfields were also used in forests (Figure 48). As bush-lines receded from established settlements, timber-workers were accommodated in temporary camps. Some chose to migrate, notably Ngāti Kahu into Ngāti Whatua territory on the Kaipara Harbour.

The value of the timber industry to the northern economy was larger than export statistics show because of demand for New Zealand buildings. By 1901 the more accessible hills were denuded and timber trade had dwindled. By 1914 timber mills were closing. Kauri forests had been plundered and a large proportion was wasted because of transport difficulties. Later cuttings removed tōtara, rimu, miro and kahikatea. To meet settlers’ objectives of clearing land for pasture much was burnt where it had stood.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{49} Resident Magistrate’s report, AJHR, 1885, G-2, p.3.
\textsuperscript{50} Mckenna, pp.6-7.
For Māori, similar patterns of motivation for land sales applied to forestry. First there was the desire for partnership with Pākehā and validation of claims to land; pressure for money posed a second challenge to their values. ‘We could see [timber felling] was destroying the bush and the bird life. …We tried hard to protect the younger trees as we felled the big ones … but the timber company did not care’.  

**Horticulture & agriculture**

The mainstay of Māori diet, and an important component of their economy before European contact, was kūmara. Regarded as a sacred crop – a taonga loaded with symbolic meaning – its production was hedged with ritual. Kūmara played a key role
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51 Recollections of McCully Matiu, Matiu and Mutu, p.24.
in relations between Te Rarawa and Te Aupōuri in the far north.52 Far northern Māori
were the earliest recipients of new plant material, dating from de Surville’s 1769
landfall there.53 Whaling ships were calling at Mangonui Harbour frequently by the
early 1800s for shelter and provisioning. Māori bartered firewood, pigs, potatoes,
kūmara, pumpkins and fruit for gunpowder, flints, fishhooks, knives, metal tools and
blankets as well as tobacco pipes, beads and mirrors. In 1840, it was estimated that
the Māori settlement of Oruru (about 200 households), had supplied more than 200
tons of potatoes to ‘upwards of a dozen vessels, chiefly whalers, … besides all the
settled white population’.54 There were extensive plantations at settlements
throughout the far north. Ernest Dieffenbach made particular mention of Houhora,
Awanui, the valley upriver from Kaitaia (later named Victoria Valley), and Ahipara,
in addition to Oruru.55

Roger Wigglesworth found that up to 1840 some chiefs felt secure enough to trade on
their own behalf. Others used Māori who had worked on European vessels and learnt
some English to negotiate for them, but Europeans were the most widely employed
intermediaries. In the early years, Pākehā-Māori fulfilled this role, but later,
missionaries, settlers and whalers were used. The advent of resident intermediaries
shifted trade from intermittent shore-to-ship transactions to continuous, more stable,
land- and relationship-based interchange.56

52 Metge, ‘Returning the Gift’, p.322. The northern centre of Te Aupōuri, Te Kao, was named for the
process of drying a specific small-tubered kūmara as a delicacy.
53 Leach, pp.98-101.
54 William Butler, Clement Partridge and Hibernia Smyth, letter to the editor, *New Zealand Advertiser
and Bay of Islands Gazette*, 1840; cit. Mogford, p.6.
56 Wigglesworth, pp.236-7.
From the Hokianga Harbour, where Dieffenbach estimated, when he visited in 1841, there were already 200 Europeans, traders and sawyers, one George Russell\textsuperscript{57} had started a large trade in timber, flax, pork, potatoes and tattooed heads, and a large shipbuilding industry, based in Horeke.\textsuperscript{58} By 1848, William Butler had established satisfactory trading arrangements with Māori in the Mangonui district. They were his principal sources of firewood, flax and gum, pork, vegetables and fruit.\textsuperscript{59}

The second phase of change, starting in the early 1830s, introduced farm animals, implements and know-how to Kaitaia and Hokianga. Two male missionaries appointed to Kaitaia had spent time, in 1832-33, at Waimate under the guidance of Dorset farmer turned missionary, the Rev. Richard Davis; their two wives were his daughters.\textsuperscript{60} Compared with other mission stations’ farms, where sites were generally chosen for security rather than their farming potential, and therefore achieved only modest production,\textsuperscript{61} Kaitaia’s was located on fertile land, and farming was more expansive and varied. This provided an advantageous basis for mutual gift exchange with the Māori community, into which the missionaries were adopted. It also meant that Māori in this location were amongst the earliest to be introduced to pastoral farming. On his 1841 trip Dieffenbach commented, with cynicism, on the economic relationship between missionaries and Māori:

\begin{quote}
During my stay I saw them [Te Rarawa Māori] reap wheat and plough several acres of land, and the missionaries encourage them to exchange their former unwholesome food of decayed maize and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{57}Father of the first MHR for Northern Māori in 1867.
\textsuperscript{58}Harrison, p.14.
\textsuperscript{59}Mogford, p.19.
\textsuperscript{60}Jan Harris, \textit{The Waimate Mission Station}, Waimate North, 1984, p.58. The Waimate mission farm imported tools and implements, including ploughs, and blacksmithing equipment with which further items were manufactured. During his time there, the older of the two Kaitaia missionaries, William Puckey (later dubbed the ‘handyman missionary’), assisting or assisted by Davis, made a breaking plough, triangular levelling harrow, and breaking harrow, possibly for the planned Kaitaia mission station. R. Davis Journal, April – September 1833, cit. Harris, p.62.
potatoes for bread. Several of the natives have one or two head of cattle and horses; and I have every reason to believe that here at least the missionaries will encourage their acquiring them, in order to dispose of the increase of their own stock.\textsuperscript{62}

The farming venture of a European man and his Māori wife represents another type of early change in the economic relationship of Māori to Pākehā.

Southee’s farm; it is situated on both banks of the river … The maize, growing ten or twelve feet high, and the fields of yellow wheat, bowing under the weight of the grain, showed what the land is capable of producing. Cattle were grazing about, and the well-stocked farm-yard bore testimony to an industry such as is very rarely met … Mr Southee has about 300 natives around him in his immediate neighbourhood, who cultivate bits of land interspersed with his own, and who, for cheap wages, work for him in various branches of husbandry, and thus procure for themselves those European commodities for which they have acquired a taste. He gives them articles to the value of 2l. [£2] for every acre they clear.\textsuperscript{63}

The nature of the economic exchange between Māori and Pākehā in the 1840s was fully consistent with Māori traditional gift exchange between members of a self-sustaining community. The exchange system was also consistent with the barter and neighbour-help system of rural England or Europe. Dieffenbach’s interpretation of the exchange as waged labour therefore appears to be out of context. For instance, referring to Southee’s property, he uses a monetary value, while making it clear that it is goods (to the value) given in exchange for clearing land. In reference to the mission station, he records that ‘a bridle-road [of] thirty-four miles … was cut [through the forest] … by fifty natives for as many blankets … The days of such cheap work are now gone’; although once again goods were exchanged. The concept of paid labour is not likely to have been in the minds of Māori at the time; the arrangements bear closer resemblance to partnerships in which Māori were the senior partners – they had the numerical power and mana or authority to evict their guests.

\textsuperscript{62} Dieffenbach, p.218.
\textsuperscript{63} ibid., p.215.
On these foundations of informal social relationships and the substantial pre-colonial economic system, an informal rural economy was built.

**Figure 40 - Overseas shipping to and from Mangonui and Hokianga, compared with ports at Russell and Auckland**

Mangonui became a safer harbour than the Bay of Islands during the Northern War of 1845-46. Whaling ships were able to barter for basic essentials and there were no port or customs duties to pay. Mangonui’s importance as a trading port grew after 1845. When William Bertram White was appointed there in 1848 he observed ‘as many as forty whalers in the Mangonui harbour at one time moored side by side.’65 In 1852 traffic increased again as whalers became wary of putting into Sydney for fear of desertions to the goldfields. Hokianga’s trade was much smaller. Ships avoided its harbour because of the possibility of hostilities, and many resident Europeans left.

The Wesleyan mission closed in 1863, and the Catholic mission was reduced to one itinerant priest, after which just 100 Europeans remained among 3000 Māori.66
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65 Mogford, p.21.

66 Harrison, p.14. Judge Munro’s national perspective on events differed from Heke’s: ‘About two years after 1840, a wave of depression passed over the colonies, businesses and industries came to a standstill. No ships came into Hokianga for either timber or native produce. The Maoris were all thrown out of employment and the enforced idleness bred discontent which culminated in Heke’s War’. Heke’s discontent was more with the local effect, the removal of the seat of European power and decision making from the Bay of Islands to Auckland.
Northern Māori expanded their agriculture to meet ships’ needs. Missionaries encouraged wheat cultivation. It was hoped that Māori would become self-sufficient in flour, increase trade with Europeans and decrease their mobility.\(^{67}\) By 1845, when flourmills had been ordered, pre-paid, it was assessed there would be ‘scarcely ... a village amongst them which does not possess a steel mill and flour sieve’.\(^{68}\) By 1848 there were about thirty ‘of the smaller kind’.\(^{69}\) A surplus of wheat was produced and traded through the next decade, but ultimately there was insufficient or variable demand, and gum proved to be a more reliable income source for far northern Māori.

In 1850 the scale of Pākehā cultivations was still modest.\(^{70}\) Use of the horse, plough and spade, replacing traditional cultivating tools, enabled Māori to expand the scale of their plantations easily.\(^{71}\) Once cash was needed to meet taxes, and it could be obtained for gum, food cropping reduced.

---

\(^{67}\) Puckey to CMS, 6 June 1842, CMS Missionaries and Employees Papers.

\(^{68}\) Puckey, Annual Report, 30 June 1845, WGP, L&J.

\(^{69}\) Puckey to CMS, 8 May 1848, ibid., p.189.

\(^{70}\) Simkin and Hardie, p.41 Table 33. Returns of land use for the two main European settlements of Mangonui and Kaitaia showed only 17 acres in wheat, oats, barley and maize, 31 acres in potatoes, 10 acres of onions, 22 acres of garden, for a total of 80 acres in crops, much of which would still have been worked by Māori. There was a nil record for Hokianga. Either no returns were submitted or no European settlement was recognised at that time.

\(^{71}\) The first plough used in New Zealand was at Kerikeri, 3 May 1820, behind a team of six bullocks. McLauchlan, p.62. Ploughs were first used in Kaitaia for small areas from 1834, and on a larger scale,
From Cook’s first visit, Māori were introduced to tobacco. The leaf was used in gift exchange to the extent that it later became a quasi-currency, and its use became socially ritualistic. 72 Contrary to John Broughton’s argument, missionaries in the far north did use tobacco in gift exchanges. 73 Some Māori grew tobacco for their own use, alongside other new crops, from the 1830s. 74 Missionaries did not discourage smoking, being practitioners themselves. At that time it was associated with the image of peace and tranquillity. By the mid-nineteenth century, tobacco had become a vital part of world capitalism. 75 New Zealand’s imports rose from about 22 tonnes a year, during the early 1840s, to 137 tpa in the 1850s, and 477 tpa in the 1860s, making its society one of the most nicotine-dependent in the world. Tobacco comprised 18% of the value of imports through Mangonui and Hokianga ports, over the 1853-58 years for which details are available (Table 5). Demand was even larger than the official figures indicate because an informal trade thrived alongside recorded traffic. 76

By the 1850s, Māori were enthusiastic consumers of tobacco, smoking was widespread and nicotine addiction well established. Tobacco smoking had become a cultural norm by 1880, although Māori did not adopt the customary Victorian social behaviour, as Māori women probably took up smoking as much as Māori men, whereas it was not socially acceptable for European women to smoke. 77 The health effects of smoking, understood primitively in the late nineteenth century, but only convincingly from the 1950s, undoubtedly contributed to the decline in the Māori pulled by bullocks, in 1841. Marlene Greer, 70 Years of Service 1901-1971: Kaitaia Co-Op Dairy Co. And Oruru-Fairburns and Herekino Dairy Companies, Kaitaia, 1972, p.3; Harris, p.62.
72 John Broughton, Puffing up a Storm: “Kapai Te Torori”, vol. 1, Dunedin, 1996.
73 Indicated in the waiata quoted in Dieffenbach, p.220.
74 Michael King, Māori. A Photographic and Social History, Auckland, 1989, p.150.
75 Broughton, p.87.
77 Broughton, pp.36, 39, 93, 94.
population. But population recovery after 1896 was not accompanied by a reduction in smoking.

**Table 5 - Value of Imports to the Far North, 1853-58**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Mangonui</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms &amp; ammunition</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Eqpmt</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery, saws, flax mills,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grindstones, hardware</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic beverages</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil (Cocoa-nut, sperm, fish)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total value</strong></td>
<td><strong>1192</strong></td>
<td><strong>2718</strong></td>
<td><strong>3497</strong></td>
<td><strong>3357</strong></td>
<td><strong>1764</strong></td>
<td><strong>3683</strong></td>
<td><strong>462</strong></td>
<td><strong>1379</strong></td>
<td><strong>585</strong></td>
<td><strong>958</strong></td>
<td><strong>2729</strong></td>
<td><strong>1589</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: Statistics of New Zealand, Part II, Registrar General, 1853-1858.

The colonial government exploited nicotine traffic for profit, through customs duties and taxation. The rate of duty on finished tobacco trebled, and the tax on unprocessed leaf increased fivefold over 40 years. Duties collected during 1875-80 amounted to almost 13% of all government revenue from customs and excise. Within the country there were no controls; anybody could make money from tobacco, and the first Tobacco Act of 1879 offered token protection to colonial tobacco growers. Unknown quantities of leaf were grown in the hinterland by Māori and Pākehā farmers, well beyond the sight and knowledge of government. In 1885, in Hokianga, ‘tobacco is now grown as a regular crop in most settlements, and is a real success, very little of the imported article being used’, whereas in Mangonui ‘some of the inland Natives grow enough tobacco to supply their own wants but the crop is not raised in any quantity’.

---

79 Eldred-Grigg, pp.96-8.
80 ibid.
81 Resident Magistrates’ reports, AJHR, 1885, G-2, pp.1-3.
In other parts of New Zealand, Māori grew tobacco as a cash crop from the late nineteenth century. But in the Hokianga, attempts by Māori to grow tobacco for export were not successful.82 Seeing hospital patients’ (both Māori and Pākehā) inability to meet hospital fees, in the depressed period of the late 1920s, Rawene Hospital’s Surgeon Superintendent, Dr. Smith,83 struck on tobacco cropping as a means by which they might earn money to satisfy their indebtedness. The climate suited the plants’ growth well, but without adequate means of drying the harvested leaf, the temperate rainforest supported mildew equally well. The first year’s crop was lost after harvesting; the second year’s reached the London market but fetched a price that barely covered shipping costs.84 Given the extent of local consumption, it is difficult to understand why Smith promoted export instead of domestic import substitution. In closing the venture, he remarked that they had learnt from their experience and would be well equipped to start again when a satisfactory means of drying could be found. But it would be another type of weed that benefited from that experience, some decades later.85

Tobacco was not the only recreational drug. Both tobacco and alcohol had become well-established components of Western capitalism. Use, abuse and addiction to alcohol had a severe impact on Māori economics. While there is no indication that missionaries used alcohol in an economic exchange with Māori, its use in church services introduced a ritual normality. Along with additive and adverse health effects, and legislation and regulation pertaining to both drugs, Māori were drawn into

82 King, Maori. A Photographic and Social History, p.150.
83 Dr G. M. Smith 1883-1958, Surgeon Superintendent to Rawene Hospital in the Hokianga 1914-1948.
85 The same climatic and economic conditions promoted the growth of marijuana.
a relationship with the Pākehā economy from which it became difficult and problematic to withdraw. According to Dun Mihaka:

Most commentators tend to emphasise the great significance that the musket played … Yet the heavy artillery that did the real damage were the cheap commodities like axes, blankets, tobacco, alcohol and the like. Of course the value of the musket was astronomical but, in the long term, for their utility, the [others] were by far the most potent.\textsuperscript{86}

While Māori increasingly consumed goods imported through northern ports, provisioning of ships with agricultural produce was taken over by Pākehā settlers (gradually in Mangonui County but more aggressively in Hokianga), with the exception of the well-established Māori kūmara plantations. Beyond 1860, horticultural activity diminished with land loss in favour of the more lucrative gum trade. Because horticulture did not require much land, the norm tended towards a mix of self-sufficiency in vegetables and part-time participation in a formalising economy. Large-scale kūmara plantations persisted beyond the 1920s.

\textsuperscript{86} Dun Mihaka, "Ki Te Whei Ao ..." "Ki Te Ao Marama ..." Marama Laurenson, ed., Wellington, 1989, p.80.

Figure 42 - Ngawini Hetaraka (left) and Ngahuia Hetaraka harvesting kūmara, Awanui (Ngawini is smoking a pipe)
Pastoral farming

Māori of the far north expanded the diversity of their agriculture and acquired livestock earlier than iwi in most other parts of the country. By 1845 ‘The Karawa [Rarawa] are now trying to raise sheep’. ‘One tribe has as many as seventy’. ‘It is their wish to learn to weave their own garments’87 – not an unrealistic expectation, given that one of the missionaries was a master weaver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main Pākehā settlements of Whangaroa, Mangonui and Kaitaia (from which Māori sourced their stock) showed steady increases in livestock numbers by mid-century, comparable with New Plymouth, Taranaki’s main European settlement. Cultivated pastureland for the Kaitaia and Mangonui settlements alone was 219 acres by 1850. None was recorded for Hokianga. There are no comprehensive records of the early rate of expansion of animal acquisition by Māori. Earliest official statistics for Māori were collected in 1891, and then only for two decades, evidently to track transition from common to individual land working.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 6 - Livestock in main northern Pākehā settlements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horned cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> Statistics of New Zealand for the Crown Colony Period88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheep

From 1879, The Sheep Act 1878 required individuals to provide details of sheep they owned, but data was not separated by ethnicity of owners. Payment of two shillings for every hundred (or fractional part) sheep was to be made to the receiver of Land Revenue.89 Although the principal intention of the Act was disease eradication, a secondary consequence was a valuable record of changing patterns of sheep

---

87 Entries during 1845-6, WGP, L&J, pp. 82, 88, 155.
88 Simkin and Hardie, p.44 Table 36.
89 ‘The Sheep Act’.
ownership over the period data was collated. As the records list individual owner’s names, it is possible to identify most Māori owners.90

G. V. Butterworth argued that because Māori had no tradition equivalent to their experience in agriculture, and they did not understand the need to keep flocks free from disease, their experiments with stock farming tended to be failures. As a consequence, he states, sheep were bought but soon died of scab.91 Butterworth appears to have taken this information directly from Apirana Ngata’s 1908 report to Parliament, which described first attempts of Māori at sheep farming on the East Coast in the 1870s as crude.92 Data for the far north does not support Butterworth’s generalisation.

---

90 My analysis on the basis of names differs from totals shown for the census, partly because names do not indicate how people were recorded in the census, and partly because sheep returns and censuses were collected at different times of the year and breeding season. While it is not possible to reconcile these figures at the detailed level, because individual names are not available for census data, I can speculate that the principal difference could arise from my classification of the flock of Sam and Ngawini Yates as Māori-owned. I have classified on the basis that the flock was taken over from a previous Te Kao Māori owner and grazed on Māori land, and the Yates family lived with the Māori community. Certainly, it would be hard to argue that the flock was anything other than Māori-owned following Sam’s death, when Ngawini continued to own and manage the flock for another decade. Whether the family is deemed to be Māori or not is of less significance than the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy through marriages of this type, which is discussed elsewhere in this thesis.


92 AJHR, G.i., 1908, p. 16; Felix M. Keesing, ‘Maori Progress on the East Coast’, Te Wananga: being the journal of the Board of Maori Ethnological Research containing its proceedings, and selected articles and reviews on Maori and Polynesian matters, 1, 1, 1929, p.29.
By 1879, many Māori in the far north had been raising sheep for up to, or exceeding, 30 years – more than a generation, and more than enough time to have developed a new tradition in farming. The first returns show one flock of over 1000 at Parengarenga, and several other Māori-owned flocks exceeding 100 in this and the Awanui, Pukepoto, and Ahipara areas; levels above mere subsistence farming. From the time of the first returns, and therefore probably earlier, some flocks were run for many years by one owner, sometimes passing on to a son or another member of the whānau. Some returns were made by corporate or co-operative ownerships (for example, Waimamaku Sheep Co, Omapere, and Tuakana Karaihe & Hori Rewi at Herekino), but most were made by individuals, although some individuals most likely represented a whānau or hapū (for example, chief Paraone of Parengarenga). This would have made economic sense because the sheep levy applied to each 100 or part thereof, and by combining flocks the part hundreds could be minimised, but it could
equally reflect continuation of communal economic activity. Nor was the disease rate high: the Chief Inspector reported for 1880 no infected flocks in the Bay of Islands’ subdivision of the Auckland Sheep District, which covered the region. 93

The total number of sheep owned by Māori between 1879 and 1920 was consistently less than that owned by non-Māori, but their flock sizes were larger until World War One, and there were fewer Māori owners. In the early 1890s, the number of sheep far northern Māori owned in total reached its peak, representing just over 40% of all sheep owned in the area. At their highest level of ownership, Māori represented just over 30% of sheep owners in the mid- to late 1890s, when their population proportion was about 50%.

Figure 44 - Flock sizes and comparison of proportions of ownerships

Data Sources: Sheep returns in Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives

True to Dieffenbach’s assessment, 94 the northernmost tip of the island proved to be capable of supporting a large number of sheep. The establishment of the large Te Paki sheep station has been attributed to Sam and Ngawini Yates. However, the

93 AJHR, 1880, H8, Section B. A distinction was made between ‘infected’ flocks, referring to scab, and those infested with lice. Lice affected all flocks in the country, but worst infestations were in Napier, Canterbury and Otago districts.
94 Dieffenbach, pp.208-12.
sheep returns for 1879 show that T. A. Brown (Paraone, chief of Parengarenga\footnote{Te Karere Mäori 1861-63: Vol. 2, No. 14, p.19; Kereama (Hoeft), p.xvii.}) owned a flock of 1012, in the year before Sam Yates’ first return. Evidently the Yates acquired their flock from its previous Mäori owner, because Paraone’s name does not appear in the year that Yates’ first shows. It has been suggested that Yates could exert pressure on Mäori to sell because they had probably run up big accounts at his Parengarenga store during the gum industry’s periodic slumps.\footnote{Armstrong.}

The Yates couple built up the flock to just under 5000, but it did not reach its peak of over 5000 until after Sam’s death, when Ngawini was running the station herself. Nor were Sam and Ngawini the only owners of substantial numbers of sheep in this area. Wi Kurukuru ran a flock ranging in size between 300 and 1000 over the period 1884-1905, Heni Patana ran 100-220 from 1901 to 1905, and Karipa We Patene ran 220-375 between 1902 and 1905. Temaru Ngarama ran 98 in 1881, building up to 230, and then reducing to 80 in 1896. Rewiri Hongi ran 130-500 from 1883 to 1896, and Rewiri Murupaenga ran 500-1250 between 1897 and 1908, probably taking over or inheriting the flock of Rewiri Hongi. There were two other flocks of 100 or more in the Awanui area, but the small number of other Muriwhenua holders\footnote{Te Aupōuri, Ngäti Kurï and Ngäi Takoto.} ran fewer than 90 each. With the exception of Yates, these substantial flocks might reflect continuation of communal farming.

The other three tribal territories’ holdings were characterised by more owners and smaller flocks, which could indicate a move away from communal ownership compared with Te Aupōuri, Ngäti Kurï and Ngäi Takoto. Flocks in the Ngäti Kahu/Te Paatü area (Karikari peninsula, Mangonui, Taipa, Kenana and Peria) built up more slowly but were maintained over the two decades straddling the turn of the century.
The upturn in 1916 coincided with Te Aupōuri’s downturn, as a result of the sale of Te Paki station to Pākehā. Following Ngawini’s death, one son, Gustavus, established his flock of 500-900 in Ngāti Kahu/Te Paatū territory. The combined holdings of Te Rarawa exceeded those of Ngāti Kahu/Te Paatū, but they were concentrated in geographically separated areas, mainly in the hills around the Hokianga, Herekino, and Whangape harbours, with a smaller number in the Ahipara hills, and even fewer in the river valleys near Kaitaia.

Figure 45 - Distribution of sheep over tribal territories

![Graph showing the distribution of sheep over tribal territories from 1879 to 1919](image)

Data sources: Sheep Returns, AJHR.

Although Te Rarawa generally had more owners and smaller flocks than Te Aupōuri, possibly due to earlier individualisation of land title, several farmers had flocks of a commercial size. Walter Mare⁹⁸ built his flock in Herekino from 90 to 530 between 1890 and 1912. Henepere Te Tipene of Mitimiti ran 80-440 from 1882 to 1904. Hori Hare ran 100-300 in Rangiahua, alongside Mrs Hapeta Hanare’s 120-300 over 1892-

⁹⁸ Related to Ngawini Yates (nee Mare/Murray).
1903, and Huirama Tu Kariri ran his flock for 30 years at Kenana with a maximum return of 212 sheep.

The build-up in sheep numbers bears an unexpected relationship to the population recovery of Māori. The peak-period in sheep ownership coincided with the ebb-period in population, while the absolute peak coincided with the period of sharpest population recovery. Conceivably, the build-up in sheep numbers contributed to the population recovery. But the preceding data, showing the most dramatic increase in sheep numbers occurring when the population was declining to its lowest point, indicates a determination to invest in future generations, by taking advantage of refrigeration’s revolution of sheep farming. The decline in sheep ownership started in the year the population regained its former high of two decades earlier.

**Figure 46 - Correlation of Māori population and sheep ownership in the region**

Data sources: Sheep returns, AJHR; Population Census, Department of Statistics

Sheep farming by Māori was abandoned in the Hokianga in 1905, and then had a brief and modest return over the years of World War One, when requirements for troop supplies lifted prices, but this was terminated by the meat industry’s subsequent
More northerly members of Te Rarawa and Ngāti Kahu made similar contributions to the war effort. In Muriwhenua, Te Paki station was sold to Pākehā in 1910, and other lands vested in the Tai Tokerau Trust Board were leased to Pākehā, rather than being farmed by their Te Aupōuri owners. Figure 43 clearly demonstrates the takeover of sheep farming by Pākehā from Māori, effected by land alienation and unequal access to capital. The move of Māori away from sheep could also suggest the same move to dairying that Ngāti Porou made, when small holdings arising from individualisation of title became unprofitable as sheep farms. There are other explanations, which will be discussed later, but this is an appropriate juncture to examine land holding at the time sheep statistics were first being recorded.

**Land holdings**

The 1882 Freeholders’ list would have been a useful point-in-time indication of changes in ownership patterns, but ‘all land belonging to Māoris have been omitted, for it would be impossible to obtain any information that would enable them to be classified as to ownership’. The 1881 electoral roll is a less precise alternative. Franchise qualifications were males aged 21 years and over who either owned property or had lived in New Zealand for at least one year and in an electorate for at least six months before registering as an elector. Māori men who owned property on individual titles were eligible to register as electors in any European electorate where they were so qualified. Because switching rolls was optional, registration on the general roll is more a measure of choice than of qualification by land holding.

---

Of those Māori who did register on the general roll, most were recorded as being ratepaying ‘settlers’. These ratepaying settlers were concentrated in the Ahipara (58), Waima (45) and Waihou (18) areas, with just one other recorded for Wairoa. Localities of freehold properties were more precise. Of the 29 Māori on the general roll whose properties were freehold most lived in and around the Hokianga, but one was in Mangonui. Eight with residential properties were distributed: three in Hokianga, two in Oruaiti, and one each in Kaitaia, Ahipara and Parengarenga. Other than settlers, three were labourers, one was a stockman at Parengarenga, one was in the Civil Service and one was a clergyman.

Although the information is sparse, it indicates that individualisation of titles happened first in the areas immediately north and south of the Hokianga Harbour and the south-west of the Mangonui County, but by 1881 this change was slight. By the end of the century the pace had quickened. When dairying started early in the new century individual farms were becoming the norm in some places, as Matire Kereama remembered:

Now that the free and easy life of the gumfields was over, [some] Te Aupouri returned to resettle on their ancestral lands at Whangape. … they separated into two groups. [Some went to old Makora pa]; the rest moved … to Pawarenga. The bush at Pawarenga was full of good things to eat, the streams teeming with eels.

… the elders… decided that each family would have a piece of land on which to make a home. The land in question was a block called Rotokakahi, which had lain idle and unoccupied for a long time.

… each person was asked to point out the area which he would like to claim for himself while acknowledging the river to be the general

100 Use of the term ‘settler’ is interesting. In settler societies, settlers might be settling down after a nomadic existence or settling somewhere else, having migrated. Lloyd and Metzer, ‘Settler Colonization and Societies in History’, p.5. Use of the term when referring to Māori appears to indicate a choice to live permanently in one location instead of periodically relocating in response to seasonal resource availability or other circumstances.
boundary … a knoll or big tree was selected as the boundary mark for an individual claim. Once the limits had been defined, it was decided that the boundary lines should be cut the next day. … By sunset the boundary lines had been fixed and some owners had even begun to erect their nikau whares.

…They knew that the Native Land Court would be sitting at Opononi and they had heard how it was possible for the judge to make one of them the permanent owner of a section if the person could prove his hereditary claim to it. … At the next sitting of the Native Land court all went to file their claims and so became titled owners of their chosen parcels of land.101

As the Waihou and Ahipara areas correspond with Te Rarawa territory, within which a few Te Aupōuri/Ngāti Kurī lived, the electoral representation gives an indication of within-region differentiation of the relationship of Māori to Pākehā economic policy-making; a difference in the choice and voice of iwi and hapū. Mangonui and Hokianga harbour regions both had early and sustained contact with Europeans, but Ngāti Kahu (of Mangonui), who were closely related to Te Rarawa, appear to have made a different decision about individualisation of land title and/or voting.

**Other livestock**

By the time first Māori-owned livestock statistics were collected in 1891, any numerical advantage far northern Māori might have had earlier had been overtaken by iwi in other parts of the country, with the exception of cattle in Hokianga. Here, 8.5% of Māori-owned cattle in Aotearoa were owned by 6.8% of the Māori population. Statistics for dairy cattle and horses were only recorded in the last year in which this data was collected (1911), but it is evident from that year alone that Māori in this region were already engaged in dairying. Horse-riding became a way of life, as did its by-products of horse-racing and betting, discussed in the next section of this chapter.

101 Kereama (Hoeft), pp.45-48. Throughout her book, consistent with the style of story telling, Matire does not use dates. Here she seems to be equating the end of the gum period with about the turn of the century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7 - Census data for Māori land cultivation and livestock holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mangonui</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual land cultivated (acres)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land cultivated in Common (acres)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total land cultivated (acres)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops (as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sown Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cultivated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tussock &amp; other unimproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livestock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Māori censuses for 1891, 1896, 1901, 1906, 1911

Notable in the post-1891 statistics are the variable numbers of sheep and cattle, and the decline in pig numbers, possibly explicable by livestock roaming wild and unrecorded. Even more notably, despite rapidly increasing sown areas, no communally sown areas were recorded, which indicates a possible correlation of increases in pastoral farming with individual cultivation. However, all varieties of livestock, whether owned individually or communally, were grazed on tussock, as well as sown grasses.

If the data is accurate, it highlights differences in land use patterns between the two counties. In Mangonui cropping declined (both communally and individually), sown areas increased and then reduced, along with livestock; whereas in the Hokianga, Other figures raise a suspicion that there were inconsistencies. There is also the possibility of boundary changes, which could shift some numbers between the two counties or those adjacent to them.

---

102 Data collection methods might not have been very reliable at this time, as the non-collection of cultivation data for Hokianga in 1896 indicates. Other figures raise a suspicion that there were inconsistencies.
individual crop cultivation increased markedly, at the expense of communal cultivation. Sheep and cattle numbers increased substantially in conjunction with sown areas, but pig numbers reduced even as dairy herds were being built up.  

Figure 47 - Changing pattern of Māori livestock holding

The significance of the large drop in cultivated areas and livestock between 1906 and 1911 for Mangonui begs more critical explanation than can be achieved here, and the enormous increases in the same for Hokianga are even more intriguing. The analysis of individual sheep ownership indicates some boundary movement, which contributes to an explanation. Māori farmers in both counties responded to opportunities afforded by refrigeration, and it is evident from dairy company shareholder lists that Māori in the Hokianga participated in dairying earlier than in Mangonui. Heremia Te Wake had encouraged farm development in the area, before his death in 1918, but whether the efforts of his community alone explain the significant increase in livestock is indeterminable.

103 The expectation would be that pig numbers would be maintained or increased, unless there was pasture substitution, because if milk was home-separated, skimmed milk (the waste from butter fat extraction) was typically fed to pigs.
Cattle

Cattle returns were not required in the detail that is available for sheep. Therefore an analysis of the extent of changes in Māori ownership of cattle is limited. As Table 7 showed, sheep were more important in the Mangonui county 1891-1911 but in Hokianga sheep and cattle vied for dominance. Sometimes cattle were acquired informally, as Matire Kereama explained:

While they waited for the sitting of the land Court [to individualise titles] … some of the young men went pig hunting during which they saw a mob of wild cows, bull and calves. [It was decided] that everyone would go deep into the Warawara bush and drive out every cow they could find. The cow that each man caught would become his personal property. …

All the young men of the village set out with horses, dogs and ropes. Some had guns for protection. … a mob of cows, bulls and calves came down the hill, the men yelling behind them as they drove the herd into fenced areas on the flat. … cows and calves were claimed by their owners. One cow each was the rule so that everybody would have a share in the great haul. … Our share of the cows was a good red one with a few white markings on her face. She was to become the mother of a fine herd which we reared at our new home at Pawarenga.104

Māori mustered and drove sheep and cattle, and they also became involved in meat processing when the Moerewa meat works started operating in 1922. There were both ownership and labouring contexts to beef farming. Dairy farming, which started early in the twentieth century, is a central focus of Chapter 6, but bullocks came first.

Boats and beasts of burden

Before European contact, Māori travelled by foot and various types of waka (canoes), regularly covering considerable distances. Whaling introduced European boat designs, and Māori adopted these for some purposes by or before the mid to late

104 Kereama (Hoefl), pp.48-9.
nineteenth century,\textsuperscript{105} although the extent is indeterminable due to paucity of data.\textsuperscript{106} Bullocks and horses, first brought to the region by missionaries early in the century, were immediately useful transport innovations. Hard-sand beaches were roads, and land yachts were used on the long western beach from the 1850s, but inland roading was rudimentary until the 1920s.

The first bullock was introduced to the north in 1840; Māori were ploughing land with them by the following year.\textsuperscript{107} Many Māori-owned teams were used on the gumfields, on land being cleared for pasture, and in forest areas south of Awanui to haul kauri and other native logs. Bullocks were invariably steers, selected from herds of cattle for their apparent strength, trained, and often given women’s names. Breeds used were mostly

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Māori-led bullock team hauling logs, c. 1910s}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushright}
ATL PA1-q-180-034, Northwood album 4 (PA1-q-180)
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{105} H. W. Bishop to Native Under Secretary, AJHR, 1885, G-2, p.3; Muriwhenua Fishing.
\textsuperscript{107} Greer, p.3.
Shorthorn, a few Herefords, and Jersey-Shorthorn cross for lighter teams. Ngawini Yates bred her own strain on Te Paki station in the late 1800s. At the end of the nineteenth century, Māori were hauling large loads with their bullock teams.\(^{108}\)

‘Bullocks built the Furthest North, too – patient, slow, steady beasts – working on into the 1930s, still hauling away when they’d disappeared completely in many other parts of New Zealand’.\(^{109}\) They were grazed on rough native feed and could outpull horses in the roadless conditions of the north, over steep hillsides, tracks of mud and broken sandstone, and winter bog; they had a steady pull, like machinery. Teams were used to bring in stores, provisions, iron and timber, and to take out mountains of gum, 40 sacks weighing two hundredweight each, to the creeks and inlets where the barges and ships waited.\(^{110}\)

The identity of operators is invisible until introduction of regulations and licensing towards the end of the nineteenth century generated records. Some oblique references then start to appear in court records, but these are too sketchy and arbitrary to deduce how widespread horse and bullock teams’ ownership might have been. Around the turn of the nineteenth to twentieth centuries, amongst others, Neho Popata had a team of six bullocks; Roto Kepa drove a team of eight; W. Murray, Ngaputi Hehi, Rori Rakena, Rauma Rapena, Ihimaera Tahe, Heteraka Komini, Matangi Tahi, Hohepa and Hunia operated teams of unspecified numbers. Herbert Karepo owned a four-wheel wagon drawn by two horses.\(^{111}\) When photography became popular in the north, some identities were recorded. By the 1920s, the two main bullock teams that plied

\(^{108}\) AJHR, 1893, H-24, p.5.
\(^{109}\) Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.49.
\(^{110}\) Ibid.
\(^{111}\) Entries dated between June 1895 and October 1902, BAFO 10825 12a, 1881-95, ANZA; BAQS 4760 1a, 1879-1912, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
the Ahipara fields (the latest to be mined) were those of Nopera Arano (Noble Allen) and Ralph Berghan.\textsuperscript{112}

Although horses did not work forests or gumfields until the second decade of the twentieth century, they were more efficient than bullocks when some sort of road was available, and were used for lighter loads on easier terrain. They revolutionised stock handling, personal transport, and sport or entertainment. At first missionaries had been wary of the enthusiasm of Māori to own horses, lest they become like wild Arabs!\textsuperscript{113} For some, horse riding reached its pinnacle of fun in the making of the film \textit{Cowboys of the Red Manuka}, shot amongst dramatic sand dunes through which Te Kao’s actors and extras rode into the sunset, resplendent in ‘ten-gallon’ hats.\textsuperscript{114}

\textbf{Figure 49 - ‘Natives conveying flax to the mills, Houhora, North Auckland’}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{flax_transportation.png}
\caption{Source: A. J. M. Northwood photo, Auckland Weekly News, Christmas 1906.}
\end{figure}

By 1911, Māori census figures showed 1328 horses in the Mangonui County and 2982 in the Hokianga. This equates to one horse per 1.8 Māori in Mangonui and 1.14

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{112}{Personal communication Bruce Berghan (son of Ralph), June 2005.}
\footnotetext{113}{Entry dated 11 October 1846, WGP, L&J, p.155.}
\footnotetext{114}{Henderson, \textit{Te Kao} 75, p.36. Date not determined, c. 1930s.}
\end{footnotes}
Māori in Hokianga, compared with one horse to 1.03 Māori for Aotearoa in total, and 2.3 people to one horse for the Pākehā population. Comparative figures for Ireland, in 1911, were one horse for seven people.\textsuperscript{115}

Matire Kereama’s father used money from gum trading to buy a breeding mare and race-horses, which was not an unusual investment. A number of racetracks around the far north attracted enthusiastic crowds; they were places at which all ethnicities met convivially and networking was facilitated. Race meetings, which complied with prevailing regulations, were organised regularly. However, regulations could not be allowed to intrude on enjoying unscheduled races, with the attendant irregularity of betting. Gambling had been noted as a new ‘sin’ in 1870, in conjunction with card playing.\textsuperscript{116} In 1916 five Māori men were charged with holding a race meeting at Waima without a licence, and in 1917 nine men, including one Dalmatian and one Māori, were charged with taking part in an illegal horse race.\textsuperscript{117}

Other forms of illegal gambling were prosecuted, such as boxing contests and rolling dice.\textsuperscript{118} The only gambling game permitted in the New Zealand Army during World War One was housie, but smart operators foiled best efforts by authorities to prevent other forms.\textsuperscript{119} These games of chance again involved a range of ethnicities, such as an Ahipara group that included six men and women of Pākehā-Māori descent.
Päkehā and one Māori. Gambling also features large in Dalmatian oral accounts. By the close of the century it was coming to be regarded as a legal rather than a social crime, although the Protestant churches still frowned on the practice. Besides being a form of entertainment, gambling generated for some players sufficient gains to make the risk worthwhile. Wiremu Tomas was able to buy 300 acres of land, with a house, with money earned from gumdigging and gambling. Tomas recalled that people hardly ever banked their money, and there was no stealing, but there was a lot of gambling. ‘You weren’t allowed to gamble … but there was … only one policeman’. Horses added to the gambling dimension of the informal economy.

Horse-drawn sledges or buggies carrying milk or cream from farms to dairy factories, and from factories to the ports from which butter was shipped, lent impetus to roading improvement from early in the twentieth century. Increasing numbers of businesses servicing the dairy industry imported cargoes through the same ports. Some carriers had contracts to cart certain goods, but there were several others who waited for a load from the regular steamers. Horse-drawn passenger and mail coaches increased in number with the expanding population. Māori actively participated in carrying businesses in the 1900s-1920s, as they had on the gumfields. ‘Brown Rivers, a Maori driver, would leave at speed with two matched light horses in a light four wheeler, perhaps a passenger alongside him, and the Kaingaroa and Lake Ohia Post Office mail in the back.’ Mail was relayed north by Walter Evans (Päkehā) to Waiharara, where it was transferred to his brother Bill’s wagon to travel north, and Jimmy Manuel (Hemi Manuera) picked up the Te Kao mail bag from Waihopo.

120 Two events at Ahipara involving the same group of people, dated 27 March and 7 April 1890, BAFO 10825 12a, ANZA. (Restricted access.) One Päkehā was dismissed on the merits of his case.
121 Personal communication James Belich, 25 May 2006.
122 Tomas, ‘Gumfields of Lake Ohia’.
123 Reminiscences of Charlie Hutley, an early carrier, Northland Age, 6 June 1981.
Rocky Te Awa would be down with his two bullocks yoked in a dray with his load for the ship. … Our shop doors would close when Sugary Kemp a fine old Maori would come along at a trot on his konaki, the wooden two-wheeler with a skid in front that was the hearse from the marae to the Awanui graveyard. … When the dairy started in Kaitaia … Pat Hobson [Hopihana] who lived at Paparore brought the cream from the north in a six-horse team picking up along the way.124

The mechanisation of dairying, which spurred changes in roading, had been preceded by mechanisation of shipping, but sail and ‘pulling’ boats were used for lighter traffic on harbours and navigable rivers flowing into them. Schools arranged contracts with local providers to ferry children living on the opposite side of waterways from the school they attended.

Figure 50 - Whangape Native School Ferry ca 1906

Source: Alexander Turnbull Library, Ref. 1/2-023045-F.

124 Reminiscences of Charlie Hutley, an early carrier, Northland Age, 6 June 1981.
Boats carrying fare-paying passengers were required to be certificated from the late nineteenth century. The numbers of passengers permitted varied with the size of the boat and the weight of cargo being carried, passengers substituting for cargo. Survey records for these vessels indicate low participation of Māori in the *formalised* water-borne passenger and freight-carrying industry. The same activities persisted on an *informal* basis in more remote harbours, such as Whangape and Parengarenga, where kin-based arrangements would not have involved fare or freight payments. A 1905 report describes this combination of formal and informal activity on the northernmost harbour. ‘The Yates’ oil launch conveys provisions from Te Paua to the various gumdiggers’ camps near these waterways, and returns laden with their produce of gum. Native boats also may be seen at all times of high water flitting over the waters, generally making their way to Te Paua for stores’. Dugout canoes were still used regularly in 1932, when Te Kao’s first wharf was built. (Chapter 6, Figure 65.)

Breaches of regulations by both Pākehā and Māori launch owners indicate ‘irregular’ informal economic activity. There were more prosecutions on the Hokianga Harbour, possibly because the cost of monitoring more remote harbours would have exceeded any benefits from improved safety, or potential recoveries. Prosecutions included carrying without a licence, carrying more passengers than permitted by the licence, acting as a master of a ferry without being licensed, or failing to carry appropriate lighting according to the Shipping and Seaman’s Act 1908. Non-compliance increased revenue and decreased costs.

---

125 It appears to have been assumed that any passengers were fare-paying rather than free-riding.
127 Entries for 21 December 1910, 26 April 1911, 27 August 1913 and 29 June 1916, BADE 10742 1a, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
Vessels’ surveys were recorded from 1896, although they appear later for the northern harbours, and without indication of when vessels came into service or were used in the locations where they were surveyed.\textsuperscript{128}

The steamship \textit{Maori} was owned by John Harrison (married to Ngawini Te Haara) at Whangape around 1910-13. However, by this time most launches were oil-engined; some carried auxiliary sails. At Parengarenga Harbour, Joseph Conrad, Thomas Norman, Hone Tepania and Tom Murray each owned launches of around 3 gross tons, which were permitted to carry 12 passengers. Manuera Waata and Lawrence Lazarus owned launches operating out of Te Hapua, which were not certified for passenger transport.\textsuperscript{129} At Whangape, in addition to Harrison, owners were Karu Kamira and several members of the Murray family; each of the vessels was well under 3 tons, with passenger-carrying capacity of 10-18 passengers.

Hokianga sported the most Māori-owned vessels. The largest, \textit{Kaipoi}, owned by Ngatai Tahere, at 5.67 tons, could carry 20 passengers. Kahi Wirori was master of the Union Box Company’s 5.35 ton \textit{Houmoana}, which could carry 20 passengers.


\textsuperscript{129} Entries dated 21 October 1925 and 19 December 1927, BCAI 10820 2a, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
Heremia Te Wake’s 4.58 ton *Te Wake* was also certificated for 20 passengers. Martin Te Wake owned vessels of 2.5 and 3.8 tons, able to carry 18 and 30 passengers respectively. Moa Harrison, John Teihi, Tuku Poto, Titipa Harris and other members of the Harris family owned and operated vessels ranging in size from under 2 to under 3 tons, for ten to 20 passengers.

Members of the Harris family in the Hokianga all descended from a very early sawyer trader, Christopher Harris, and his three wives, Te Auparo (of Rahiri in the Waihou Mangamuka area), Ngahuia from Motukaraka, or Te Karehu. The Tahere family (Mangamuka and Whangaroa) is inter-related with the Harris family. The launch-owning Conrad, Norman, Tepania, Yates and Mare (Murray) families at Parengarenga were related to one another, and were also related to the Murray family at Whangape.

Some members of the sawyer/trader descent network used vessels for limited coastal transport. In addition to passenger-carrying limits, use limits for each vessel were recorded on each survey document. These varied according to the vessel and the coastal conditions. Limits were worded to restrict use in the downstream direction, that is ‘within harbour limits as far down as Omapere wharf’, for instance. On the west coast, ‘within harbour limits’ was the general restriction, but some were worded ‘within harbour limits unless towing’, which suggests use as coastal vessels at least to a limited extent. For vessels registered as based in the east coast harbours, limits were more relaxed but still indicate local use, for instance ‘extended Awanui river

---

130 Personal communication Aroha Harris, 15 March 2006. But note that members of the Harris family in Mangonui, who ran a transport business, were not related through this line and do not appear to be related by chain migration from England. But the Flavell family of Mangonui, descended from the Ngāpuhi chief Ururoa, is related to the Harris family of Hokianga.

131 The register had been set up when vessels under scrutiny were river steamers used in the upper reaches of the Auckland Harbour and on the Waikato and Thames rivers. As oil engined vessels (OEV) replaced steamers the register continued to be used for vessels used primarily within harbours.
limits’, or ‘Awanui river limit when not towing or carrying cargo’. ‘Inside heads when not carrying cargo’ suggests the vessel could not be used exclusively for coastal passenger-carrying. Interestingly, this last restriction applied to a lifeboat from SS *Elingamite*. The lifeboat had come into the ownership of Hone Tepania after the steamship was wrecked on rocks at Three Kings Islands in 1902.¹³² Navigable rivers, mostly feeders to the harbours, extended the working range of launches inland at favourable tide times. The river from Victoria Valley to Rangaunu Harbour had been navigable upstream to just beyond Kaitaia until introduced willows clogged the waterway. Trees were cleared and the river straightened and widened around 1914, but the improved water flow resulted in silting at the river mouth, which impaired navigability. The problem was not resolved before the ascendancy of road transport. Rivers into the Hokianga Harbour could take water transport inland to Mangamuka Bridge and Rangiahua.

Larger coastal trading vessels serving the far north were not owned by Māori. The Subritzky family had established the earliest fleet, operating first out of Houhora and later also from Awanui. Two members of this family married several local Māori women.¹³³ The Northern Steam Ship Company was the second major operator through the study period. From whaling times Māori had crewed on large vessels, and they continued this occupation with the coastal vessels.¹³⁴ In smaller and more remote harbours there was a sense of identification with the owners of the ships that provided regular services bringing produce, taking out gum and flax, and ferrying

¹³² Christchurch Library website, http://library.christchurch.org.nz/kids/nzdisasters/sselingamite.asp, (February 2006). The passenger restriction when Hone used the boat was 12. The lifeboat had carried 52 survivors to safety in 1902. Just as well the restriction didn’t apply at the time of the wreck! Files which might have indicated how the boat came into Hone’s ownership do not survive.
¹³³ Māori men did crew on ships in the Subritzky fleet, but Māori descendants of Subritzkys engaged in commercial fishing locally.
¹³⁴ Employment records for the Northern Steam Ship Company do not survive, and thus the participants in this trade cannot be individually identified, apart from the occasional reference, in minutes, to accidents.
inward and outward passengers. The Northern Steam Ship Company fostered this sense of ‘ownership’ by naming many of its vessels after tribes whose localities they served, thus building bridging capital that would return loyal patronage. An early and long-serving steamer was the *Rarawa*. In 1905 three vessels were commissioned at the same time, and named *Aupouri, Apanui* and *Ngatiawa*. The smallest of the three, *Apanui*, served the north faithfully for many years. The people of Te Kao ceremoniously presented a photograph of Mere Ngaropo, ‘Queen of the Aupōuri’ (first wife of Te Rarawa chief Timoti Puhipi), in response to the naming of *Aupouri*.135 Far northern Māori did not own any ocean-going vessels. While some crewed them, most concentrated their efforts on or near ancestral lands.

‘The forgotten rural worker’

From early resident magistrates’ reports, the government’s ambitions for Māori to become a labouring force are evident.136 ‘Maori should be relieved of the burden of their lands so they might learn to labour for a living’.137 Schooling during the time period of this study generally channelled Māori boys into unskilled labour, or trades, and perpetuated that expectation through wide circulation of the *School Journal*.138 While some Māori might have been willing full-time labourers, others chose to participate part-time or minimally.

Some argue that a dual labour market developed during the depressed 1840s, as ranks of unemployed and under-employed swelled owing to seasonal work, having a flow-on effect to the transport and waterfront industries. This pattern, they suggest, was

---

135 Personal communication, Ross Gregory (Te Rarawa), June 2005.
136 For instance Spencer von Sturmer to Native Under Secretary, 20 April 1885, AJHR, 1885, G-2, pp.1-2.
137 *Muriwhenua Land*, p.328.
manifested in a minority of more skilled workers, owners and professionals with relatively secure and regular income, and the majority of labourers with more casual work patterns and pay.\textsuperscript{139} But the relationship of northern Māori to these economic phenomena was less straightforward than a dual economy would suggest; they could have a foot in both camps. On one hand, many were involved in labouring and casual work, on the other hand, many of these same individuals were also attached to their tribal lands, to which they returned daily, less frequently or during off-seasons.\textsuperscript{140}

Because Māori occupational data was not collected in censuses until after 1951,\textsuperscript{141} it is impossible to be precise about their earlier engagement in each of the sectors of the Pākehā economy. What is known is that during the study period (1860-1940) Māori remained rurally based, with some migration occurring between the two World Wars and exploding after the Second. The relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy was, by this logic, more rurally based, and for this reason is more profitably studied within the rural setting. John Martin’s argument that Māori, amongst rural wage earners, were the forgotten workers, and Ngata’s opinion that ‘[w]e owe to his labour much of the pioneer work’, point to Māori efforts being significant from the beginning of the settler rural economy.\textsuperscript{142}

Although occupational statistics were not collected during the study period, nominal rolls for World War One Māori volunteers from far northern iwi give some indication.\textsuperscript{143} The records show a broad range of occupations. Less than 44% of

\textsuperscript{140} Butterworth, \textit{Māori Mobility}, pp.21, 46.
\textsuperscript{142} Martin, \textit{Forgotten Worker}, pp.15, 38-9.
\textsuperscript{143} It is an indication rather than a representation for several reasons. First, volunteers were drawn from younger adult men whose occupational profile might differ from that of the whole adult male population – for instance, young men might work as farm labourers with the aspiration of becoming
volunteers were self-employed and more than 56% were employees. Farming, gumdigging, and bush contracting dominated self-employment. Employees were predominantly general labourers, bush-workers, mill hands, and farm labourers. As there was no railway to the far north, the railway porter worked outside the district. The police constable and clerk were the only urban-based employees, but their work was with the rural community. Blacksmiths, butcher, carpenter, and farrier represented the trades.

**Figure 52 - Occupations of far northern Māori war volunteers**

In the far north, main areas of labour employment, after flax and timber, were in shearing, milking, fencing, road construction and drain digging. Kin-based groups usually formed rural work gangs, thus maintaining the socialisation of work; the impersonal Marxian-type, individually replaceable labour units, were not immediately

---

144 It is not possible to be precise as a bushman could be a self-employed contractor or an employee.
145 Pugsley, pp.86-130.
evident. What was imposed in the employment relationship was the notion of working to time. This had started to be inculcated with the school system of bell-ringing in the 1860s. Some forms of employment brought Māori within the ambit of compulsory unions, in which some, particularly shearers, took an active part.

The corollary to employment is unemployment or under-employment – where insufficient is being earned to meet expenses but some employment is still available. This, or other money-management issues, gave rise to debt default. For Māori, the expectation of immediate money-debt repayment was far removed from the time-delayed utu principle of reciprocity. From debtor court records, a profile of engagement with the cash economy can be drawn.

When people came before the court on charges of unpaid debts, they were required to indicate their ability to repay. They specified what and how they earned, how many dependents they had, and what their assets were. Typically, in 1917, sources of income for debtors were a mix of kūmara and other vegetables cultivated on small holdings, digging for gum under the World War One government scheme (9/- a sack), short-term road or drainage work (at 10/- a day) and farm labouring – what might be termed today occupational pluralism. Families tended to be large, contributing to the increasing Māori population from the turn of the century. Assets might include a barrow, a horse, or a wagon for carting produce to town. In one case a debtor lived on his employer’s property and the employer took his wages for food and clothing.


147 The impact on people’s perception of time and their culture, as a consequence of the fundamental restructuring of the Industrial Revolution in Britain, is a subject dealt with by E. P. Thompson and cited in Ommer and Turner, ‘Informal Rural Economies’, p.153.
Another’s employment was terminated by a dispute with his employer, on whose property he lived. Part of the employment arrangement was provision of a small plot for growing kūmara. Termination of his employment resulted in loss of the kūmara crop. Sharemilkers would be allowed to obtain credit from shops against future earnings, but were dependent on receiving their portion of the cream cheque, from the dairy company shareholder for whom they worked, to be able to repay. Ultimately, if debts could not be paid, bankruptcy loomed.

Bankruptcy is generally a good indicator of poverty and exposure to the economic system. It is a formalised system of relieving debts accumulated in excess of an individual’s ability to access resources to repay them. Given that Māori appear to have been extremely cash deficient at times through the study period, the lack of Māori bankruptcies is remarkable – marginally over 1% of all bankruptcies recorded for the Auckland area between 1887 and 1940. If cash were not readily available, it can be deduced that either Māori helped each other out in dire circumstances, as indicated in a Te Hapua case discussed in Chapter 6; or that it was a matter of mana not to carry the bankrupt label; or that it was not possible to be declared bankrupt if assets were held. Debts were settled by compulsory realisation of assets and land was lost in the process.

Bankruptcy or insolvency associated with business failures was probably low because business ventures far northern Māori established carried lower risk than flour-milling by iwi in the Waikato and Coromandel, for instance. At various times over the study period, far northern Māori owned whaling boats, shore-based whale processing plants, bullock teams, gum stores, fishing boats, launches, buses, and farming

---

148 Entries dated 16 and 17 April, 19 June and 22 August 1917, BADD 10815 1e, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
ventures, but they do not appear to have developed any sort of tourism industry such as Te Arawa’s, or deep-sea fishing as in the Bay of Islands; the Northern Steam Ship Company’s summer cruises only sailed as far as Whangaroa Harbour. Apart from farming, far northern Māori businesses earned a return, were adaptable to other uses, or were easier to exit.

Those few far northern Māori who were declared bankrupt were generally gumdiggers, labourers, contractors, bushmen or seamen. One farmer and one gum-store owner were bankrupted. Bankruptcy was not an option for those who could repay debts with assets or labour. Māori could not avail themselves of the bankruptcy system to relieve themselves of debt, and retain their land. Multiply-owned land could not be freely sold. Therefore, bankruptcy is not as accurate an indicator of poverty and exposure to the economic system as it is when considering Pākehā hardship.

One of the periods of hardship was during the First World War, when disrupted shipping lanes suspended gum exports.

**World War One – waged warriors**

World War One was a defining historical event (in political and economic terms) for Māori and Pākehā relations, as well as New Zealand’s relationship with Britain, and Britain’s relationship with other world powers. Without denying the undoubted bravery and loyalty of many, and the stupidity of some or even of the event itself, it is valid to consider World War One as an economic event, isolated from its strategies and tactics. War is big business. New Zealand’s expenditure on the Great War was £63million to the end of 1918 – £14.5million a year at a time when annual
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149 Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p.204.
appropriations from the consolidated fund for such purposes as health, education, rail, road, post and telegraph were running at £8-9.5 million a year in total, and GDP was £94-127.6 million for these years.

Additional to amounts recorded in the War Expense account were unquantified costs. No monetary value was attributed to the massive loss of lives and other collateral economic effects significant to Māori. Māori paid, in blood and lives, for a war that arguably was not theirs. Because the call to war arose out of a British obligation, there was considerable debate at the outset over whether Māori would be allowed to go overseas. The Imperial view at the time of the Boer War was that it was a ‘white man’s war’. But Māori volunteered and also donated money to the war effort. The absence of Māori servicemen deprived local communities of their contributions of money and labour. Labour shortages pushed up wage rates, resulting in a higher opportunity cost for Māori volunteers than if only Pākehā men had gone. Dalmatians, who were not accepted into service, could take advantage of the higher wage rates, and simultaneously work the gumfields, thus depleting one of the few cash sources readily available to Māori. The absence of Māori who had become soldiers reduced the strength of resistance to land sales to Europeans, which continued through the war.

How far northern Māori chose to participate in the war reveals an important aspect of their relationship to the Pākehā economy. Was there was an ideological match between the British and Māori reasons for war? Did Māori volunteer and participate because of a past accustomed to war, or unrequited war lust, or an ideology grounded in their economic model?
In her study of utu in intergroup relations as it applied in the far north, Joan Metge demonstrated ‘that as well as forging and reinforcing bonds between social groups, gift exchange also marked and reinforced their existence as separate entities, and was … deliberately used for that purpose’. Reciprocal exchanges of both good and bad gifts wove the fabric of social capital in a complex process. ‘Relations between Te Aupouri and Te Rarawa … alternated between periods of peace and of hostility and war’. Following this theme, I sought a thread of commonality with the approach of far northern Māori to participation in World War One. The war was not one of their making but their participation was an exercise in relationship building and ‘trading’ in their own economic terms. ‘Ngata saw WWI as an opportunity to raise the profile of the Maori and to prove that he was the equal of his Pakeha comrades’. More importantly it was an opportunity to build social capital with Pākehā in expectation of being able to draw on that capital in the future.

By the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century Māori had already experienced over a century of contact and conflict with European explorers and settlers. Māori were considered to be a warrior race; the British admired their courage, cunning, chivalry and intuitive skills. However, their experiences were small-scale compared with the vast scope and sustained violence of the First World War. Northern Māori were quick to volunteer in numbers. They were the first to enter training. Approximately 200 Māori men from the far north served overseas in
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World War One.\textsuperscript{156} This represents 28\% of Māori men aged 20–44 years in the region. The total number of Māori volunteers for New Zealand\textsuperscript{157} was equivalent to 24\% of Māori men aged 20–44 years. Thus, the participation of far northern Māori was proportionately more than the average for New Zealand, but possibly slightly less than the representation of participating iwi. Māori whose lands had been confiscated 50 years before chose not to participate (Waikato), or there were few volunteers (Taranaki).\textsuperscript{158} Amongst far northern iwi, the highest participation (numerically) was from the west between, and including, north Hokianga Harbour and Ahipara/Pukepoto. This area, predominantly Te Rarawa with some Te Aupōuri/Ngāti Kūrī at Whangape, contained the most dense Māori population of the region at the start of the war. The people in the east and north of the far north volunteered first; Hokianga joined later.\textsuperscript{159}

The last major war between Māori in the far north was the Ngāpuhi reinforced musket raid by Te Rarawa of northern Te Aupōuri around 1824–5. Following this, lesser scale disputes between Māori were recorded about once a decade, generally over land ownership. Far northern Māori were minimally involved in the Northern War of 1845–46, and not directly in the wars of 1860–72. They were not disinterested; the issue had been discussed in earnest, and the decision not to directly engage was as earnestly taken. From one assembly of Te Rarawa, a missionary who was present reported that although one person said they should take action to get rid of the white people, ultimately ‘They said that the only weapon they intended now and always to

\textsuperscript{156} The data for far northern Māori participation in World War One is taken from Nominal Roll, Deaths and Decorations listings in Pugsley’s \textit{Te Hokowhitu a tu}. Men were identified as coming from the far north based on the addresses of their nominated next of kin.

\textsuperscript{157} There were 2227 men in the Maori Battalion, and 458 Pacific Islanders.


\textsuperscript{159} King, \textit{Whina}, p.71.
use was the word of God’.  

Because title to approximately 43% of the land in the far north had already passed to the Crown or Europeans by 1865, the battles further south did not seem so relevant. ‘In all parts of the district [Mangonui] the people are quiet and well disposed, being so far removed from the rebellious parts of the country they feel little interest in the people of the south’. However, some Māori in the western area of the far north had been involved in armed resistance more recently than those of the rest of the region. Some Te Rarawa at Hokianga had supported Ngāpuhi in the 1898 ‘Hokianga Dog Tax War’. But, it still held true that ‘it would be a generation of young Māori without first hand knowledge of war and untested in the skills of the warrior who would be required to win recognition by emulating the deeds of their ancestors’.  

Far northern Māori followed the general trend in the rest of New Zealand of increased militarism in the early 1900s, and it was a point of pride for Te Aupōuri that they had contributed one who might have been amongst the first Māori to serve overseas: Lancelot Yates who had gone from Te Kao to the Boer War in 1902. Sea scouts had been introduced to their school by headmaster Herbert Rogers – an ex-Naval officer of the Royal Marines, from the Isle of Wight. Pupils were equipped with dummy rifles and military uniforms, and were drilled to such a high standard that early volunteers for World War One adapted to army disciplines easily.

In a way it is surprising that the far northern participation rate was so high; that was not the only course open to them. They had appeared convinced by the peace-making influences of their tupuna Paroa and Panakareao, and early missionaries had worked
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hard to impress on them the evils and privations of war and the advantages of peace.

Further south, while Ngata and his colleagues were activating the traditions of
Tumatauenga, Te Puea was reinforcing those of Tawhiao, prophet of peace. Waikato
was not about to capitulate to the enthusiasm of loyalty to the Crown. They objected
on grounds of past grievances over land confiscation, pacifism and the belief they
owed nothing to the Crown, which had deprived them of much of their land. Yet
far northern Māori, on the whole, were strongly loyal to the Crown. Reminiscing
some time after World War Two, a Te Kao elder questioned ‘Where do we stand
today? I have often been amazed with the number of disloyal Pakeha. At Te Kao you
will never find any signs of disloyalty’.166

The outbreak of World War One had little immediate effect on Hokianga Māori.
However, news of alleged atrocities in Belgium improved the local recruitment rate.
Whina [Cooper] recalled: ‘We identified with the Belgians. Like the Maoris, they
were only a small people, and they were being invaded and mistreated by the
Germans. … Our old people also felt it was up to the Maories to play their part in
defending Aotearoa. Heremia believed that especially. And Peter Buck’.167

Wira Gardiner held that:

in some areas, especially the smaller communities, the enlistment of
many of the eligible men of the community had potentially
disastrous consequences for families and the community at large.
And yet all understood the need for the men of the family to
exercise the right to raise the war trail. It had little to do with
patriotic duty; rather it was the age-old tradition of maintaining the
mana or the status of the family, the hapū and the iwi.168

165 Gardiner, p.22.
166 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.39.
167 King, Whina, p.71. Heremia is Whina’s father. Peter Buck is Te Rangi Hiroa.
168 Gardiner, p.29.
However, in one respect the Māori response to war was different from their traditions. War had not been the exclusive domain of men. For instance, in the far north, Nga-kahu-whero (grand-daughter of Te Rarawa’s eponymous ancestor Tarutaru) went into battle at Waitukupahau and Te Oneroa-a-Tohe, and was at Motuhauri when Moetara and Ngāti Korokoro attacked the pa in May 1833. The main role in which women were permitted to participate overseas during World War One was nursing although, as Figure 53 shows, nurses were overwhelmingly Pākehā.

Figure 53 - New Zealand nurses and medical officers at the New Zealand Stationary Hospital, Wisques, France

ATL 1/2-013478, Returned Services Association (PAColl-5311), 1914.

Besides enlistment, another tangible, early expression of solidarity was the erection of New Zealand’s first World War One Memorial, in Kaitaia. On ‘8 January 1916, barely a fortnight after the evacuation from Gallipoli, … a Maori, L. T. Busby [Leopold or Riapo Puhipi] of Pukepoto in the far north wrote to the Minister of Defence, James Allen, …’ to say that the local community would be erecting the memorial, and inviting a government minister to attend the unveiling. (Riapo’s son, Hamiona, had sailed with A Company on 14 February 1914.) The memorial was

\[169\] Tate, *Nga-Kahu-Whero*. 
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unveiled on 24 March 1916, with Maui Pomare present. The inscription, in both Māori and English, reads:

In loving memory and in honour of our sons and relations both Māori and Pakeha, dead or living from the county of Mangonui who willingly offered to sacrifice their lives to uphold the honour of the King and Empire and for the Glory of God in this terrible war … Splashing through the mountainous waves of the Indian Ocean our brave lads uphold the names of your noble ancestors, seek to avenge the death of your relations that have fallen. God will give victory to the righteous. 170

Chris McLean and Jock Phillips quote this memorial as an example, like others erected later in other parts of the country, which carries two contradictory messages—sadness and pride. In my view, this particular inscription talks more of mana and utu, reputation and reciprocation, the underpinnings of social capital formation that clearly align with the Māori integrated social, political and economic principles. And yet note that the wording says *our* sons uphold the names of *your* ancestors and avenge the death of *your* relations. This was truly a magnanimous gift.

Raymond Firth ‘[linked] the exchange of gifts of all kinds into a single system: gifts given for primarily economic purpose and gifts given for primarily social purposes; gifts given in … everyday life and highly valued *taonga*; gifts given within and between local communities; “good” gifts and “bad” gifts and “good” gifts given to counter “bad” … Delay in returning gifts, combined with the imperative to give more than was received, worked to maintain the relationship, whether in positive or in negative mode, through an imbalance of obligation … Gift exchange forged and maintained social bonds between groups, and was deliberately used for that
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purpose.’ If Māori approached participation in World War One from that perspective, what might they have expected in return?

In 1914 the four Māori members of Parliament were determined to recruit and train a Māori contingent for overseas service to contribute to the British war effort. During the first decade of the new century, a younger and more dynamic group of Māori leaders, particularly members of the Young Māori Party, led the effort. Ngata, Te Rangi Hiroa and Pomare, together with Sir James Carroll, were the founding members of the Native Contingent Committee to organise and supervise the recruitment of Māori soldiers. Whina Cooper recalled that, in his recruitment speech to Te Rarawa ki Hokianga at Waipuna Marae, Pomare explained, ‘Māori should take their share of the fighting to preserve the tradition of their ancestors and help us get a better deal from the Pakeha’. The Native Committee wanted Māori to do more than their share – they wanted them to distinguish themselves in the war in order to show the government that Māori should be treated as full citizens of New Zealand, with the same rights, privileges, and opportunities as Pākehā. In particular, they should be able to borrow money for farming. After the Gallipoli campaign, Te Rangi Hiroa wrote:

> All who have come through the Gallipoli Campaign, where Pakeha and Maori have shared the fatigue, danger, and incessant vigil of the trenches, side by side, recognise that the Maori is a better man than they gave him credit for, and have admitted him to full fellowship and equality.
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171 Metge, 'Returning the Gift', p.332.
172 Gardiner, p.13.
173 King, Whina, p.72.
174 King, Apirana Ngata, p.35.
175 Pugsley, p.44. Note: Pugsley refers to Cowan, p. 15, but this reference is incorrect. Similar sentiments are expressed in J. B. Condliffe, Te Rangi Hiroa: The Life of Sir Peter Buck, Christchurch, 1971, p.136. ‘…the parents and relatives took comfort in the fact that the younger generation had bred true to the fighting instincts of their ancestors. Just as the British troops had learned to respect their Maori opponents in the Maori War of 1862, so the British troops learned both to respect and admire
This expressed less reality than hope. The hope might have been buoyed by words expressed at the time but written much later: ‘The outcome is that when men are given an equal chance, they are in the great things of life very much the same, whether they be white, brown or yellow in skin, and whether they be of high birth or low. We are all built of the same clay, and are all moved by the same spirit’.176

When casualties were heavy, both Ngata and Pomare supported conscription for Māori and Pākehā alike, but Tau Henare, the new member for Northern Māori, opposed it. He argued that if Māori returned soldiers were promised the return of unoccupied confiscated land, the response of those tribes that had held back from participation in the war would be immediate.177 One ideology sought equality, the other sought respect, both sought reciprocity. The tension between the Young Māori Party’s drive for equality and the traditional model of leadership was, in effect, between bridging capital and bonding capital. Accepting conscription would have ‘bridged’ (equalised) the difference between Pākehā and Māori treatment. But tradition was more likely to generate cohesion (bonding) in the Māori battalion.

‘Leadership was … a critical element in the development of a Māori military style. Hereditary and natural leaders led by example rather than command. … Chiefs had to persuade and motivate … Discipline was a matter of respect. The military force was a volunteer one’.178 The government’s extension of the Conscription Act in 1917 to cover Māori, with the specific intention of press-ganging Waikato into service, was a
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move that, in Michael King’s opinion, ‘can only be described as shameful’, running directly counter to traditional military values.179

Gardiner concluded that ‘the process of standing beside Pakeha in their own right had started’.180 This process had been intended by Māori to be a partnership of equals. Māori had intended to fight with the British as equals, not for them as subordinates.

The British had the opposite view, as evidenced by their insistence on Pākehā leadership by command, and the allocation of support rather than front-line roles after Gallipoli. The inviolable assumption of British military superiority prevailed. While the British would acknowledge Māori courage, chivalry and intuitive skills, they could not admit that Māori had any ability to combine, co-ordinate or plan strategically.181

For returning soldiers, Māori rehabilitation was also unequal. ‘In spite of Ngata’s efforts and hopes, when the war ended, the Government refused to help Maori soldiers back into civilian life as it did Pakeha soldiers, paying them money to buy farms, and training them for trades. The country had some way to go before there was full racial equality’.182 In her 1950 thesis, Sheila McClean argued:

> The only scheme put forward was that of Ngata, who wanted blocks earmarked for the settlement of Maori soldiers, but he had decided that this was too much to ask. He had, therefore, decided that the Maoris would set their own land aside to sell to Crown for re-sale to Maori soldiers. At the same time he had asked for financial assistance to the [settling Maori] and instruction in farming and business methods.

> Why Ngata considered it too much to ask for special blocks for the Maoris he did not say. Perhaps he felt certain that the Government would never regard it favourably. He may have believed that the

179 ibid., p.22 quoting Michael King.
180 ibid., p.22.
A gesture of selling land for Māori soldiers was likely to win more support in the direction of finance and special instruction. 183

If Māori war participation is perceived as a gift offering, it is not difficult to speculate why Ngata would not ask for more. He would have expected the gift return to be delayed in time in order that the government could make a generous offering. To ask would have undermined the mana of both giver and receiver. In the event, little came of the Māori rehabilitation schemes. The MHR for northern Māori, Paikea, commented later that only two Māori received assistance and they had European names, 184 reflecting what has been observed elsewhere in this thesis, that often Pākehā-Māori descendants had better access to capital than those of only Māori descent.

If Māori participation in World War One is perceived as traditional gift-exchange, the determination, strength, vitality, and generosity of their gift becomes obvious. However, the gift was under-appreciated and not reciprocated. Whereas recent historians have questioned the national significance of Gallipoli, the surrounding events remain an historic marker of the socio-economic relationship of Māori to Pākehā. The Māori gift to the war effort was substantial, but, in Gardiner’s opinion, ‘In the context of the lengthening shadows of the British Empire, it was probably too much to expect that greater advances could be made’. 185 Probably Ngata thought assistance and opportunities would have to flow first from Britain before they could be passed on. For, as Belich noted, the real surprise is that he negotiated so much from ‘one of the stingiest governments in New Zealand history’ in the difficult economic times of post-war depression. 186

183 McClean, pp.41-2.
184 ibid.
185 Gardiner, p.22.
Christopher Pugsley stated boldly that Māori participation in World War One ‘was important in forcing a recognition of Maori worth on a complacent and unresponsive Pakeha society’. If correct at the time, the notion must have been short-lived. Would Pākehā be ‘forced’ to any view? Clearly the objective had not been met in the inter-war period for:

In 1939 Maori were well aware that the full benefits and privileges of New Zealand citizenship were proving difficult for Maori to obtain. Sir Apirana Ngata ... saw World War Two as an opportunity for Māori to meet their obligations as New Zealand citizens. By offering the ultimate sacrifice as the price of citizenship, they felt that the Crown would be compelled to meet their obligations as partners to the Treaty of Waitangi.

Back in Te Kao, a returned World War One soldier recalled, ‘I found out how going overseas in the war was a great education in itself – knowledge that stood me and others in good stead in the years that followed’. Whereas, a Māori wife said, ‘they were very quiet men when they went away, they looked very different when they returned; they were not the same – shall I say “very active”?’ One can but speculate what that activity might have been, but perhaps it encompassed social, political and economic. Returning to their remote home, where as many had died in the influenza pandemic as on remote battlefields, and the community’s autonomy had been destroyed, there was a crying need for activity. Without rehabilitation assistance, most returning servicemen reverted to the gum industry, which enjoyed a brief recovery following the war. Others invested in commercial fishing vessels. But their economic situation would deteriorate before a solution in the form of farming schemes was promoted.
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190 Following the death of the Yates couple, the land they owned was sold to Pākehā. The land they had leased, which was vested in the Tokerau Māori Land Board, was leased to non-Māori. See Chapter 6.
Formation of formal and informal economies

World War One marked the transition between meat farming and the dominance of dairying in New Zealand, and between diverse use of natural resources and land use converging on production of dairy products for the British market. Timber and flax had passed their peaks; gum faltered during the war, recovered briefly then collapsed, removing a range of entrepreneurial opportunities. Co-operative dairy companies, with factory manufacturing, formalised farming in a new way. Changes in how Māori related to the Pākehā economy accompanied the structural changes. This is an appropriate point at which to retrace the formalisation process.

Philip Harding and Richard Jenkins argued, that there are two long-term, interconnected but distinct processes that lie behind the difference between formality and informality. First is the development of literacy, being a necessary condition of the second, which is the rise of bureaucracy; ‘each was important to the gradual definition and expansion of formal social relations and institutions’. Figure 54 formulates a schematic (not specific to New Zealand) of formal and informal economy formation, correlating transitional stages with the two economic revolutions referred to in Chapter 1. Preliterate societies were still regulated. Behaviour that did not conform was antisocial.

Although the governing British brought their literacy with them, bureaucracy and regulation took time to implement. As New Zealand’s economy became more formalised and established, and the country became more regulated, activities
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originating in what is now termed the informal economy became differentiated. The first differentiation was on the basis of scale, with smaller enterprises, such as self-employed gumdigging, staying in the informal sector and larger enterprises, such as merchant/traders, migrating out. The second differentiation was on the basis of legality. Illegal activity would likely escape the visibility of the formalised economy and become ‘hidden’. The process of differentiation rendered the informal sector a mere shadow of its former self (in that activity had migrated from informal to formal), but not a shadow of the formal economy. Rather, the formal, the irregular and the criminal were created by regulation and definition, and expanded as a consequence.

The regulatory processes that contributed to the formation of the formal economy further differentiated the informal economy, because there remained choices for individuals, households and firms between acceptance or rejection of, or resistance to, the new regime. Irregular sector activities are responses to taxes and other forms of control over the use of resources. Tobacco cropping was part of the formal economy if taxes were paid, but part of the irregular sector if taxes were avoided. Resistance and rejection (such as breaches of launch and vehicle regulations, gambling, illegal horse-racing and sale of alcohol to Māori) bolstered the irregular and criminal sectors, which became more distinguishable by growth in size.

How significant these sectors were is impossible to gauge because the practices were concealed. However, as already noted, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Local raconteurs hint at gambling dens hidden behind wine shops on the gumfields, fish sold on the black market from unregistered boats, use of non-
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regulation fish net sizes or when farm development schemes discouraged fishing, but there is no paper trail.

**Figure 54 - Hypothetical history of formation of formal and informal economies**

The choice for informal economy participants was not so much a case of opting out of the formal economy but of choosing whether or not to opt in. Even if individuals wanted to opt in, there could be obstacles. Understanding the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy during the critical period of transformation, 1860-1940, depends on understanding the interplay between formal and informal economies. The knowledge and skills that enhanced human capital in the Māori economic system did not always match those valued in the Pākehā system, and social capital was based on different social relationship structures. The Institute of Policy Studies at Victoria University of Wellington has placed considerable emphasis on social capital, deriving from social relationships established in the voluntary sector, supporting business activities. The voluntary sector is part of the informal sector of the informal economy. Thus, social capital provides one of the links between informal and formal
economies. However, as Table 8 indicates, social capital can also be built up and drawn down in the formal economy and other sectors of the informal economy – in the illegal sector by associations between individuals operating outside the law; in the irregular sector by associations that encourage cash-in-hand work; and in the household sector where goods and services are exchanged between friends and family on a reciprocal basis. The types of social relationships Māori formed would affect their relationship to the Pākehā economy.

**Table 8 - Types of relationship and sector in which made**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illegal sector</th>
<th>Formal economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mafia, gangs, ex-prison inmates</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political/Government - party membership, MWWL, Young Māori party, Kotahitanga, Kingitanga</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based - Settlers’ societies, cultural groups e.g. Caledonian &amp; Dalmatian, service clubs, sports clubs, lodges, churches, schools, marae, interest groups</td>
<td>Informal/Voluntary sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin &amp; kith - Whānau/family, relations/hapū/iwi, adoption, friends, trusted associates</td>
<td>Household sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Not only is there a link between the informal economy and social capital, but also these two theoretical concepts correspond closely with what Denoon referred to having overlooked – indigenous economic principles and solidarity. Principles and solidarity could be invoked to protect against market competition; they could also be used to manage demand.¹⁹⁴ Principles, solidarity, managing demand, engagement and

competition were some of a range of options Māori used to relate to the Pākehā economy through the study period.

**Conclusions**

From whaling, flax and timber, through commercial fishing and the transition from agriculture to pastoral farming, the immediacy and extent of engagement of far northern Māori in the Pākehā economy is evident. The desire to secure trade and to establish businesses first noticed in their whaling enterprises applied to other economic endeavours. There was also enthusiasm for literacy and horses, both for their step-change advantages. These were not merely faddish forays into novel pastimes. Engagement with economic opportunities appears to have been the same well-considered, long-term commitment that Hazel Petrie found for the ownership of flourmills and ships by iwi further south and in earlier times. In both cases, the level of Māori participation in transport linkages epitomises initiatives taken to engage with the Pākehā economy.

Although they were responsive to a variety of possibilities, the opportunities Māori grasped were dictated to some extent by geography and social context. Those near the ports of Mangonui and Hokianga had greater opportunities to provision ships. They also engaged more easily in the timber trade once the first sawyer/traders settled amongst them. The social basis of trade was reinforced by incorporation of the sawyers, by marriage, into the community, and this social network then underpinned gum trading in later decades. Those Māori associated with mission stations were encouraged to engage in wheat cultivation and pastoral farming, in preference to trading with sawyers, and consequently developed pastoral farming earlier.
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society’, in which hunter-gatherers were able to satisfy limited demands for clothing, housing or other physical capital. Marshall Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, Chicago, 1972; Butlin, p.72.
For most of the nineteenth century, with the exception of land ‘sales’, the nature of the economic exchange between Māori and Pākehā was fully consistent with both Māori traditional gift exchange between members of a self-sustaining community, and the barter and neighbour-help system of rural England and Europe. The agrarian economy was first, foremost and essentially informal and socially based. It is not accurate to say that Māori were integrated into capitalism in farming until towards the end of the nineteenth century because, while they still retained land, the means of production was under their control and could be managed in a non-capitalist manner. On their own land, they worked for themselves, rather than as paid labour, and the far northern economy was not highly monetised.

Although Māori were encouraged to develop an agricultural economy, European settlers quickly became self-sufficient. When ships’ provisioning opportunities diminished, an established addiction to sugar, nicotine and alcohol, the increasing adoption of European-style clothing and tools, and the inability to produce what they consumed themselves, together with other factors, adversely affected the trade balance and health of Māori. In direct contrast to agriculture, the gum market was neither tied to, nor constrained by, local population size or wealth, as the product was exported to a seemingly unlimited international market until early in the twentieth century.

Once money was needed, and was not reliably available from agriculture in the second half of the nineteenth century, Māori energies were increasingly diverted to the more stable industries of timber, flax and gum. Vegetable and grain cropping for market reduced accordingly, also as a result of land loss. Large-scale flax and timber harvesting crowded out traditional flax dressing, forest-based food sources and
associated tool-making skills. Increasing adoption of European-style clothing crowded out traditional garment-making. Participation of adults in extractive industries crowded out communal activities such as agriculture and the annual shark hunt. Children’s participation in gum digging crowded out education. Additionally, Māori were crowded out of traditional and commercial fishing by regulation and land schemes, and possibly sheep farming by individualisation of titles. In contrast, World War One opened a new opportunity for a once-redundant occupation – the warrior.

Empirically, war is about control of resources – the fundamentals of any economic system. Imperially, the war cry might be to fight for freedom, ‘for God, for King and for Country’, but that can be freedom of access to and control over resources, as well as personal freedom. British and Māori ideologies were very similar – mana and utu are apt terms for both. Just as the Native Contingent Committee wanted Māori to do more than their share of fighting, so New Zealand’s leadership wanted as much of all its citizens. Belich quoted James Allen’s ‘We have a higher aim [than Australia and Canada], a higher purpose, and I hope at the end of the war we shall reap a higher reward’. Is that not mana and utu (reputation and reciprocation)? Any difference lay in the extent to which the leaderships of each group were prepared to lobby those from whom they sought economic reciprocation. Māori held back out of a cultural assumption that to ask would reduce the mana of both parties, whereas the New Zealand leadership knew the British protocols of assertive lobbying. The contradiction is that the New Zealand government denied Māori the very reciprocation it sought from Britain – mana and utu – respect and reciprocal obligation to provide economic assistance and opportunities.

World War One marked a transition from meat farming to the dominance of dairying. Nationally, sheep held an early advantage in their dual products of wool and meat, until refrigerated shipping broke through the distance barrier for perishables, thus expanding markets for meat and dairy products. Far northern Māori shifted their farming focus from sheep to dairy as individually owned and operated land-holding, and targeted funding favoured dairying, and the gum industry declined.\textsuperscript{196} Emergence of dairying also marked a change from diverse resource use to converging land use, product and market mix, and more formalised farming practices, institutions and economy as Chapter 6 explains. In the formalising process, the informal economy became more clearly demarcated.

\textsuperscript{196} In some areas individualisation of title preceded dairying, for instance at Pawarenga; in other places, such as Tē Kao, dairying preceded title changes.
Chapter 6 – Rural renaissance revisited

In the interwar years, the economic situation was made more difficult for the north than for other parts of the country by abrupt failure of the gum industry in 1926. Social connections became ever more important to survival. The old sawyer/trader descent network supported Māori migrating from the gumfield into motorised transport ventures. The co-operative dairy movement introduced new network connections within the communities that initiated the four dairy factories. Each community had different social characteristics, some favouring Māori involvement in dairying more than others. There were individuals, new ‘experts’, who adopted a bridging role. Ordained Maori clergy acted as individual bridges to Pākehā systems. Dr. G. M. Smith, Surgeon Superintendent to Rawene Hospital, was heavily involved in Māori health and economic issues in the Hokianga from 1914 to 1948 (Chapter 5). Some Native School teachers linked remote Māori communities with Pākehā systems. Judge Acheson of the Native Land Court, and president of the Tokerau Maori Land Board from 1924 to 1943, understood the function of bridging in facilitating negotiations between Māori and the Pākehā economic system. When asked, by the Commissioner investigating the Native Department in 1934, if European control of farm development could be effective for Māori, he responded, ‘It is only partly effective and it is always on a very insecure basis … I advise a bridge between [European experts and advisors] and the Maoris. … There must be a bridge, but they must not be on one side of the stream and the Maori on the other.’¹ Dr Smith’s initiation of economic activity in the Hokianga in the 1920s, and Māori acceptance of

¹ F. O. V. Acheson evidence given at Auckland in, Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, p.327.
his leadership, had their counterparts in Acheson’s efforts with Te Kao’s dairy scheme. In calling Acheson ‘the missionary judge’, clearly Māori saw this type of role as a replication of early Pākehā interventions in their district.

Failure of the gum industry coincided with the beginning of a dramatic decrease in agricultural employment. The meat trade declined steeply, after the brief hiatus of World War One, as the country headed into depression. For Māori displaced from these industries, alternative sources of income were few, but might be found in government-sponsored and controlled relief or public works, or Maori Affairs’ farm projects, such as Ngataki. Farm labouring still involved a personal element of relationship between Māori and the Pākehā economy. But industrial labouring, public works’ employment and unemployment relief could be increasingly depersonalised forms of work, except where these were tribally organised. Whereas a degree of independence had been maintained with agricultural and pastoral economic activities, supplemented by transient labouring and gum digging into the late 1920s, displacement from land, income sources and social structures, as well as lack of assistance to soldiers returning from the war, increased Māori dependence on the Pākehā economy.

Increased dependence translated to decreased voice and choice for Māori in the Pākehā economic policies and practices after the war. Into this breach stepped Ratana, whose aspirations for a fair society coincided with Michael Savage’s ideas of a welfare state, and a union of convenience was forged between them. In contrast, Ngata, who favoured free enterprise, strongly supported Māori enlistment for war on the basis that, by serving King and country, Māori would create an obligation on the

2 A term used in the far north. Personal communication Margaret Mutu.
Crown, and could thenceforth be assured of respect, and equality with Pākehā.\footnote{Durie, p.5.} Far northern Māori had been among the first to offer their services in World War One as a matter of mana and utu. Judging by initiatives taken in earlier businesses, some would have preferred the path of free enterprise to Ratana’s aspirations. But against mounting odds, only a small minority would be able to maintain the self-supporting land-based occupations that Ngata promoted. An even smaller number ran their own businesses.

Each pathway to improved economic engagement had its obstacles. The 1935 Labour government’s transport consolidation policies eliminated many small operators. Dairy co-operatives progressively merged, from 1925, into centres of Pākehā concentration, diluting Māori participation and eliminating their voice from boards of directors. Farming became less labour- and more capital-intensive, increasing agricultural unemployment and diminishing the ability of Māori to participate because of limited access to financial capital. Dr. Smith and Judge Acheson fell out with their respective authorities; in the authorities’ eyes the bridges had crossed to the far side of the stream.

Graham Butterworth challenged interpretations of Māori history, such as those of Firth\footnote{Firth, \textit{Economics of the New Zealand Maori}.} and Sorrenson,\footnote{Sorrenson, \textit{Maori and European since 1870}.} which claimed that a revival occurred in the late nineteenth century.\footnote{Butterworth, ‘Rural Maori Renaissance?’} Sorrenson had argued that population recovery correlated with the timing of the Native Land Court processes, Northland recovering earlier than other parts of the country. From its nadir in 1896, the far north’s Māori population had increased 70% by 1921. From 1896 to 1940 the increase was 140%. Butterworth contended that a
revival, in the form of a ‘rural renaissance’, was from 1920 onwards and was more short-lived than the others claimed. His argument was based not only on improvement in standards of living, but also on revival in Māori artistic forms, carved meeting houses being the most tangible. In a footnote, Butterworth pointed to the differing experience of North Auckland. Although the far north’s population was recovering, revival did not extend to living conditions. Judge Acheson observed that in 1925 ‘the Tokerau Maoris were the most neglected section of the Maoris in New Zealand and they became all the more neglected the further north you went’.8

For the far north, the first four decades of the twentieth century were also notable for lack of far northern Māori professionals and for little building. One exception was the meetinghouse partly built in conjunction with Te Kao’s scheme, but not completed until 1941; another was Te Paatū’s whare matua, Mataara, started in 1940 and completed in 1941. The one vocation in which Māori had been able to persist was priesthood, although their places at St John’s theological college were capped at ten a year, and the economic influence of churches was diminishing. One ordained man obtained his Licentiate in Theology, a few Māori had started teaching and nursing, but the far north’s first University graduate was not capped until 1944. These were the earliest indicators of a renaissance that would emerge after World War Two. Such a delay in economic recovery was not for want of aspirations or effort on the part of far northern Māori, as this chapter will show.

Chapter 3 explained links between the institutions of Anglican Church and government, and characteristics in common between far northern iwi and Ngāti Porou. In this chapter, far northern, Ngāti Porou and Hokianga farming activities are

8 Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, pp.281, 290-91.
compared. Arguably, one of the most effective strategies for connecting Māori with the Pākehā economy was incorporation of European immigrants by marriage into local families.9 Some of the earliest examples formed the Eastern Network, discussed in Chapter 4. As well as trading, store and hospitality businesses, Network members provided important transport links to the economy for Māori, with their bullock teams and harbour launches, discussed in Chapter 5, and then as bus operators. Use of bullocks and motorised transport overlapped by at least a decade. In the late 1920s, Nopera Arano had acquired a lorry for carrying gum and other freight where suitable roads became available, but bullocks worked on into the 1930s.

**Buses – the new waka**

Coastal shipping services to the north started to face competition from rail and road transport in the second decade of the twentieth century. In 1914 the railway arrived in Kaikohe from Otiria and Whangarei, the section to Okaihau was completed in 1926 but the rails reached no further north than Rangiahua, when construction was stopped in favour of road. Rail and road competition south of Maungataniwha resulted in contraction of coastal shipping to the whole of the north, before roads were constructed around remote harbours. In the early part of the twentieth century, the poor state of New Zealand’s roads prevented road motor services from becoming very widespread, particularly in rural areas, and even more particularly in the far north. From about 1910 some hardy pioneers started establishing services over the country’s few, difficult roads. The far north lagged a decade behind until metalling of roads improved the small network from the port at Mangonui through the fertile Oruru valley to Victoria Valley, and from Awanui to Kaitaia.

---

9 Whether or not the strategy was ‘successful’ depends on the basis of measurement of success, i.e. whether it was profitable for the individual or the collective.
From the early 1920s, after World War One and its attendant technological advances for motor vehicles, transport services started to increase. A motorised passenger service from Mangonui, via the east coast, operated through Kaeo and south by about 1920, but the road was unpredictable. The western districts were provided with a more direct route through the Mangamuka Gorge in the Maungataniwha range in 1922, but wash outs, slips and mud regularly accompanied rain. The largest operators by the late 1920s were the centrally based Pākehā-owned companies of Taaffe (Kaitaia) and Hutley (Awanui). Taaffe had started with a taxi service in Kaitaia. After he expanded into buses, one of the two long-serving replacement taxi drivers was Fred Hopa.

Failure of the gum industry, followed closely by the depression of 1929-35, suppressed discretionary spending on passenger transport. Parengarenga lost its coastal passenger service in 1931, when its road access to the nearest town 45 miles away was still barely formed and few, if any, Māori owned cars that could withstand the distance. The only transport service was Te Kao dairy scheme’s thrice-weekly cream truck, which was licensed to carry a small number of passengers. To meet demand, a network of transporters, based on the Eastern Network, emerged to service Parengarenga and Whangape. The network evolved and enlarged, once roading had been developed, into several bus companies, principal amongst which was Murray Motors. J. Murray (Mare) operated a mail and goods service. By 1938 W. Petricevich, the founder of Petricevich Motors, was based at Te Hapua; he had married Ngamatehuiurua Mare. In 1940 A. Murray was a motor proprietor at

---

10 Parker, p.39.
11 Keith Parker, Kaitaia: A Nostalgic Glimpse at the 1940s, Kaitaia, 1994, p.144.
Pawarenga and Sonny Murray had a taxi at Whangape.\textsuperscript{13} When Tom Murray (Tame Mare) moved from Te Hapua to Ngataki in 1938, he swapped his truck for his brother’s Chevrolet car, complete with licence to carry passengers.\textsuperscript{14}

**Figure 55 - Some connections between launch- and bus-owning families**

Charlie Hutley pointed out that ‘all the big passenger proprietors of the county started up north or moved down from the gumfields’. The Taaffes were at Houhora, the Hutleys started transport at Waihopo, Jack Walsh moved from Houhora to start at Ahipara and ‘Walter Petricevich, a Waihopo schoolboy, started on Te Kao transport and then moved to Kaitaia to become a big operator’.\textsuperscript{15} Nopera Arano and Ralph Berghan started on the gumfields. Quite probably other Māori who operated bullock teams on the gumfields also continued carrying off the fields.

Before the mid-1920s there was almost no barrier to entry to carrying, other than the capital cost. After this time, commercial carriers were required to apply for licences

\textsuperscript{13} Wise’s NZPO Directories, Auckland City Library.

\textsuperscript{14} Joe Murray to Registrar, Native Department, Auckland, 23 December 1938, BAAI 1030 361e, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{15} Reminiscences of Charlie Hutley, an early carrier, Northland Age, 6 June 1981.
under the Motor Omnibus Traffic Act of 1926 and, later, the Transport Licensing Act of 1931. The licensing system was intended to protect New Zealand Railways from predatory competition; the government had invested too much in rail infrastructure to tolerate competition from road transport. Extant operators benefited by being granted licences, which then acquired considerable commercial value. While the system protected existing operators from competition, it also restricted growth aspirations they might have had if those aspirations involved encroaching on another operator’s territory; the usual avenue was to buy the other operator’s licence.

School buses, owned by the Education Department and private contractors, started operating from 1924, on the principle of taking children to school instead of taking schools to the children. Railways Road Services, the road transport arm of government-owned New Zealand Rail, became a giant countrywide operator under the nationalisation policies of the first Labour government, after 1935, but did not reach the far north until 1940. Rail extended no further than Okaihau. Thus, during the study period, far northern operators were spared the weighty challenges from the state-owned operator, although New Zealand Rail would still oppose

---

16 Jon Addison, *A History of School Buses*, Wellington, 1977, p.19. Operating life of buses on the beach run was 12 months. The beach was still a more reliable road than inland tracks.

17 *ibid.*, pp.5-6. Under the Education Act of 1877, education became compulsory for Pākehā children, although it was limited to children living within 2 miles of a school. For Māori children, compulsory school attendance was introduced by the School Attendance act 1894. The distance became the limit beyond which children were eligible to use school buses, when they were introduced. In 1886, the law had been changed to make education compulsory for children living within 2 miles of a railway, although that legislation was never relevant to the far north.

18 Tracks were laid as far as Rangiahua in 1922, with completion scheduled for 1925, but work was halted and manpower diverted to other districts. It appears that the then MHR, Allen Bell, did a deal for improved roading instead, with the result that neither happened.
(usually unsuccessfully) transport competition between the railhead and Moerewa meat works.

Another network of far northern bus operators was formed by the now-familiar process of incorporating newly arrived Pākehā, by marriage, into local Māori families. The buses served the communities in which they lived. In the late 1920s, Ralph Berghan, descended from one of the first Mangonui Pākehā sawyers, held a licence for an Ahipara-to-Kaitaia bus run, including the school bus to Pukenpoto. In 1933 Berghan’s licence was transferred to J. T. (Jack) Walsh, whose run was extended to include Awanui. Walsh had married Berghan’s niece Maata Davis (the Carnival Queen of 1926; of Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu and Tainui descent). The other of the two bullock-team owners, Nopera Arano (Noble Allen), had acquired a motor lorry by 1931, although he continued to work the bullocks on the steep and difficult Ahipara Hill road. F. J. Silva, descended from a Portuguese whaler who deserted his ship in Mangonui in 1866 and married a local Māori woman, operated a passenger service to Kaitaia through the eastern Oruru, Peria and Victoria valleys.

A mix of waterborne and road transport persisted in Hokianga. On the harbour, W. P. Leef, descended from an early sawyer and some of the leading Ngāpuhi and Te Roroa chiefs in the Hokianga, operated a mail and passenger service from Kohukohu to Panguru and Mitimiti. The mail contract was worth £23 a year. In Whangape, the Enwright family became related to the Peri (Perry) family, and operated a car service from Pawarenga Post Office to Broadwood. The licence was later transferred to

---

19 James Berghan married to Ngāpuhi Chief Ururoa’s daughter Turikatuku.
20 Entry 25/1/123, 16 August 1933, Minute Book of Number 1 District Licensing Authority, BAAD 5638 1a, 1932-33, ANZA.
21 BADD 10825 6a, 1929-32, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
22 Entry dated 28 February 1935, Minute Book of Number 1 District Licensing Authority, BAAD 5638 2b, December 1934 – July 1935, p. 75; BAAD 5638 1c, May – July 1934, p. 9, ANZA.
Laura and Bill Peri, who extended the run through to Mangamuka, and later still from Pawarenga to Kaitaia via Broadwood and Herekino. Three sons of newcomers John and Ann Bowman married into the Berghan and Yates families, and one operated a cream run with passengers between their base at Herekino and Kaitaia.23

Dairying in the north spawned a third set of operators, usually suppliers themselves. These included cream contractors, who carried the odd passenger in their cab, such as Puckey Taramoeroa who took over the cream contract from Mrs Pirimona at Paparoa,24 Kamira Cook on the Mangamuka-Motukaraka route,25 and the cream truck run by the Tokerau Māori Land Board as part of the Te Kao dairy scheme, which started in 1926. The first driver was Tiriki Wiki.26 At Karikari, ‘Wäta … cart[ed] cream on wagons and horses. He would start at Whakapouaka and go as far as Aurere’.27

Some truck owner-operators carried only freight and livestock. By 1933, S. Himiona had been operating two vehicles for 15 years on the Kohukohu, Motukaraka, Whangape, Waihou, Mangamuka route, and had been carting pigs for four years.28 In 1934 the Kapa brothers were granted an all-class, whole-county licence for road construction material.29 New Zealand Rail objected to any licences for carriage further south than the Okaihau railhead, but the licensing authority tended to overlook

---

23 Minute Book of Number 1 District Licensing Authority, BAAD 5638 1c, May – July 1934, p. 160, ANZA.
24 Puckey Taramoeroa to Secretary Kaitaia Co-op Dairy Co., 20 March 1930, File 235, Far North Regional Museum.
25 Entry 25/1/96, 24 January 1934, Minute Book of Number 1 District Licensing Authority, BAAD 5638 1b Vol. 2, 1933-34, ANZA.
26 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.42.
27 Matiu and Mutu, p.121.
28 Entry 25/1/129, 16 August 1933, Minute Book of Number 1 District Licensing Authority, BAAD 5638 1a, 1932-33, ANZA.
29 Entry 25/1/202, 24 January 1934, Minute Book of Number 1 District Licensing Authority, BAAD 5638 1b Vol. 2, 1933-34, ANZA.
this objection in favour of sparing distress to livestock being carried to the meat works at Moerewa, a short distance beyond.

People were entitled to carry their own products, livestock and freight without a licence. No doubt boundaries (between formal and informal economies) became blurred when favours were returned as neighbour-help in a close community concerned with conserving resources. But with the advent of road and vehicle regulations came enforcement. If the list of authorised operations is long, the list of prosecutions for all manner of breaches, by Pākehā and Māori road users, is extensive. Typically charges related to plying for hire or carrying passengers or freight without a licence, carrying a load in excess of that authorised for the class of road, expired licences, unregistered vehicles, failing to display registration plates, inadequate brakes or non-working lamps.30 Breaches of these types, if undetected, reduced transaction costs compared with strict compliance, and gained entry to an otherwise restricted business. Perhaps police enthusiasm for enforcement arose because road users were far more accessible or numerous than their bullock and boat-using predecessors. One incident that exemplifies an excessive enthusiasm, and which might well have encouraged further disregard of regulations, was a horse rider charged with failing to keep to the left while passing another horse being ridden in the opposite direction!31 Whereas it was noted earlier that restricted access to finance and knowledge have been correlated with participation in the informal economy (whether as cause or effect or a self-perpetuating cycle), discriminatory or over-regulation has been identified as a cause. There must be some reciprocal benefit from regulation to induce compliance.

30 BADD 10825 6a, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
31 Entry dated 4 February 1918, BAFO 10825 2a, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
The number and range of licences issued to motor transport operators of Māori
descent indicates continuation of that commercial drive that was evident in whaling
and fishing, in the gum industry and farming. But initiatives in transport were
eventually constrained by regulation and encountered a political obstacle. War
measures in 1940 called for consolidation of transport, particularly on main routes. In
this year a plethora of individual carriage licences was amalgamated in two transport
firms, Kaitaia Transport Ltd and the Northern Co-operative Carrying Association, the
latter including the Kaitaia Dairy Company. Both transport firms were registered
companies with shareholders, amongst whom was Jack Walsh.32 New Zealand Rail
Road Services bought the two main passenger-carrying companies. Smaller operators
continued to serve outlying areas but, as roading improved, larger carriers
increasingly displaced them. Māori dairy farmers were indirect shareholders in the
Northern Co-operative Carrying Association by virtue of their shareholding in the
Kaitaia Dairy Company, and they were users of the service when goods were
delivered to their farms and dairy products were uplifted. Just as far northern Māori
had been early entrants to pastoral farming, fostered by missionaries, so they
participated in dairying when the four factories started between 1901 and 1910.

Dairying, drainage and roading

From early European settlement, some farmers in the far north produced more milk,
butter and cheese than their own families’ needs, and sold to settlers, itinerants, and
ships. New Zealand’s earliest commercial dairyman, Rawiri Taiwhanga, whose skills
had been honed in the same Waimate forge as the far north’s missionary settlers, set
the example.33 While small amounts of butter were exported from Mangonui port in

32 Parker, Kaitaia 1940s, p.145.
33 Orange, Taiwhanga, Hirini Rawiri 1832/1833?- 1890.
1860 and from 1869-84, technology advances later in the century enabled dairying on a commercial scale. Replacement of sailing ships by steamers compressed time and distance to New Zealand’s British market; refrigeration (1882) suspended despoliation of perishables; centrifugal separators (1885) revolutionised production and processing, and the use of fertilisers (after Kempthorne and Prosser started manufacturing superphosphate at their Westfield, Auckland, plant in 1887) improved soil fertility and livestock land-loading.

This section of the chapter considers dairy farming; the next section deals with co-operative dairy companies as institutions. Farm schemes for the northernmost communities of Te Kao and Te Hapua are emphasised because they used two specific new institutional forms of relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy (community and unemployment schemes); other remote communities at Karikari and Whangape have different stories to tell. Panguru is covered in a comparison of farm schemes. Because it is not possible, within the constraints of this thesis, to explore all examples, those with differentiating factors have been selected.

To bring greater acreages into pasture, the government subsidised ambitious drainage schemes from around 1910 through to and beyond 1940. During World War One, Dalmatians were directed to work on far northern schemes. When Dalmatians were released, after the war, Māori worked on the drains, even though their traditional inland-waterway eel habitats were being destroyed in the process. Pre-contact, far northern Māori had modified the swampscape with extensive drainage systems and

---

35 Greer, p.6.
36 Cross, ed., p.148.
eel weirs to improve the efficiency of the harvest. Pākehā caught eels also, but did not regard them as a delicacy.

Figure 57 - Drain diggers Motutangi Swamp, 1934

Pastureland for Māori-owned farms was increased in some areas by the drainage schemes, but it appears that Māori interests were a secondary consideration. A group at Pukepoto sewed English grass pastures after a 1911 drainage scheme. Over the next two decades deforestation of the hills above, and larger-volume drains from Pākehā settlers’ farms upstream, caused more rapid runoff in times of high rainfall. A stop-bank was constructed in the mid-1930s to compensate, and after this project the lower-lying Pukepoto farms received backflow in high floods and waters receded less rapidly. The Pukepoto farmers petitioned Savage, Minister of Native Affairs, saying that their land had been ‘classified and rated by the Drainage Department as fully

---

38 It would not be until the mid-1970s that an export industry in eels for the Japanese table would develop. 'The Big Eel Hunt', *The Northlander*, 17, 1976, pp.21-5.
drained and it is impossible to meet such a liability’, because the grass had been killed
and the land was useless for grazing or cropping.\(^{39}\) A Native Department Supervisor,
T. T. Ropiha, agreed with the causes, but because the stop-bank had been erected on
Crown land and a decision made by the Court of Appeal indicated that no claim
would lie against the Crown, he took the matter no further.\(^{40}\) An engineering report
written some 18 months later disagreed with the causes claimed by Māori, and
concluded that because the land was free from water at normal times, ‘there must be
material benefit to the … Native lands’.\(^{41}\) However, the Public Works Department
was more responsive to an approach from European settlers over the same issue, and
a new outlet to Waipapakauri was subsequently constructed.\(^{42}\) Official and settler
attitudes were often disparaging, and the thorny issue of non-payment of rates
persisted. Some Pākehā settlers successfully took a case to the courts for
compensation for lands affected by the Whangatane spillway construction. But when
Māori made the same case a few months later, some settlers accused them of being
greedy, arguing that they had benefited. In the event, the Māori claimants were
awarded 60% of the Pākehā compensation rate.\(^{43}\)

A second landscape modification induced by dairying was much-improved roading.
Demand also came from the perceived link between roading and economic growth,
and from post-war development of motorised transport. But dairying was the specific
economic justification for expenditure. Factory production required daily haulage of

\(^{39}\) Hehi Wiremu and others, of Pukepoto, to Minister Native Affairs, [unspecified date in] 1936, AATE
A1003 509a, ANZA.

\(^{40}\) T. T. Ropiha to Registrar, Native Department, Auckland, 13 October 1936, AATE A1003 509a,
ANZA.

\(^{41}\) J. W. Bussellmann, Assistant Engineer, Kaitaia, to District Engineer, Public Works Department,
Whangarei, 3 November 1937, AATE A1003 509a, ANZA.

\(^{42}\) Under-Secretary, Department of Lands and Survey, Wellington, to Under-Secretary, Native
Department, Wellington, 7 January 1937, AATE A1003 509a, ANZA.

\(^{43}\) F. Holder, As We Were in Kaitaia, Whangarei, 1952, p.44.
milk from farm to factory throughout the season – from the muddy end of winter, through summer, and well into the next rainy season.

Roading proceeded first for the purpose of serving Pākehā settlements and farmers. Māori who lived in these vicinities also gained better access to the dairy factory. Outlying Māori farms had a longer wait. In 1935, Pakete Waitaia, one of the owners of the Motuti Metal Quarry at Whakarapa, complained that she had arranged with the Public Works Department that metal could be taken, free of royalty, for metalling the Motuti and Tautehere roads, provided proper road access was also given to Panguru. The metal was taken for a number of years, no royalty was paid, and the road to Panguru was not constructed. The assistant engineer denied knowledge of the arrangement and recommended that the through-route be left in abeyance until justified by any further development and increase in the production of the area. It seems that in this remote area productivity was to precede roads, whereas in settler areas roads were required to enhance productivity! The District Engineer recommended that the Native Department pay one-third because the road would give ‘purely Native access’. But even the remote areas found an enthusiastic ally in one Public Works engineer, Henry Thompson. Thompson did not shy from pushing bureaucratic bounds to build roads. He was not beyond building the road along the most obvious route and getting permission later – through surveys and negotiating with landowners, be they

44 District Engineer, Whangarei, to Assistant Engineer Okaihau, 18 November 1935, AATE A1003/935a 18/2/297, ANZA.
45 Assistant Engineer, Okaihau, to District Engineer, Whangarei, 1 February 1936, AATE A1003/935a 18/2/297, ANZA.
46 District Engineer, Whangarei, to Permanent Head, Public Works Department, Wellington, 8 February 1936, AATE A1003/935a 18/2/297, ANZA.
47 Son of William and Elizabeth Thompson, settlers in Victoria Valley.
European, Māori or even the Crown.\textsuperscript{48} If funding seemed under threat, he would push his labour force to form a useable road before the anticipated curtailment of funds, counting on the inevitable delay in communications between his Kaitaia base, the Whangarei office through which all communications passed, and the Public Works head office in Wellington.\textsuperscript{49} Māori were employed in road construction but, where the roads were deemed to be serving an exclusively Māori population, they were often expected to work for half wages.\textsuperscript{50} Te Hapua’s refusal to accept such a proposition was supported by Thompson, who explained to his departmental superiors that all they had to live on was precarious earnings from gum and road work.

During the depressed inter-war years, road works absorbed many unemployed. Work was keenly contested, and inevitably in these circumstances discrimination occurred. The Public Works Department tried to ensure that most needed roads were prioritised over roads in the locality of an unemployed population. If the latter was suspected, then Māori were to be moved to approved road schemes. However, there was a countervailing preference to employ local Māori on roads in the vicinity of their kainga rather than to bring in outsiders – be they Māori from other places, British or Dalmatian. Men with large families were given priority for employment over single men.\textsuperscript{51} Political strings were strummed – two Waipapakauri men wrote to MHR Tau Henare reminding him they had kept their promise of voting for him in 1928; they

\textsuperscript{48} Exchanges between Thompson, District Engineer, Whangarei, Engineer in Chief and Under-Secretary Public Works, 1 May, 11 June and 2 July 1929, AATE A1003 986a 18/4/230, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{49} Thompson to District Engineer, 9 March 1928, AATE A1003 986a 18/4/230, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{50} For instance, Te Hapua-Waitiki Landing, Whangape and Rotokakahi roads; Engineer in Chief Wellington, to District Engineer, Whangarei, Public Works, AATE A1003 986a 18/4/230, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{51} Waipapakauri-Te Kao road, Public Works Department, May 1926 – March 1929, AATE A1003 986a 18/4/230, ANZA.
needed relief work: ‘A large number of Ratanites have obtained employment and we ask to be given the same opportunities’. 52

Poor road conditions at the start of the century dictated that dairy factories be established in separated far northern settlements. Oruru-Fairburns 53 started in 1901, Kaitaia and Motukaraka in 1908, and Herekino in 1910. Following road improvements Herekino amalgamated with Kaitaia (by then at Awanui) in 1927 and Oruru joined them in 1952. For the Hokianga dairy factory at Motukaraka, the river was the road; it was not until 1957 that the roads were of a sufficient quality to warrant amalgamation with the Bay of Islands, Kaikohe, Whangaroa and Waimamaku companies, although the closing of the Motukaraka factory appears to have been decided precipitously and prematurely, devastating the community. 54

**Figure 58 - Road conditions for transporting milk, 1914**

![Road conditions for transporting milk, 1914](ATL 1/1-006307, Northwood (PA Coll-3077), 1914)
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52 Apetona Waata and Wiremu Hakaraia, Waipapakauri, to Tau Henare, MP, 5 January 1929, AATE A1003 986a 18/4/230, ANZA.
53 Oruru (factory), Fairburns (creamery).
54 Harrison, p.65.
While the Oruru-Fairburns, Herekino and Motukaraka factories were initiated by settlers of the government schemes of the 1860s and the later Ballance era,\(^{55}\) of the 22 founding suppliers of the Kaitaia Dairy Company, 20 (91\%) were members of the three core missionary, trader and Native School teacher families of the Pākehā network shown in Figure 60. Of these, a number were fluent speakers of te reo Māori. Given these longstanding relationships, one would expect Māori farmers to be included in the new co-operative. While shareholder lists before 1918 have not survived, it is evident from Figure 59 that Māori were suppliers to the Kaitaia Dairy Company by 1917.

**Figure 59 - Annual luncheon Kaitaia Dairy Co. at Agricultural & Pastoral Hall 1917**

![Annual luncheon Kaitaia Dairy Co. at Agricultural & Pastoral Hall 1917](image)

Far North Regional Museum ref. 235/12. Reproduced with permission.

Despite their close association with the network of Pākehā families who established the company, and its chairman’s reference in 1972 to the important part Māori played in the company’s development, during its first 70 years of existence only two suppliers with Māori ancestry became directors, and these were father and son descendants of one of the Pākehā sawyers from the Eastern Network (Chapter 4).\(^{56}\)

From a present perspective of equality of participation and representation it would be

---


\(^{56}\) Greer, pp.1, 52. List of directors.
difficult to interpret this omission as other than systematic and self-serving exclusion, but at that time Pākehā directors might have been accepted as agents in the roles their forebears had played as bi-cultural translators. Māori might also have been reluctant to become involved in the Pākehā politics of this new form of institution.

At first, dairying was small-scale, each farmer milking fewer than 20 cows manually; specialisation would only be viable after World War One. Combination farming was the norm, and often flax or timber milling would supplement farm income, as land was cleared for pasture. Sustaining a living depended on family effort. Although farm labour had been important in the pioneering period, in the late 1920s few farms employed labour. James Belich argued that the social organisation of New Zealand’s farming gave it an edge over ranching countries such as Argentina.57 While estate owners historically enjoyed privileged access to market information, organisationally they were less cost-efficient.58 Although the importance of family farming has been generally well-recognised, unpaid work of family members does not feature significantly in descriptions of the developing Aotearoa New Zealand economy.

The significance is multi-faceted. First, working of farms by families blurred boundaries between formal (farming) and informal (household) sectors of the economy. Households consumed farm produce, and family members substituted for paid labour. The household sector has been referred to as ‘the forgotten economy of the Western World’.59 It has been sufficiently undervalued to attract recent research efforts aimed at reinstating its importance in long-run economic dynamics. There is

57 Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, p.66.
an even stronger argument for New Zealand’s economic history to reconsider the part played by extended Māori families. Second, the informality extended beyond the immediate family to networks of families (related or not) who would co-operate, particularly in seasonal work or to cover illness or absence of a member; for instance, in wartime. Informal rural economies have also been the subject of recent research similar to my own.60 Third, it goes without saying that family networks involved marriage alliances, but it is worth adding that those alliances in farming families secured access to land for the marriage partner. Fourth, in a patriarchal society, marriage provided employment for women (and children) when other opportunities were scarce. Fifth, if women and children were able to manage a farm, male family members could seek external employment to supplement farm income. A combination of these facets could enhance the economic value of women, Pākehā and Māori. Limitations of space do not permit an in-depth analysis of all facets. Here, I will concentrate on the relationship of Māori to the farming economy, as developed by Pākehā.

For Māori, in the pre- and early-contact, non-cash economy, distinction between paid and unpaid work was irrelevant. Men and women had both separate and shared roles in the community economy. In farming, also, there could be gender separation of work – for instance men undertaking the heavier tasks – although there was much variation, to some extent dependent on economic circumstances. While work differentiation could arise by choice, more often than not it was a matter of economic necessity. Farming was truly a working partnership for married couples; women contributed more or less equally to the success of the venture.

60 Ommer and Turner, 'Informal Rural Economies'.
That economic contributions were shared, however, does not imply that they were equally valued. Women could attribute higher value to matters of importance to themselves, than men might attribute to the same contribution, if it were of lesser consequence to men. Belich’s speculation about the ebb and flow of pre-contact gender value attribution offers a useful approach to analysis. Using documentary and archaeological evidence to deduce women’s activities, he surmised that ‘the circumstances of migration and early Maori economics may have enhanced women’s economic centrality’. As the population increased there were opportunities for gender specialisation and value differentiation, followed by ‘a second opportunity for loosening of male ascendancy’ as large game disappeared, having been hunted to extinction.61 Farming presented a twentieth century opportunity for enhancing women’s economic value, which followed hard on the heels of population recovery from 1896.

Female dairy company shareholders were a small but visible minority. Some inherited shareholdings when their husbands died, some took over while male shareholders were on active war service, and others participated independently. Māori and Pākehā women were represented in each category. On the west coast, a woman managed the family farm for a number of seasons after her husband volunteered at the start of World War Two. The Native Department supervisor reported that her management ‘has proved fairly successful, but [she] has had a fairly difficult time. The Dept’s deduction of 50% [of the cream cheque] and an order of £30 per year in favour of [the stock agent] did not leave her with sufficient’ 62

---

62 Supervisor Kaitaia office to Registrar Native Department, 6 October 1943, BAAI 1030 17b, ANZA.
A woman’s value could also be enhanced by judicious marriage. Whereas most of the 100 trader and sawyer European men who remained in the Hokianga after the northern wars gained access to land by marrying Māori women with land rights, in later times some Māori women married European men who (or whose families) had bought land from the government, the women thereby regaining access to previously Māori-owned land. In most cases of intermarriage a Māori woman married a Pākehā man, but their children usually retained close social and economic links with their Māori families.63

Undoubtedly one of the most significant marriage alliances in the region was that of Ngawini to Sam Yates, discussed in earlier chapters. Networks of families (as opposed to family networks) associated on different bases. Chapter 2 described the incorporation of missionary families into Māori tribes in the 1830s. The association did not end with the death of the original missionaries. Rather, a complex network expanded and evolved. It is said of the missionaries that they did not integrate because they did not marry Māori, but this only holds true for the two missionaries themselves (who were already married when they arrived in the region) and their first generation of offspring. Beyond these, a network of kin-based linkages started to develop. There was a high level of intermarriage between the Subritzky trading family, the families of the missionaries and the families of the Native School teachers (some of whom were descendants of missionaries or ordained clergy), and also between the Subritzkys and Māori at Te Hapua. Through these marriages, second-generation missionary descendants had close Māori cousins, who formed part of the network; some also married Māori themselves. A relationship chart for these families becomes intertwined with Māori relationship charts, even if peripherally at first.

63 Butterworth, 'Maori/Pakeha Intermarriage'.
Overlaid on this network is the strong church association referred to in Chapter 3.

One intersection of Māori of the ‘priestly’ families and the Pākehā network can be seen on the right-hand side of Figure 60. Hera Paerata’s marriage to Tau Henare first appeared in Figure 12, Chapter 3.

In Chapter 4, I noted that the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy was affected by how Pākehā related to one another. Economic interchanges within the rural community were activated by personal relationships rather than as arm’s-length, purely commercial transactions; there was a high degree of informality. Just as for the Māori families amongst whom they lived, Pākehā family relationships held

---

Sources: Richard Davis Anniversary booklet, Subritzky Legend, Anderson reunion booklet.

**Figure 60 - Network of Pākehā relationships and Māori connections, Kaitaia area**

---

[Image of family tree diagram]
opportunities for co-operation and non-co-operation; they suggested not only whom you might interact with economically but also whom you might not! Later-arriving settlers expressed a degree of nervousness about these informal networks. The nervousness was particularly directed at the missionary group. When the resident magistrate for Mangonui was about to retire in 1873, following quarrels with ‘almost all the settlers’, one settler expressed concern that one of the missionaries, or his son,\textsuperscript{65} might be appointed, the concern being that he would be too sympathetic to Māori and not sufficiently understanding of settlers.

It renders us peculiarly sensitive as to who is to be his successor. Knowing that Mr. Puckey has solicited the Natives to sign a petition for his appointment, we cannot but express our opinion that, however fitted he might be to fill an office where the Maoris only are concerned, we feel assured he is totally unfit to preside in a Court and administer the English law he has never learnt.\textsuperscript{66}

As late as the 1920s, Māori families, with their bullock teams, would live on missionary land for weeks during the eeling season, helping with land clearing while fishing for winter stocks. Transactions between Māori and missionary families were not on a cash basis; they followed the well-established tradition of gift exchange.\textsuperscript{67}

The social capital basis of this continuing interdependency is described in the comparison of farm schemes later in this chapter.

In 1920s New Zealand, child labour within families came under the spotlight, particularly in rural areas. Through paid and unpaid work, rural children (both male and female) made a significant economic contribution. Not only did they work from a much younger age than urban children, they also left school earlier, having achieved

\textsuperscript{65} This person is more likely to have been a son because Puckey senior died in 1878 and was in poor health for some years before. By this time members of the next generation were taking government appointments; for example, Judge Edward Puckey at Thames and his first cousin Major William Mair in Tauranga.

\textsuperscript{66} W. H. Clarke, Mongonui, to Colonial Secretary, AJHR, 1873, Vol III, H37.

\textsuperscript{67} Personal communication Walter Puckey, March 2001; Greer, p.4.
less. It had been anticipated that the advent of milking machines and electrification would resolve or alleviate the incidence. Instead, the problem was worst in dairying areas. Butter prices dropped sharply at the start of the 1921-22 milking season, reliance on family labour increased, and by 1926 no labour was employed on 60% of farms. Hand milking was still prevalent in the north. Although some farms used diesel generators, electricity was not reticulated to the far north until 1940, and then only to the central, Pākehā-dominated areas. The 1926 report on health of rural school children concluded that among share-milkers the school progress of 26% of children was more than three years behind their age group.68

The child labour issue was particularly pronounced for Māori families. From 1896, the far northern Māori population started to recover numerically. Recovery resulted from increased fertility, reduced infant mortality and extended longevity as immunity to introduced diseases built. Large families meant more mouths to feed. Inevitably, older children shared caring for younger children with their parents. In poorer families both parents (and children) worked, first on the gumfields and then in dairying. For many Māori families it was not unusual for mother and children to be the dairy workers, while father sought paid employment away from home. In one case studied, a man kept his finances separate from his wife’s. She was the share-milker and dairy company shareholder, holding 70 acres on lease, milking 20 cows (with the help of their children) on shares for her sister, while he did a bit of gardening and bought and sold cattle. They had 11 children, of whom two were at ‘the front’, one was working at the wireless station, and one was with the grandfather.69

---

69 Entry dated 10 December 1917, BADD 10815 1e, ANZA. (Restricted access.)
The reality for farming children was far from the clean, neatly-dressed, smiling boys portrayed in Northwood’s typically posed representation in Figure 61. Cowsheds and their workers were inevitably splattered with dung; the hours before dawn were not bright and sunny; and having to face a day’s schooling after rising so early for the morning milking was not fun. In the inter-war years education was becoming more important. Manufacturing was seeking skilled workers, and opportunities for unskilled labour, particularly in the agricultural sector, were shrinking. Decreasing rural employment opportunities, combined with Māori Land Schemes’ failures from the end of the 1930s, led an urban migration for far northern Māori. Comparatively poor education restricted their urban employment to lower paying work, while urban living dramatically increased living costs. Even so, urban opportunities, for earning and children’s education, seemed better than mounting debts and regressing rural opportunities.

How then did Māori play an important part in the Kaitaia Dairy Company’s development, as the chairman had proclaimed? Commercial stock farming had begun before the 1900s, as the Māori census figures show, and dairying from the first decade of the twentieth century, as shareholder records indicate later in this chapter. But it was when finance became available, through the Māori Trustee in 1920, the Tokerau
Land Board from 1925, and the Māori Land Development Schemes in 1929, that Māori farming increased substantially. The increase was accompanied by moves from communal to individual farms, and from cropping to pastoral farming. Unlike Ngata’s Ngāti Porou, far northern population and land-holding was not sufficiently concentrated to support viable, separate, Māori-owned-and-managed dairy factories, although that had been the intention for the combined Te Kao and Te Hapua communities.

Māori provided land and helped clear land. They were employed on the substantial drainage schemes to convert swamp to pasture, to construct vital roading, and as farm and factory workers. They were dairy factory suppliers and cartage contractors. In addition to increasing supply by Māori farmers, Te Kao’s dairy scheme was particularly important as its truck provided a service that enabled a substantial number of Pākehā settlers between Te Kao and Waipapakauri to enter dairying and boost the Kaitaia factory production. The part Māori played was not just important, but crucial. Dairying would not have been established as early or as successfully without their significant participation.

There was within-region variation in how iwi managed their involvement with the farming aspect of the Pākehā economy. Individualisation of title enabled early entry for Te Rarawa families and Te Aupōuri in the west. Whina Cooper devoted much energy, and finance borrowed from Father Kreijmborg, to farm development by Te Rarawa ki Hokianga, following in the footsteps of her father, Heremia Te Wake. 

---

70 G. V. Butterworth and Cyril Mako, *Te Hurihanga O Te Ao Maori: Te Ahua o Te Iwi Maori Kua Whakatatua*, Wellington, 1989, p.208. And also see Chapter 5, Table 7 – census data for Māori land cultivation and livestock holdings.

71 Stokes, p.281. Another had been proposed for Pukenui, which had its own wharf and was closer to Te Kao than was the Awanui factory. Holder, p.45.

72 For example, Puckey Taramoeroa, Waru Puku, McCully Matiu.

73 Greer, p.24.

Kao, under the guidance of Judge Acheson and their chiefs Eru Ihaka\(^{75}\) and Matiu Tupuni (the Ratana leader), negotiated communal entry into the dairy industry in 1925. Ngāti Kahu participated in the consolidation and land development scheme of the 1930s.\(^{76}\) Ngāti Kurī of Te Hapua were offered the prospect of farm units if they relocated to the government scheme at Ngataki.\(^{77}\)

Apirana Ngata met a mixed reception in the far north. In the Hokianga his ideas and schemes were embraced, supported and implemented enthusiastically by Whina Cooper and her followers;\(^{78}\) he clashed horns with Eru Ihaka at Te Kao, threatening to cut off te hiku o te ika; and mutual disrespect between himself and Ngāti Kahu was expressed in his referring to the Karikari peninsula as ‘te kotore o te whenua’ (the anus of the land). It is likely the differences between iwi responses to Ngata arose out of conflicting ideologies, which Mason Durie described for the 1900-1925 ‘Recovery’ period.

With a population struggling to hold its own, and a greatly depleted tribal estate, thoughts of positive development were something of a luxury. If there was a developmental goal, it was at best recovery, though more likely simply survival. Yet despite the threats and despondency, and the possibility of extinction, or complete assimilation, two Māori plans for development emerged.

One approach advocated adaptation to western society, and to the law, as well as the retention of a strong Māori cultural identity. The other approach also supported the acquisition of western knowledge and skills but placed greater emphasis on Māori control and autonomy with less dependence on government goodwill.\(^{79}\)

Durie contrasted the Young Māori Party’s confidence in Western democracy with other Māori leaders, who considered that a dual Māori and Pākehā identity was not

\(^{75}\) ‘Ngata of the North’, grandson of Paraone who had established sheep there.

\(^{76}\) Matiu and Mutu, p.200.

\(^{77}\) Details of the Ngataki and Te Kao land schemes are covered later in this chapter.

\(^{78}\) Even to the extent of Kamira Himiona writing five verses commending Ngata’s work. Tate, Kamira.

\(^{79}\) Durie, p.4.
only impossible, but had contributed to the dramatic decline in the nineteenth century. For them the answer was Māori sovereignty – to focus Māori energies on building an identity that upheld Māori language and culture and included a sense of ownership and control, with emphasis on Māori autonomy and authority.80

Livestock figures suggest more positive thoughts of ‘development’ in the far north than Durie argued. Te Rarawa ki Hokianga might have agreed with Ngata more wholeheartedly than Te Aupōuri, possibly because of the size and concentration of the Māori population there, compared with Te Kao’s small numbers and isolation from a larger Māori population. Eru Ihaka appears to have valued a greater level of autonomy, but might also have been influenced by Te Puea’s arrangements, there being kin relationship between the two peoples.81 Te Puea encouraged autonomous development for Tainui, and shared some of Ngata’s dream for a flourishing rural economy and Māori farmers.82 She visited Te Kao in 1929, on one of her trips to the north, where she met Acheson and her relative Rev. Mutu Kapa.83 Ihaka was influenced by Judge Acheson, but on later reflection Te Kao’s elders considered they should have retained a greater control on decision-making themselves.84

Ultimately, all communities where land had been retained became involved in dairying to some extent, and most were disappointed, some fatally. Pawarenga shared its experience with many.

After many years had passed the same people [who had earlier decided to individualise titles] chose to become dairy farmers and were advised to approach the Native Affairs Department for assistance. The land had to be mortgaged to the Department so that

80 ibid.
81 See Chapters 2 and 3.
82 Durie, p.5.
84 Henderson, Te Kao 75, pp.42-3.
the owners could obtain the financial assistance they required to buy cows and farm equipment.

Everybody entered into the scheme quite happily and worked hard to repay their loans. They acquired comfortable homes but as time went on they found that they needed other things on their farms. But their financial position had not improved and while some may have been able to pay back the money to the Department most gave up trying and left their homes.85

Comparison of three Māori farm development schemes in the far north and East Coast demonstrate religion or church-based social capital in action: East Coast (Ngāti Porou), Te Kao (Te Aupōuri) and Hokianga (Te Rarawa). The first two communities were associated with Anglican missions, whereas the Te Rarawa communities in the Hokianga area were associated with Roman Catholic missions. CMS missionaries to the East Coast and far north were related by marriage, through daughters of Rev. Richard Davis, who established the first English-style pasture farm at Waimate North.86

Figure 62 - Missionary relationships far north and East Coast

---

85 Kereama (Hoeft), pp.45-8.
86 In addition, William Puckey had lived with Henry Williams for seven years before his marriage and two of their grandchildren married.
The relationship between Ngāti Porou and CMS missionaries dates back to a chance event in the Bay of Islands in 1833. A missionary investigated an incident in which seven men and five women were brought from the East Cape to Rangihoua, against their consent, on a whaling ship, and distributed as slaves to some Ngāpuhi chiefs.87 The missionaries redeemed them, and returned them to the East Cape the following summer. For the months between redemption and return, the Ngāti Porou group lived at the Paihia mission station, and eventually formed the nucleus that established a stronghold of Anglicanism on the East Coast, before the first mission station was established there in 1840. This Ngāti Porou group effectively bridged between the missionaries and their own iwi. The family of Rev. William and Jane Williams stayed at the Turanga mission station until 1850, where son Leonard became an assistant. They later moved the station further inland. Another son, James, started sheep farming at Hawke’s Bay. Although Jane and William Williams retreated to Napier during the New Zealand Wars, some of their adult children stayed behind. William Williams was first bishop of the Waiapu diocese referred to in Chapter 3. A number of descendants followed him into ordained ministry. The relationship between Ngāti Porou, the church and the Williams’ family was sustained beyond the mission period into the present.

The far northern mission had a different character. It was established earlier (1834) as the first foray of the CMS outside the Bay of Islands. Unlike the East Coast mission, Kaitaia’s remained stable in its original location, staffed by the first missionaries until their deaths between 1878 and 1894. Also unlike the East Coast station, Kaitaia’s was not threatened or disrupted by Anglo-Māori wars. None of the far northern missionaries’ descendants entered the ordained ministry of the Anglican

Church. Consequently, by comparison with the East Coast, the connection between church and Māori was weakened by the lack of continuity. However, the far northern mission was also similar to the East Coast’s in that, from the outset, elementary education was a priority and, from an early stage, preparation of Māori for ordained ministry became important, as discussed in Chapter 3. A modest seminary was established in 1867, but was not funded by the CMS. The far northern missionaries conducted some teacher training but the Williams family was far better educated.

Both sets of mission families practised farming alongside mission work and education, as an intentional extension from the Waimate farm. In 1915, when Apirana Ngata defended to Parliament the land-ownership of the Williams’ families in the East Coast, his comments suggested that he thought of the work of church and farming as of equivalent value.

[Some] members of the family carried on the work of the Church. [Others] carried on the work of assisting the Maori as a farmer. … I can vouch for the fact that but for the assistance that [family] gave to my people they would not have been in the splendid position that they are in to-day.88

Like church and schools, the farming relationship extended well beyond the mission period. Ngata described first attempts of Māori at sheep farming in the 1870s as crude. However, he noted, ‘When the Waipiro station, which consisted chiefly of native lands leased to Mr J. N. [James] Williams, commenced operations’ in 1882, Ngāti Porou Māori made a second attempt, picking up farming and stock management techniques from this example. Stocks were drawn mainly from the Williams’ farm.89

---

89 AJHR, 1908, G.i, p.16, in Keesing, p.29. Proceeds from the wool were used to pay survey costs on the land that had been taken through the Native Land Court process.
Trust, as social capital in action, was even more evident at the time Ngata took over management of one of these blocks. An unexpected debt spurred him to contact Archdeacon Samuel Williams, who had been so much involved with Te Aute College. The Archdeacon authorised the trustee of the Williams’ family trust, T. S. Williams, to make unsecured loans, up to £30,000 in a year, to Māori farmers.90 In defending the landholding of missionaries, Ngata proclaimed ‘No bank dare make the advances they made … in many cases the security was that which the old chiefs gave to their fathers and grandfathers – just the bare word; nothing on paper.’91

Sheep farming in the far north had started successfully much earlier. Te Rarawa owned sheep, sourced from the mission, as early as 1845. By 1879 Te Aupōuri at Parengarenga owned one flock of over 1000 and several other Māori-owned flocks exceeding 100.92 Māori and farming families of missionary descent maintained their interdependence well into the twentieth century.

Dairy farming had a different history for each area, too. Individualisation of titles on the East Coast reduced landholdings to the point where sheep farming was no longer profitable, as a consequence of which Ngāti Porou people turned to dairying in the 1920s. They were at an advantage compared with their northern counterparts, in that they had retained ownership of the most fertile land, and they had good metalled roads for transporting dairy produce. In 1924, they went ahead with their dairying project.93 The ambitious project was debated at length in the community. Conviction came from a meeting with the then head of the Māori Anglican Church, Archdeacon

92 AJHR, 1880, H-8, Section B.
93 Keesing, p.43.
Herbert Williams (grandson of William Williams). An article in the journal *Te Wananga* states:

He reported to the leaders on the good results that were being obtained by certain Maori dairy-farmers around Wairoa in Hawke’s Bay; also he lent the weight of his scholarship to emphasise his conviction that, just as with their Maori forefathers in the very strenuous times of old, the Maori people had the work-capacity and the potential tenacity to “make good”.

In the far north, some Māori who had obtained individual land titles became suppliers to the Kaitaia factory before 1920. Te Aupōuri at Te Kao, who had been loyal suppliers of Anglican priests even after the community was divided by the Ratana movement, undertook the first communal dairy scheme in 1924. Finance for the scheme was sourced from the Tokerau Maori Land Board, and the supply arrangement with the Kaitaia Dairy Company was negotiated in the period that a grandson of one of the original missionaries was chairman of its Board of Directors. Although the principal instigator of Te Kao’s project was Judge Acheson, the project was one of immense personal interest and commitment to the dairy company’s chairman.94

Integration of farming and missionary work was not the exclusive domain of the Anglican mission. According to their Fr Durning, the Roman Catholic Mill Hill Fathers were missioners of quality, practical men, builders, and untiring workers. Their work was single in its purpose.95 Although that singularity would appear to preclude farming, one of the Mill Hill Fathers (Kreijmborg) became personally involved in Māori land development.

94 Personal communication, family members.
The Mill Hill Fathers had gone to the Hokianga area when Fr Becker started his 51 continuous years, 1889-1940. The Catholic Church had been established in the area for much longer. Overlapping the start of Becker’s time was the one remaining Marist, Fr McDonald, who identified deeply with the community. Over Becker’s time, 19 fathers worked with him. Some stayed for short periods of a year or two at a time, but others were long-serving. Kreijmborg stayed for 12 crucial years from 1915 to 1927. This continuity, and the commitment of the Mill Hill Fathers to shared vision and values, maintained strong bonding capital. Three of those who served the Hokianga also spent time at Hato Petera Auckland school for Māori boys. Originally established to educate boys as catechists and priests’ assistants, it had no secondary department until 1945, a year after the first ordination of a Hato Petera old boy. The staffing of Hato Petera by the Mill Hill Fathers provided continuity between parish and urban settings for young Māori. In this respect, there is similarity to the staffing of the Anglican Waiapu Diocese and colleges by the Williams family.

Unusually for the Mill Hill Fathers, Fr Kreijmborg came from a comparatively wealthy family, from whom he inherited in the 1920s, when the economic plight of Māori in the far north was at an all-time low compared with earlier times. Gum digging, one of the few sources of cash, had declined dramatically, the population was reeling from its losses to the influenza pandemic, and the country was heading into depression following World War One. Panguru’s chief, Heremaia Te Wake (Whina Cooper’s father), died of the ‘flu’, and a leadership crisis amongst family members followed.

96 Kreijmborg was mostly in Panguru; Bresser had 21 years, mainly in Panguru, following Kreijmborg; Zangerl spent 48 years, mainly in Pawarenga; and Hazelzet, over 20 years, from 1932. Becker was from Germany, whereas the vast majority of the others were from Holland.
In the wake of World War One, Apirana Ngata was experiencing success with Ngāti Porou’s land development schemes, and he had convinced the government, and Whina Cooper of Hokianga, of their value to Māori and the country. Ever the practical man, Kreijmborg knew that his inheritance could help alleviate local conditions by building churches and financing farm developments. He financed Whina’s purchase of the local store to keep money circulating within the community. Whina had been Kreijmborg’s housekeeper early in his time in the Hokianga; a high level of trust had built between them. Kreijmborg saw her as his ‘right hand man’. He used Whina’s mana to achieve community co-ordination for church activities that he could not achieve on his own. It was a reciprocal relationship, another hallmark of social capital, that reached back into the previous generations, when Whina’s father and Frs McDonald and Becker had cemented church and tribal identities.98

These three examples – two from the far north and one from the East Coast – demonstrate the usefulness of religious or church-based affiliation to some Māori economic activities. The concept of social capital contributes to an understanding of the influence of social relationships on economic outcomes through time and over generations. That a religious association played a part in economic activity does not necessarily imply that the outcome was beneficial. Religiously-based social capital could set up an asymmetric dependence rather than interdependence, as Hirini Kaa’s recent thesis on the cultural economy of Ngāti Porou argues.99 Dependence could have eventuated whether intentional, unintentional, or despite the different intentions of both parties. The outcome is likely to rest on the relative negotiating strengths of the parties.

Religious or church-based social capital produced different outcomes from those generated by other forms of association. Notably, the two groups that have received close attention in this thesis – the network that incorporated Pākehā sawyer traders by marriage, and the network of families associated through church – were involved in different sets of economic activities. A further difference was in civic engagement. For the most part of the study period, members of the House of Representatives came from the church-based network, whereas in local bodies it was the Pākehā-Māori derived network that provided the only Māori representation. The distinction indicates alignment of rank with policy-making at national level, and entrepreneurship with implementing policy at county level – a strategic-tactical divide. If there was a distinguishing feature about how far northern Māori related to these political bodies, how did they relate to new formalising farming institutions?

**Co-operative dairy companies**

Where the co-operative gum stores had functioned as the nexus between Māori and the Pākehā economic system in the boom phase of the pre-war gum industry, co-operative dairy companies held the potential to fulfil a similar role in the replacement industry. Social capital was a key component in the establishment, expansion and operations of these ventures, as has been shown in a study of co-operative dairy companies in Denmark and Poland, with which the far north’s companies will be compared.

While milk and dairy products had been sold by individual farmers producing more than they required for their own consumption during the nineteenth century, participation in the far northern dairying industry in the early twentieth century almost

---

100 On Mangonui County Council, the only councillors of Māori descent came from the early sawyer trader network – James Noble Berghan, Ivan Berghan and Richard Wrathall. Harding Leef was a councillor for Hokianga County Council.
inevitably entailed becoming a shareholder in one of the four co-operative dairy companies. The dairy co-operatives were initiated and established by community groups and, unless a farm was situated at the extremities of the borders of contiguous geographic regions, generally the condition of roads precluded choice of which company to join and supply. With minor variations, the rules for each company were that a person had to be a dairy farmer to join the co-operative, farmers could only supply to the company if they were shareholders, and a farmer could only be a shareholder if he or she supplied the contracted amount of milk or cream. Changing companies was only possible between seasons, because contracts were for a fiscal year. These written rules were similar to those of co-operative dairies in Europe. Gunnar and Gert Svendsen argued that an important explanation for the success of the co-operative dairies in Denmark and Poland was the organisational statutes, in the form of written ‘rules of the game’, which facilitated co-operation between competing interests that would not have been conceivable without them.\footnote{Svendsen and Svendsen, pp.79-80.}

Co-operatives had their origins in Rochdale near Manchester in England, where a group of weavers founded the first co-operative wholesale society, a sales and purchasing company owned by the members. Across Europe the co-operative sector has been claimed to be a reaction to the transformation of social structures in early capitalism. In the agricultural sector, as capitalism developed, farmers pooled their buying and selling power to protect against exploitation by large companies selling goods to them and buying their produce where, as individuals, they had poor bargaining power. Denmark’s model of co-operatives was formulated in 1867 to fit the norms and culture of the rural population; the network-based co-operation of an inclusive nature was promoted within economic life, with the resulting accumulation
of productive bridging social capital. Co-operatives facilitated balancing competing interests of ‘well-to-do farmers’ and smallholders, through democratic voting systems and distribution of profits in proportion to their inputs to the venture. Voting was generally on the basis of one person one vote, rather than votes corresponding with herd sizes, but distribution of profits matched contributions by reflecting in prices paid for produce supplied.\textsuperscript{102}

While the social and economic situation was different in rural New Zealand, and the differences between large and small farmers were not as great as in Europe, the co-operatives served similar purposes, although one enthusiast claimed the structure as a New Zealand invention.

That this company is built entirely upon co-operative principles makes the story more entrancing, demonstrating as it does the genius of the race for daring and doing – for blazing a path to success untrammelled by conventions and old company forms.\textsuperscript{103}

What was important to both Danish and New Zealand dairying, as with any industry, was access to steady market demand, which, for both countries, came from Britain. At the time the far northern dairy factories were opening, in the early 1900s, Denmark was providing 42% of Britain’s butter, and New Zealand was contributing just 5.3%. By 1933, after New Zealand entered its ‘recolonisation’ phase following redistribution of global power and markets after World War One, New Zealand contributed 28.4% of Britain’s butter – slightly more than the 28% from Denmark.\textsuperscript{104}

Co-operatives had spread rapidly throughout Denmark, with the result that butter and milk exports increased from 12.5 million kilograms and 200 litres respectively in

\textsuperscript{102} ibid., pp.48-49, 74, 76, 80.


\textsuperscript{104} Belich, \textit{Paradise Reforged}, p.66.
1880, to about 90 million kilograms of butter and 600,000 litres of milk by 1900. The rural population joined the co-operatives voluntarily, put up their own money as starting capital and raised loans from financial institutions, acting independently of the state by using their own resources. It was a bottom-up movement, not the result of central administration. The co-operatives were able to leverage the productivity from scarce rural resources through the mutual confidence and trust (social capital) between members of the local society.\(^{105}\) As it had in Denmark, the co-operative movement spread rapidly in New Zealand, from the establishment of the first factory near Dunedin in the 1890s, through Taranaki and Waikato, to North Auckland. Both assisted and unassisted farmers in the far north stood to benefit more by co-operating than by operating independently. While voting in the far northern companies was not on a one person one vote basis, neither was it one share one vote; the various formulae did not unduly favour large shareholders.

Each of the far northern communities that initiated a co-operative had a distinctive social structure; Māori featured differently in each. Oruru-Fairburn’s co-operative was initiated by a group of settlers who bought land in the 1860s to 1880s. It was a close and closed community; its members did not fluctuate greatly and they intermarried amongst each other profusely. Many of the families were part of what was referred to as the ‘Ball Party’ – a group of mainly staunch Wesleyan agricultural workers, general labourers and tradesmen who migrated in 1859-60. Even in 1945, a high proportion of Oruru-Fairburn’s dairy company shares was still held by the old families – on the basis of surnames, old families comprised 28% of the shareholders and held 39% of the shares.\(^{106}\) Perhaps the closeness gave the impression of exclusivity, lowering levels of trust by outsiders, there being suggestions that some of

---

\(^{105}\) Svendsen and Svendsen, p.76.

\(^{106}\) Not counting surnames which female family members adopted on marriage.
the directors were not real dairy farmers but kept only sufficient cows to qualify them for the directorate.107 Low trust reduces social capital, which was detrimental to Māori in this area.

In contrast, Kaitaia’s initiating membership comprised predominantly members of a network of CMS missionary descendant, Native School teacher and independent trading families, all of which families had lived closely and interdependently with Māori for some generations. Although many members of these original families remained shareholders throughout the company’s existence, and members of the directorate, the shareholder list expanded and diversified quickly.

The western co-operatives at Herekino and Hokianga, although initiated predominantly by Pākehā, were set amongst dense Māori populations and included Māori in their initiating committees. Travelling difficulties in the Hokianga restricted committee members’ attendance of community meetings; one of the few convened was at the residence of the paramount chief Peri Leef, older cousin of Harding Waipuke Leef, who would later become a long-serving director.108 Herekino had been a struggling Ballance settlement, which was re-opened in the

---

107 Parker, Portraits from the Past, p.49.
1890s on the same basis as the original 1886 scheme, and several Dalmatians had taken up the challenge of its difficult terrain. Amongst the first 11 dairy factory suppliers were the names of Lunjevich and Posinkovich. Some members of each of these two families, and other settler families, married local Māori women. The marriages bridged between the three ethnic groups and several religious denominations in the region, and strengthened the bonding social capital of the community, even though some tensions arose. The tight-knit, multiply-related hapū of Whangape contributed a disproportionately large number of Herekino’s shareholders.

The Svendsens assumed that knowing one another well, and therefore trusting one another, was a precondition for people joining in the shared and risky economic ventures. They based their premise on a statement made by one of the early promoters: ‘Because the number of participants of a co-operative dairy was limited by the small size of the local area, one may presume that these people knew one another very well’.  

While such a premise might have held true in Denmark’s long-established, stable rural population, the same could not be said for the rural far north of Aotearoa New Zealand. Here, Europeans were comparative newcomers and, apart from the Kaitaia group, could not have been said, generally, to know their Māori neighbours very well. And yet together, particularly in Herekino and Hokianga, they were prepared to pool resources in a risky venture; trust did not require knowledge.

Other preconditions for success, the Svendsens believed, were a common economic interest based on open and inclusive membership; democratic decision-making,

assuming equality of individuals; shared economic responsibility; and profit sharing in proportion to supply volumes. In Denmark, the Svendsens argued, due to the practical outworking of social capital, total profit from dairying increased 20-25% compared with the old-style home dairies.\textsuperscript{110} Aotearoa New Zealand did not have a long-established home dairy system with which to compare outcomes. But what could be said is that the co-operative factory system, combined with co-operative single-desk marketing, promoted competitive exports and enabled many to enter the dairying industry who would otherwise not have had access to markets. Amongst those co-operatives enabled were many Māori, who might otherwise have been excluded by any system that did not address competing interests. In this scenario, social capital can be seen as a new production factor harnessing joint effort to achieve more than individuals could alone or collectively in its absence. Thus the co-operative system, built as it was on the combined local efforts of Māori and Pākehā, acted as a bridge connecting Māori to the Pākehā economy and simultaneously strengthening community bonds. The extent to which this bridge facilitated inclusion of Māori is evidenced in the shareholder registers.

Retention of shareholder registers by the Companies’ Office has been inconsistent, which complicates a direct comparison between the four dairy co-operatives.\textsuperscript{111} Such data as there is (summarised in Table 9) shows early participation of Māori in dairying and also the expected increase from the 1920s.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{110} ibid., p.79.
\item \textsuperscript{111} Opening shareholdings are available, but are not necessarily accurate, for all four. After this time, the earliest for Oruru-Fairburn is 1945, and for Kaitaia the earliest is 1917. There is a period between 1932 and 1945 for which shareholder lists for Kaitaia have not been retained. Herekino merged with Kaitaia in 1927, and shareholder lists are available for the full period of its operation. Hokianga’s records are the most complete, with full shareholder lists available for all years from the start through to 1940 and beyond.
\end{itemize}
Oruru-Fairburn was the first company to start operations, and the one for which there is the least data. Five years after the end of the study period, 93 shareholders of Māori descent comprised over 30% of the total number of shareholders in the company, yet their shareholding was just under 15%. The number of shares held by each shareholder varied with the amount of milk or cream contracted to the company. For some companies this was indicated in terms of herd size, for instance that each shareholder should hold at least one share per cow from which milk was supplied to the company. Thus, the difference between the percentages for shareholders and shareholding for Oruru-Fairburn in 1945 indicates that the herd sizes of Māori farmers were much smaller than those of their Pākehā counterparts, who held 85% of the number of shares amongst 70% of the company’s shareholders.

Table 9 - Summary of shareholding of Māori in far northern dairy companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start year</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1932</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oruru-Fairburn</td>
<td>Percent shareholders</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent shareholdings</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number shareholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitaia (includes Herekino &amp; Te Kao from 1930)</td>
<td>Percent shareholders</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent shareholdings</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number shareholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herekino</td>
<td>Percent shareholders</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>50.9 merged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent shareholdings</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>32.2 with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number shareholders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokianga (includes some ex Herekino from 1930)</td>
<td>Percent shareholders</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent shareholdings</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number shareholders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Dairy Companies’ Shareholder lists 112

By 1918, Kaitaia’s 26 Māori shareholders comprised 13% of the number of shareholders and held 10% of the total shares. The disparity between shareholder and

112 The Herekino Co-op Dairy Company, BADZ 5181, 257 14910, 1910-1930, ANZA; The Kaitaia Co-operative Dairy Company Limited, BADZ 5586 17a, ANZA; The Oruru-Fairburn Co-op Dairy Factory Company Ltd, BADZ 5181, 163 1024, 1901-1956, ANZA; The Hokianga Co-operative Dairy Company Ltd, BADZ 5181, 1136, 1907-c.1965, ANZA.
shareholding percentage, at this stage, was not remarkable and yet by 1925 the gap had widened to a 12% shareholding for 20% of the shareholders. This increasing disparity suggests that the number of Māori participating in dairying was increasing at a faster rate than Pākehā, but that Pākehā herd sizes were increasing faster than those of Māori farmers. Such a discrepancy could be attributable to preferential availability of capital to Pākehā and/or their further ability to expand because of larger land holdings or better-suited land. It could also indicate later entry of Māori with smaller start-up herds, and was probably a combination of both. Kaitaia’s figures for 1930 onwards include farmers who formerly supplied Herekino Dairy Company.

Herekino’s Māori participation at start-up was the largest proportion for the region. At 34.5% of the shareholders with 20% of the start-up shareholding, there would have been a true sense of partnership in Herekino’s dairying venture; indeed, with the small number of suppliers, the venture’s viability depended on Māori participation. A sharp increase in 1914, contributed by the farmers of Whangape, took the proportion of Māori shareholders up to 47% and their shareholding to 31%. By the time the company was considering merging with Kaitaia, Māori farmers comprised over 50% of the number of shareholders with 32% of the shares. Although the merger, along with the start of the Te Kao dairy scheme, increased the proportion of Māori shareholders in the Kaitaia company from 20% in 1925 to 28% in 1930, the remoteness of the factory from Herekino, and the effective dilution of the Herekino Māori representation, would have undermined their sense of partnership. In the two following years, to 1932, the proportion of Māori shareholders in the merged venture (KDC) increased significantly to 40%, and the shareholding proportion edged back slightly, consistent with a rush of new entrants with smaller start-up herds than those of established farmers. Data for 1940 is not available, but by 1945 the two trends had
reversed. The number of Māori shareholders was down to 34% but their shareholding had increased to 26% – smaller shareholders ceased their operations and those remaining increased them. The merger induced some Herekino company suppliers to switch supply to Hokianga, and some exited altogether because of the impracticality of transporting their output. Hokianga’s Māori shareholding increased from 29% to 35% between 1925 and 1930, and to 45% by 1940, which was still less than the 50% Herekino had reached, and Hokianga’s factory was also distant from Herekino farms.

Where Herekino had sported the highest proportion of Māori shareholders at start-up, Hokianga produced the highest number from the outset. By 1930, its 279 Māori suppliers were more than double the number supplying the then-combined Kaitaia and Herekino factories; if Oruru-Fairburn were added to Kaitaia the resulting total would still not match Hokianga’s. The proportion of shareholders for Hokianga by 1930 (35%) was also higher than the combined Kaitaia/Herekino percentage of 28.

Although record retention was inconsistent, by interpolating between the scattered data points for each company and aggregating the data so generated, a composite picture of shareholders for all four companies operating in the region can be formed.113 Figure 64 indicates a clear trend of steadily increasing levels of Māori participation in dairying, both in absolute numbers and in the proportion of shareholders; the number of Māori entering dairying was increasing at a faster rate than non-Māori participation.114

---

113 Interpolation was calculated by plotting the discontinuous data for each company in Excel graphs and generating the closest fitting trend-line. Typical start-up curves of the 3rd degree polynomial type produced the best fit for the companies with most data, with least square regressions (R²) of 0.986 for Herekino, 0.9908 for Kaitaia and 0.9912 for Hokianga. With only two points for Oruru-Fairburn, a straight line produces unreliable results, but because it is a small company, the results do not distort. Although the numbers of shareholders can be aggregated, their shareholdings cannot, because the basis of issuing shares is not directly comparable between companies.

114 In 1905 the only factory functioning was the Oruru-Fairburn. Because shareholders lists are not available between start-up and 1945, the 1905 data is not sufficiently reliable to represent a proportion
What is clear is that there was a significant level of participation *before* finance became available from the Tokerau Land Board between 1925 and 1929, or the Ngata land schemes from 1929. Although the 18-32% proportion of Māori to total shareholders before 1930 fell well behind the 46-48% Māori composition of the population, by 1940 the gap was closing. Thus, the co-operatives effectively ‘bridged’ some of the inequality of access to knowledge and capital. How well did the democratic process function?

Voting in ordinary meetings was generally by a show of hands, equivalent to one vote for each shareholder who attended, unless the chairman of the Board of Directors judged that a poll was needed. Election of directors was conducted by ballot. Although each company had slightly different voting rules, there was much commonality. The companies’ Memoranda of Association applied variations of formulae along the lines of one vote for the first five shares and an additional vote for every ten shares beyond the first five up to 40 additional shares, with a maximum of five votes for any one shareholder. Shareholders with large shareholdings were less...
able to dominate decisions than with a one share one vote rule. By 1935, interest in
meetings was sufficiently high to induce bus operators to run special services on dairy
compny meeting days.115

Voting gave shareholders a voice in decisions about the companies’ operations, but
directors of a company’s board exercised a stronger voice. In this category, Māori
were less well represented than their shareholder numbers suggest they might have
been. Oruru-Fairburn, Herekino and Hokianga each had at least one Māori director
during most of their years of operation. Hone Wi Kaitaia116 served on the Oruru-
Fairburn board from 1935 to 1944 and Wi Smith from 1946. Bill Hunia was on the
establishment committee for Herekino and served as director for 1914-15. John
Harrison from Whangape took his place for 1917-18, and Andrew Tamaho McMath,
also from Whangape, was elected in 1920. Herbert Charles Harris, from Te Tio, was
one of the establishing shareholders of the Hokianga company and a director from
1915 to 1919; Harding Waipuke Leef was elected to the board in 1920 and served a
distinguished period of 18 years until 1940, when he resigned to serve in World War
Two, during which he was killed in action. In contrast to the other three companies,
throughout Kaitaia’s operations up to 1971 there were only two directors of Māori
descent: James Noble Berghan served one year (1935-36), and his son Claude from
1955 to 1964. None of the Māori directors from any of the companies served as
chairman. The closing of Herekino’s factory in 1925 was the first in a series of
consolidations of dairy factories in the centres of Pākehā population concentrations,
which reduced the sense of partnership for Māori that the co-operatives might

115 Licences granted to C. Harris and R. C. Berghan, Minute Book of No. 1 District Licensing
Authority, BAAD 5638, 20 December 1934 – 26 July 1935, ANZA.
116 Brother-in-law to Eru Ihaka; their wives were sisters.
otherwise have perpetuated. Following each amalgamation Māori lost representation (voice) on the boards of directors.

‘Voice’ was also compromised by state intervention. Te Kao’s dairy scheme, under the Tokerau Māori Land Board, counted as one of the Kaitaia Dairy Company’s shareholders with a comparatively large shareholding and therefore maximum votes of five. The Board held the shares on behalf of the suppliers, who were not allowed to vote. Had the farmers held their shares individually, they would have been entitled to one vote each, at least, amounting to at least 50 votes by 1929. As events transpired, the shares did devolve to the individual farmers unintentionally in 1941, through a series of miscommunications between the Tokerau Board and the secretary of the Kaitaia Dairy Company. It suited the Native Department to support the misunderstanding because it put Te Kao’s suppliers on the same individualised basis as its other farm schemes. Te Kao’s shareholders appear to have been actively discouraged from engaging with the Kaitaia Dairy Company, beyond a two-way supply function, and they did not have direct representation on the board of directors. Acheson advised the dairy company secretary that the Te Kao suppliers ‘have not expressed any strong desire for a direct voice in the management [of KDC] as individual shareholders’. More likely the scheme had been structured with the Tokerau Board standing between Te Kao people and the Dairy Company for the purpose of concentrating Te Kao efforts on Te Kao’s needs.

---

117 Oruru-Fairburn amalgamated with Kaitaia in 1952 and Hokianga amalgamated with Kaikohe in 1957.
118 E. P. Earle (KDC) to Findlay, Tokerau Board, 19 July 1933, BAAI 1030 124e 26/19, ANZA.
119 Memoranda between Secretary KDC, Registrar Tokerau Board, President Tokerau Board and Native Department, 27 January 1941 - 27 February 1942, and 5 November 1946, BAAI 1030 124e 26/19, ANZA.
120 President Tokerau Trust Board to Secretary KDC, 27 February 1942, BAAI 1030 124e 26/19, ANZA.
Te Kao community scheme

For most of post-Treaty history, the small and remote settlements of Te Kao and Te Hapua were out of sight and out of mind to politicians. But occasionally an enthusiastic journalist would bring the living conditions of the Māori inhabitants to public attention, causing concern or embarrassment to some members of parliament, depending on their stance. Enquiries would be called for, sometimes engaging expert opinion, reports would be written, and perhaps read by some, a flurry of correspondence might ensue, and there the matter would generally lie. On Gordon Coates’ watch, as Native Minister since 1921, the issue resurfaced with the serious decline in the gum industry. This time he acted, by appointing Acheson to Tai Tokerau in 1924.

Acheson had established himself as an efficient operator in the Native Land Court system following his appointment as judge of the Native Land Court and president of the Māori Land Board for the Aotea District, centred in Wanganui in 1919.\(^1\) When first appointed to public service, one might question if his employer, Native Minister W. H. Herries, had read Acheson’s MA thesis on Māori land tenure, for if he had he might have detected a possible misalignment of political bent.\(^2\) Acheson’s interest in, and concern for, tikanga Māori and the constitutional role of the Treaty of Waitangi would colour his entire career, and bring it to a premature end. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, he believed in the necessity of effective bridging between Māori and the Pākehā political and economic system. He also believed in


385
equality of entry of Mäori to the Päkehā economy. ‘I want the Maoris to come into our national make-up on worthy lines, not as inferiors, not as slaves, but as equals’.

At the time Acheson was appointed, the only concentrations of Mäori land in Te Tai Tokerau were around Kaikohe and Motatau, north Hokianga, and around Parengarenga Harbour. Land remaining in Mäori ownership at Parengarenga was less than there would have been but for the large Yates’ private purchase referred to in Chapter 3. Acheson’s immediate assessment of the state of the Land Board’s records and finances, and stewardship thereof, was of disarray. Beneficiaries of land vested in the Board had proliferated with the Mäori population recovery, but little effort had been expended in tracing those who had not claimed money owing to them; a large unpaid balance, on which no interest was allocated to beneficiaries, lay dormant while needs cried out to be addressed. Accumulated interest on Board funds had been siphoned off to the Mäori Purposes Fund, from which tribes other than Tai Tokerau gained most benefit. Thus future interest on this amount was also lost. The new judge determined that thenceforth monies accruing in the north would be spent there. Most would eventually be spent on Te Kao, but almost as much would be spread around the region to seed family dairy farming.

With respect to the Parengarenga and Pakohu blocks, Acheson wrote, ‘Whoever passed the original leases … had neither business ability nor a fit sense of his or their duty to the Native beneficial owners’. He believed that the Board had allowed

---

123 Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, p.331.
124 Between 1906 and 1926, the Mäori population in the study area had grown by 35% from 3561 to 4799.
125 Acheson to Registrar, 19 September 1926, BAAI 1030/84a, ANZA; Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, pp.318-9. The Native Trust Office was drawing interest at 4.5% at the time.
126 ibid., pp.280-281. In addition to Te Kao, 78 farms were started – 11 in the Kaipara district, 21 in the Bay of Islands, 29 in the Hokianga and 17 in other parts of the Mangonui District. The average advanced to each was £300.
127 Acheson to Undersecretary Native Department, 30 June 1925, BAAI 1030/121b, ANZA.
European lessees to ruin extensive and valuable flats with gum-digging operations and failed to collect heavy arrears of rent before the Parengarenga Kauri Oils Company went into liquidation in 1923. The Board had also incurred unnecessary survey fees. In the judge’s opinion, ‘They partitioned off a tremendously long line all over the country. I am satisfied that it was a dodge to give work to the surveyor and to enable him to sell out his rights to a particular party up there and that the party intended to sell up the land and grab it from the Natives’. It was not the first time such a strategy had been employed in this part of the country. The Stout/Ngata Commission of 1907 had recommended that individuals at Parengarenga become tenants, by leasing back their own lands from the Land Board. Hone Heke Ngapua MHR countered with a proposal that Māori farmers should be extended the same loans and farm advice as Pākehā settlers, regardless of ownership structure. Ngapua died in 1909, neither option was adopted; the disastrous leases, of which Acheson was so critical, were put in their stead.

Alarmed as he might have been about conditions in the Board’s Auckland office, Acheson’s first field trip to the northern tip of the island would reveal even worse concerns. In his opinion:

the Tribes of the North were, with few exceptions, already making their way physically, mentally and spiritually to the departure platform at Cape Te Reinga. … They were going back in health,

---

128 This was not entirely true. The board had attempted in 1916-18 to secure reparation. But lawyers for the lessees had claimed that the lease only required that reparation be made before the end of the lease, and as the lease had not yet run its course the claims were premature. The Solicitor General of the Crown Law office agreed with the gum company’s solicitor. John W. Salmond to Under Secretary Native Affairs, 29 May 1918, BAAI 1030 127c 26/40, ANZA. The leases ought to have anticipated the possibility of liquidation, and required progressive or annual reparation to prevent the damage accumulating unrepaired until the end of the lease.

129 Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, p.290.

130 See Chapter 3, Annie Yates’ takeover of outstanding survey fees.

131 The first (1901) list of owners had been described by Judge H. F. Edger as representative persons, but Judge J. W. Browne adopted the ten-owner principle in his 1905 list, by attributing the term beneficiaries to the names on the list.
T.B. was rampant everywhere, … The children did not look healthy … they were living on salt junk from casks, as that was the only meat they could get … one child in four died … it came to me that my job was to rattle the dry bones of the Native Land Court in the North.132

Acheson was nothing if not a man of action, but as much a man of words. One of his first actions, after assessing the predicament that faced him, was to talk – to establish rapport, to build trust through that kanohi-ki-te-kanohi kōrero by engaging the interest of those he addressed. The outcome of the several meetings he held was a request, signed by all the prominent men of the kainga, for a land development scheme to establish dairying as a sustainable economic base for the Te Kao and Te Hapua communities, in due course estimated to require a small dairy factory between them.133 No matter that they had little pasture, few cattle, negligible expertise, and no road, let alone a vehicle to traverse the distance to the nearest factory – problems were just solutions looking for an application.134 Te Kao’s scheme was approved; Te Hapua’s was not, despite their more straitened circumstances. No doubt the various experts agreed that there would be a better chance of success at Te Kao; their land was less deficient, they had a reasonably reliable water supply (and they had been loyal providers of Anglican priests).135 It would be important for a pilot to be successful so that others might follow, but even so Te Kao was starting from behind.

132 Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, pp.281, 290-1.
133Stokes, p.281. Earlier proposals did not have the driving force or authority channels to gain traction that Acheson had.
134 Ihaka to Savage, February 1936, ACIH 16036, MA 1, 364 19/1/210, ANZW. The road to Kapowairua (Spirits Bay) was only formed in 1940 under pressure of defence needs.
135 That Te Kao negotiated its dairy scheme, and Te Hapua did not, might well have had as much to do with religious and political allegiance as it did with the comparative soil infertility and difficulty of draining swamplands that was officially reported. Eru Ihaka seemed to have this impression. In a meeting with the Tai Tokerau Board in 1925, he made a point of stating that the group present represented ‘a large number of others - all Government supporters’, although the Board in response wished ‘to make it plain that [it] represents all Natives whether they support or oppose the Govt.’ Clearly, there was some issue here, which could also have been that Eru was calling on their loyalty. Minutes of meeting, Schoolhouse, 3 August 1925, Parengarenga and Pakohu blocks, BAAI 1030 127c, ANZA. When Judge Acheson went to Tai Tokerau in 1924, there were already two factions at Te Kao. Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, p.303. The core of Kaitaia Dairy Company, with whom the supply contract was negotiated, were Anglican, many of missionary descent. However, the lack of
For their part, Te Aupōuri were receptive to Acheson’s intervention. They had used this type of bridging strategy consistently through much of their history – from Jem the Tahitian, to missionaries and the Anglican Church, to Yates. A gap of 15 of their most difficult years followed when there was no bridge, other than the Native School teachers who did not at that time fulfil an economic role, until Judge Acheson reasserted that role in the 1920s. The proposal had been made contingent on the appointment of the then Native School Master, Mr A. H. Watt, as project supervisor, he being the only man acceptable to both the people of Te Kao and the Tokerau Board. The Board would lend money for communal development work. The money would be paid as wages to men undertaking the work, after which they would develop their own sections, and bear their own costs.\(^{136}\)

Acheson recognised that community development needed to go hand in hand with that of land. The project was, in many ways, as ambitious as the co-operative dairy companies had been for their individual communities. A community store was rejuvenated at Te Kao, and a cream truck service established to transport produce to the Kaitaia dairy factory, which had recently been moved to Awanui, a few miles closer. The proposed new meetinghouse was not approved but was eventually funded locally to replace the old building, which was all but destroyed in 1927 in the most dramatic demonstration of Ratana-Anglican division (see Chapter 2).\(^{137}\) Acheson was convinced the new hall was required in order to rebuild social capital.

I was not so much afraid of the hall falling to pieces as I was afraid of my scheme falling to pieces because one section was so bitter … that they intimated that … they [had] decided to abandon the

\(^{136}\) Acheson to Native Minister, 10 August 1925, BAAI 1030/121b, ANZA.

\(^{137}\) The new hall cost £1000 and was planned to be funded from small amounts of gum collected by children and charges for hall use. In the event only £12 was recovered from gum sales.
scheme. … the leaders of the settlement … asked me if I would erect a new hall for them on a different site so as to end the enmity. … I knew it was necessary for them to have a hall where they could all meet together and where they could leave their children to sleep in comfort when discussions were going on.138

The strategy worked; both factions used the hall together. However, it would not be until 1941 that public finance, from the Internal Affairs Centennial Funds, allowed completion of Waimirirangi.139

The general store arose from an emergency purchase by the Board in 1926, when the gum industry collapsed, the government ceased purchasing, and credit was no longer available from gum traders. A permanent building was erected in the centre of the settlement in 1928 where, twice since modified, it still stands. A post office was incorporated. The store was managed by accounting-trained photographer R. A. Northwood, a Pākehā, and his wife Winnie Everitt (grand-daughter of Ratana leader Matiu Tupuni). Of Winnie, Acheson would attest in 1930, ‘His wife gets £1 a week as Store Assistant. She is worth much more, being well trained, efficient, discreet, non-talkative, and trustworthy. She is a Te Kao woman herself and speaks Maori’.140

Transactions were seldom in cash but, similarly to gum-credit days, were set off against cream cheques and wages from the development scheme; goods sold in lieu of wages between 1927 and 1930 totalled £9000. Money re-circulated within the community and store profits supplemented Board funds in financing the dairy scheme. Potential mobile competitors were kept at bay because the road to the settlement had not been declared public and Board permission (which was not

138 Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, pp.303-4.
140 J. G. Findlay to Undersecretary Native Department, 6 March 1930; Acheson to Undersecretary, 19 March 1930, BAAI 1030/121b, ANZA.
granted) was required to traverse it. The Board’s accountant in Auckland selected the wide range of goods, which the store sold at cheaper prices than were elsewhere obtainable. Stores were backloaded from Awanui by the Scheme’s cream truck. East coast waters, although kinder than the west, were too unreliable for transporting perishable cream. The Dairy Company had declined to provide a truck, but the scheme’s contract with the company included a subsidy for the Te Kao scheme’s truck and driver, which then enabled Pākehā farmers between Te Kao and Awanui to convert to dairying. The contract also provided for advice on milking procedures and discounts on milking equipment.

Gordon Coates approved loans of an initial £1000 and a further £500, with the instruction that the scheme was the president’s responsibility, backed by advice from the Agriculture Department. The land vested in the Board was the security for the loans. Acheson claimed that approval of a pilot community dairy scheme at Te Kao had been given by other tribal beneficiaries of Tokerau Board funds at hui throughout the north. Drainage was completed in 1926 ahead of schedule by the resident digging experts. By July 1927, 500 acres had been grassed and 600 chains of fencing erected. Acheson estimated that a further £4000 would make the scheme self-supporting, and the Board aimed to keep the total cost under £10,000. Before approving the £4000, the Native Undersecretary, Judge R. N. Jones, requested another Agriculture Department inspection. The advisor’s report was less optimistic than his pre-proposal assessment had been, although essentially he was saying that it was not

141 Acheson, 'Te Kao Dairy Scheme', p.18.
142 ibid., p.12.
143 ibid., p.11.
so much the money that would generate value from the scheme, but the commitment of the farmers to work.\textsuperscript{144} It depended on the social capital of the community.

Ultimately the loan was approved, along with others, with the result that by January 1929 the total of Board advances had reached £17,712.\textsuperscript{145} However, from the time of the less optimistic report, the project would be plagued by confusion about the basis of measurement of value. The advisor’s senior signalled this in his covering note to the report. ‘In judging the success of the Scheme, due allowance should be made for the human aspect. The Natives were almost starving when this work was taken up …this Scheme [is] a good test of how the Native is likely to succeed in making a living from the land’.\textsuperscript{146} Coates had asked Acheson to address the problem of living conditions in the two northern settlements. The scheme had been his proposed solution, but it was starting to be viewed as an independent economic unit, to be judged by its financial performance, rather than by the viability of the community.

Once consolidation proceeded, the number of farms escalated from the anticipated 15 to over 50 by 1929, with a total dairy herd of less than 300. Farms ranged in size from 300 acres down to 30 acres. Consolidation incurred valuation costs. It had been the intention to incorporate the lands and mortgage them, but instead money was advanced to individuals against their cream cheques. The Board maintained the accounts and held the land as security.

\textsuperscript{144} C. J. Hamblyn Agriculture Department Advisor, to Tokerau Board and Native Undersecretary, 22 August 1927, BAAI 1030/121b, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{145} In November 1928, Acheson had applied for a withdrawal of £15,000 from the Native Land Settlement Account, a misnomer for a fund for purchase of Native land for settlement by Europeans. Legislation passed in 1926 appeared to open up access to state money for Māori to develop land by allowing funds from this account to be diverted into Māori Land Boards, once the purchase programme eased. Treasury opposed the application on the basis that the Act had not been referred to them. Application for advance of £15,000 from the Native Land Settlement account under Section 417/09 from President, Tokerau Maori Land Board, ACIH 16036, MA 1, 1928/576, ANZW.

\textsuperscript{146} T. H. Patterson to Native Undersecretary, 20 October 1927, BAAI 1030/121b, ANZA.
The first cream lorry, driven by Tiriki Wiki, left ceremoniously, on 3 October 1927, with eight cream cans on board, for its two-day round trip. Eru Ihaka telegraphed Gordon Coates:

> The canoe of the Aupori [sic] has been launched afresh upon the sea of life. It is going forth carrying our hopes and our aspirations. … We look to you as [our] leader … to see that no rocks are allowed to imperil our canoe on its course.147

Well he might have worried. The world was on the brink of a depression that would more than halve the butterfat price and more than double the payback estimate for the project. Treasury denied access to a promising funding source. Coates’ government was defeated in the 1928 elections – loss of his support had serious implications for the scheme, and his successor, Apirana Ngata, was openly hostile. And the scheme’s first truck lasted only a year on the demanding road.

Road and sea transport arrangements both proved controversial. The road to Te Kao had been built hastily, at minimal cost, for the purpose of the dairy scheme, but not to the specifications of the vehicle required. The Mangonui County Council would not grant a licence for a suitably heavy truck, in 1930, insisting that the Te Kao scheme use a lighter truck. Acheson argued that the purpose of a road was to serve the ‘Actual’ needs of the struggling settlers. The Native Department undersecretary argued, in support, that the department paid a considerable sum in rates on the property and, in the interests of general settlement, the department’s activities at Te Kao should receive every encouragement from local and national government.148

Ngata favoured a compromise whereby the heavy truck be used during the flush season over summer, and a light truck on wet days and after February. Consequently,

---

147 Henderson, Te Kao 75.
148 Acheson, 'Te Kao Dairy Scheme', p.15.
the scheme was burdened with the costs of two trucks. Further controversy attended replacement of the heavier truck in 1935. Because the scheme came under the Native Department, public service policies required it to buy British, and a Leyland was selected by a group of officials not familiar with Te Kao. The Leyland was expensive, heavy, and difficult to manoeuvre and maintain, adding costs that a private operator might not have risked.

Despite difficulties, road transport was more reliable for carriage of dairy products, but shipping remained important for other bulk items. Existing landings used by Te Kao could only be reached at high tides. The first Native Department advisor for Te Kao’s scheme recommended a wharf in 1930. The department declined but, undeterred, members of Te Kao community built a jetty and two-mile approach road entirely at their own cost.149

Because other deep-water options were rejected as too expensive, in 1941 a landing was recommissioned on land donated by Hemi Manuera. Ngata remarked, ‘the initial mistake was in planting an elaborate scheme at Te Kao

149 Findlay to Ngata, 1 March 1932, AAMK 869 1356a 61/14a Vol.1, ANZW.
150 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.27.
ahead of communications and then expecting the services to coordinate’.  

However, it is extremely unlikely that the communications and services would have been coordinated in a vacuum; necessity was the mother of invention.

Ngata’s hostility to the Te Kao scheme has been pondered but not resolved. The intensity of hostility suggests a deep-seated conflict rather than one of the moment. For this, one needs to look back in history. If Ngata had been complicit in manipulating the 1909 selection of Te Rangi Hiroa (Peter Buck) for Northern Māori, as has been suggested (Chapter 3), the deceit would have inflamed Eru Ihaka’s resentment through his darkest years. Ihaka, along with three other far northern candidates, stood against Te Rangi Hiroa in the 1911 election, taking between them 41% of the votes for Northern Māori, which indicates the far north’s strong opposition to Buck. For his part Ngata might well have resented opposition to his preferred candidate and close friend. Ngata might also have had a ‘not invented here’ attitude to the Te Kao scheme, and certainly he had an abhorrence of Ratana. He threatened to ‘cut the tail of the fish off and … let it rot’. Ihaka responded, ‘We appreciate, when you use the term let it rot, that you quote St. Paul: that the seed must rot before it sprouts. We welcome that reassurance. We will sprout!’ Te Kao’s scheme came under Ngata’s purview in 1928, and yet it is not listed in the schedule of Tai Tokerau schemes in Ngata’s 1932 report to government. Quite probably Ngata thought that the level of spending at Te Kao, and its improbability of financial success, would adversely prejudice his own aspirations for Māori land development.

151 Wharf file: BAAI 1030/124b, ANZA; General report on Te Kao, Acheson to Native Minister, 27 June 1932, AAMK 869 1356a 61/14 Vol. 1, ANZW.
152 Stokes, p.254.
153 Chapter 3; Moon, pp.331-3.
154 Henderson, Te Kao 75, p.42.
Ngata was critical of Pākehā intervention in Māori affairs and of Land Court judges in particular, to which breed Acheson belonged.

The idea is that the judicial element should be taken more and more out of the problem. …The will of the Government cannot be expressed so far as Native land is concerned if the chief officers continue to be … hedged around with the ‘tapu’ of the Judiciary.156

Finally, it would have irked Ngata that Ngāpuhi, Te Rarawa and Ngāti Kahu supported Te Aupōuri’s confidence in the judge, going so far as to say, ‘We are at one in our request, from Tamaki to Spirits’ Bay, that Mr Acheson be retained’.157 Two months after receiving their petitions, Ngata wrote to Te Rangi Hiroa in Hawaii that Te Kao’s scheme suffered from overbuilding, overspending and overzealous Pākehā control, and that he intended to starve it of funds to bring the participants to heel.158

Two Native Department officials reported in 1929 that, from a farming perspective, ‘land only justifies expenditure according to its producing power’,159 thus perpetuating the measurement confusion, which had started in 1927. They concluded that £24,489 had been spent at Te Kao to achieve a production value of no more than £11,000. No reference was made to the store’s profitability or the welfare of Te Kao’s inhabitants. The quality of the livestock was praised, but the estimate that the 3500 acres should be able to carry 750 head of dairy stock was probably optimistic for its time.160 Officials reported that the Tokerau Board was possibly insolvent and drastic steps needed to be taken. Ngata reacted by severely constricting funds.161 At the same time his department’s access to funds had also been restricted by Treasury’s

156 Ngata, NZPD, 1923, 200, p.1077.
157 Ngapuhi to Judge Rahiri, 17 March 1930, Judge Acheson Papers, Auckland University Library; Herepete Rapihana to Native Minister, August 1930; Mare Tawhai to the Right Hon J. G. Coates, 16 August 1930, AAMK W3112/1, 32/2/1, Vol.1, ANZW.
159 Patrick Barry, Native Land Development Advisor to Native Undersecretary, 7 November 1929, BAAI 1030/121b, ANZA.
interpretation of legislation that purported to make finance available for Māori land development.162

Eru Ihaka was alarmed to learn that farm units owed £16,000. ‘If we had been supplied with dairy herds at the commencement of this scheme we would understand how this indebtedness was incurred’. He suggested that the Pākehā store manager, truck driver and schoolmaster take their generous salaries elsewhere.163 This was a surprising reaction, given the commitment of the three men he referred to, but understandable, given that the men were paid regardless of outcome, were not accountable for the success or failure of the scheme, and would not be responsible for the mounting debt. Ihaka might also have felt that his trust had been misplaced. This was probably one incident that led Acheson to comment about the insecurity of bridging between Pākehā and Māori.

Withholding funds from the scheme resulted in some Te Kao people returning to gum-fossicking in an attempt to meet immediate needs. By 1931 the strain was showing. Dairy standards fell because children were left to milk while their parents dug gum, which then left the adults too weary to spread fertiliser that had been delivered, or sow pasture grass, both having to be done by hand. Horses were neglected and unfit to work. Religious divisions resurfaced. And yet in 1932 Te Kao farmers had got through winter without unemployment relief.164 A marked uplift was reported in 1933, which the elder Hemi Manuera explained as a reaction against what he considered to be a slanderous attack by Ngata when they met at Ahipara: ‘We have

162 Judge Jones to Ngata, various exchanges 1928, Application for Advance of £15,000 from the Native Land Settlement Account under Section 417/09 from President, Tokerau Maori Land Board, ACIH 16036, MA 1, 1928/376, ANZW.
163 Ihaka to Native Minister, 3 November 1930, AAMK 869 1356a 61/14, Vol. 1. ANZW. It appears that £11,000 of the £16,000 was interest.
164 Acheson to Native Minister, General Report on Te Kao, June 1932, AAMK 869 1356a 61/14 Vol. 1, ANZW.
decided to live as economically as we can and by reorganising our system of work with a view to getting quicker results prove to the Minister that we are deserving of the trust placed in us by one more worthy than he to be called the Friend of the Maori’.165

Judge Acheson drew attention back to the central issue in his lengthy 1932 report.

The problem at Te Kao was at no time a purely farming and land development one. It was inseparably linked with health and other community problems, … In every respect except the value of cash repayments and the weakness of a few units, the scheme is already a success … The Board claims that the Te Kao Scheme is infinitely more difficult and many-sided than any other Development Scheme of its size in New Zealand. All the activities of the Scheme interact with each other.166

Acheson counted amongst the scheme’s many successes the end to the ‘ghastly death-rate’ in children, the absence of Te Kao people from the unemployment roll, permanent settlement of families on the land at no cost to the state, the opening of dairying land between Te Kao and Awanui, and the inspiration of the scheme to Māori settlement and consolidation in the north. An Economy Commission in 1932 and a Royal Commission in 1934, followed by parliamentary debate, focussed attention on the Te Kao scheme, much of it adverse. At the last of these, Coates presented a succinct case for Te Kao, prepared for him by Acheson, which revolved around the social capital created by the investment – a healthy, progressive, tribally organised community with every family possessing a farm, all achieved without the use of state money, and with the approval of other Tai Tokerau tribes. When a

165 Hemi Manuera to Acheson, 7 June 1932, Monica Acheson Papers, in possession of John Acheson, Acheson, ‘Te Kao Dairy Scheme’, p.25.
166 Acheson to Native Minister, General Report on Te Kao, June 1932, AAMK 869 1356a 61/14 Vol. 1, ANZW.
member interjected: ‘what was the loss on Te Kao?’ Coates couched his response in terms of this social capital: ‘Who can say whether there was a loss or a gain?’ 167

As noted earlier, the Tokerau Board had assisted 78 farms throughout other parts of the north. But the Board had run out of money to lend by 1930. Many more northern Māori residents were keen to start farming, but funds were not readily forthcoming from other government sources. 168 At this point Ngata negotiated a reversal of the earlier Treasury decision to disallow funding, but he managed further farm development through his Department rather than through the Land Boards. The remaining Tokerau loans were also transferred to the Department, leaving the Board with only Te Kao. The store, general buildings and cream service were accounted for separately, and their accumulated profits were used to repay the capital cost of the farm scheme, as had been Acheson’s intention. 169 A further source of income became available from a contract negotiated by Acheson with the Australasian Glass Company in 1933. The contract earned £100 a year (rising to £200 by 1940) in rent and royalties from glass sands on the Kokota spit at the mouth of the Parengarenga Harbour. 170 Sand had been mined earlier, but earned spasmodically and far less. It had been common practice for coastal shippers to backload sand to Opua or Auckland, often without permission or payment. 171 As early as 1885 Te Aupōuri had

167 NZPD, 7-8 November 1934, 240, p. 1202.
169 Surprisingly, in 1932 the undersecretary advised that ‘all profits arising from the Board store belong to the Board.’ Acheson countered that there were ‘neither legal nor moral grounds for using Te Kao Store profits in any other way than for the sole benefit of the Te Kao Dairy scheme’. He was adamant that neither the Board nor the Native Department had any claim on a share of the profits. Acheson to Undersecretary Native Department, 18 November 1932, BAAI 1030/121c; annotation on Undersecretary to Acheson, 21 November 1932, BAAI 1030/123b, ANZA.
170 Silica sand file, AAMK 869/6676 19/1/451, ANZW. Sand income had been £337 in total over the previous ten years.
been complaining about unauthorised taking of their sand, which they recognised had considerable commercial value.

But this particular new treasure has been discovered on the land of Parengarenga of Te Aupouri. The sand of our district is our gift like the sand of Taranaki that is worked for iron. If it is carried to the Pakeha experts to melt the sand glass is produced from which to make house windows.\(^{172}\)

They placed notices in English-language newspapers to remind that no further unauthorised mining would be tolerated, under threat of sinking ships at the beach.\(^{173}\)

Ngata resigned in 1934, amidst accusations of misuse of Native Department funds. The new administration’s assessment of Te Kao’s scheme was even more pessimistic than earlier reports. It recommended a substantial write-down, along with takeover by the Native Land Settlement Board.\(^{174}\) Hopes of completing Te Kao’s scheme, or starting a similar scheme at Te Hapua, or the Board lending to other farmers were dashed, like the metaphorical canoe upon the rocks. And yet Eru Ihaka could still say to the prime minister, and self-appointed Native Minister, of a government newly allied with Ratana:

The first cream was sent in 1927 … It was a great occasion for us. We agreed to think our children would never suffer as we had suffered on the gumfields. … We want to show you the good results. We have our farms, our stock, our store, our cream service, but most of all our health and our happiness. The school roll has increased from 60 to 100. Had we been left to work on roads as were our Te Hapua relatives, we would like them to have little to show today for all the relief money expended. … We were the first community in New Zealand to suffer from unemployment. There was no relief Scheme in those days. … Perhaps we are the only community in New Zealand left to bear its unemployment burden itself.\(^{175}\)


\(^{173}\) ibid. Original in Māori, writer’s translation.

\(^{174}\) Findlay and Wallace to Registrar, 28 April 1934, BAAI 1030/121a, ANZA.

\(^{175}\) Ihaka and others to Savage, February 1936, ACIH 16036, MA 1, 364 19/1/210, ANZW.
Under the Labour government, Te Kao’s scheme faced further neglect and hostility. Judge Acheson’s relationship with officials deteriorated to an extent that rendered his bridging role ineffective and potentially detrimental by 1940.

The sequel warrants noting. Te Kao’s farmers became individual shareholders in the Kaitaia Dairy Company in 1941 by accident rather than design. In 1943 Acheson’s appointment was terminated after bitter exchanges with Chief Judge Shepherd. ‘The maverick Judge had turned renegade, by placing himself firmly against Departmental policy’. After his removal, Acheson volunteered himself to the north and lived in Te Kao for a year, during which further reports on Te Kao’s scheme were made. Four versions of the outstanding debt emerged over the next two years: the first from Registrar J. H. Robertson; the second from the Native Department’s chief accountant, M. J. Lawless; and the third was Acheson’s assessment. The fourth was the basis for the actual settlement between Te Aupōuri Trust Board, the new Tokerau Board president, Ivor Prichard, and the Native Department, 1945-46, when the scheme was finally handed back to the Te Kao residents. Table 10 attempts to relate these.

176 Acheson, ‘A Saint and a Sinner?’ paper, p.60.
Table 10 - Comparison of Te Kao financial estimates, 1944-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robertson(^{177})</th>
<th>Lawless(^{178})</th>
<th>Acheson(^{179})</th>
<th>Prichard(^{180})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>(£25,000+)</td>
<td>(£19,000)</td>
<td>(£21,500) net</td>
<td>(£22,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Super-interest’ write-off, interest overpaid, supervision costs overcharged, losses due to financial constraints.</td>
<td>£4,500</td>
<td>£9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of ‘Surplus Lands’ Claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable claims – failure of Board to collect rent prior to 1924.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit for opening up Pākehā farms between Te Kao and Waipapakauri for dairying and other equitable claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State funding for wartime community vegetable growing &amp; other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(£4,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be repaid. Remission of administration fees. Recharged. Further interest charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>(£1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding (debt) / credit</strong></td>
<td>(£25,000)</td>
<td>(£14,500)</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>(£25,000+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is immediately obvious is that accounting was not an accurate or objective exercise in any way approaching a science. The numbers were ‘experts’ estimates, imbued with some mythical or mystical truth, and ultimately paid in real money by Te Aupōuri people. There appears to have been no onus of proof on the government to support its claims of liability by Te Kao. It was clear to Acheson, from the time of his appointment, that the Tokerau Board’s record-keeping had been negligent.

Unnecessary survey fees had been incurred, rents and arrears had not been collected,

\(^{177}\) Registrar to Undersecretary, 31 January 1944, BAAI 1030/1029b, ANZA.
\(^{178}\) Lawless to Undersecretary, 26 June 1944, BAAI 1030/1029b, ANZA.
\(^{179}\) Undated paper, Judge Frank O. V. Acheson Papers, 1906-1948, MSS & Archives 96/1, Auckland University Library.
\(^{180}\) Prichard to Undersecretary, 5 October 1945, BAAI 1030/1029b, ANZA.
interest had not been attributed, and sums of money had been siphoned off. And to those sins were added consolidation valuation costs, more survey fees, higher truck costs than were needed for the scheme, and excessive interest. In the final ‘negotiations’, with their access to data severed by Acheson’s removal, Te Kao’s elders were obliged to accept numbers they could not verify. There was asymmetrical information and bargaining power. Native Department negotiators appeared to give with one hand, but in actuality took back, plus some, with the other. No credit was given for Te Kao’s contribution to community or its self-sufficiency during the depression. No consideration was given to the initial purpose of the scheme – to alleviate the poverty of Te Kao’s inhabitants – the end result exploited their vulnerable situation. The outcome was severe destruction of social capital between Pākehā and Te Kao Māori, witnessed by all other closely related Māori in the far north.

The scheme was finally transferred to Te Aupōuri Trust Board in 1946, but the Māori Trustee managed the funds. Debts were cleared by 1953, and control was handed back to Te Aupōuri, just when urban migration had gathered momentum.

**Other farm schemes**

Te Kao had been the biggest single venture of the Tokerau Board, but Judge Acheson applied some of the Tokerau Land Board’s funds to seeding family dairy farms in the north. In addition to Te Kao, 78 farms were started – 11 in the Kaipara district, 21 in the Bay of Islands, 29 in the Hokianga and 17 in other parts of the Mangonui District. The average amount advanced to each was £300. The relationships of individual Māori to the state-structured institution appeared to work well for both parties. ‘They were strictly honourable in their dealing with the Board’. The loans still outstanding
in 1930 were transferred to the Native Department as part of the restructuring of the Land Board’s finances. By 1934, interest had been paid in full on all Land Board loans, and £7000 of the £23,000 in capital had been repaid; nine farmers had repaid the capital in full. The comparative success of these farms was attributed to the farmers having gained dairying experience by working for Pākehā, which enabled them to become productive within the first year, whereas Te Kao’s farms took three years.\(^{181}\)

By 1930, the Tokerau Land Board had run out of money to lend. After that time, financing came directly from the Native Department. Ngata’s 1931 report on Native Land Development to both houses of the General Assembly gives a comprehensive list of blocks and cumulative amounts spent in each district.\(^{182}\) In Mangonui and Hokianga 119 and 120 ‘units’ (person responsible for farm) had been assisted respectively. Māori-owned land that came under the schemes totalled 127,500 acres for Mangonui, divided into 78 blocks. For Hokianga, 99,000 acres were divided between 111 blocks.\(^{183}\) Because expenditure for the four schemes of Tokerau – Mangonui, Hokianga, Bay of Islands and Kaipara – was aggregated it is not possible to show which districts received most funding, but units assisted in the Bay of Islands (149) and Kaipara (32) were fewer than the total for the two far northern schemes. By 31 March 1931, over £15,000 had been spent in the Tokerau District.\(^{184}\) Between March and August of 1931 the sum doubled to £31,000. For the 1931-32 year, estimated additional expenditure for Mangonui and Hokianga was £7,000 and £8,000 respectively.

---

\(^{181}\) Acheson, Evidence to 1934 Commission, pp.280, 318, 317.

\(^{182}\) AJHR, 1931, I, G-10. For many areas, detailed maps of subdivisions are included, but not for Mangonui and Hokianga.

\(^{183}\) Blocks did not correspond to units. The average farm size is not given.

\(^{184}\) On dairy stock, grass seed, farm and dairy implements, fencing material, fertilizers, discharge of liabilities (presumably rates) and other sundries.
The 1938 land schemes report shows five separately identified schemes in the far north, in addition to totals for the whole of each county. The separately identified schemes were Te Kao, Ngataki, Oturu, Manukau, and Panguru.\textsuperscript{185} The areas gazetted for all developments were 100,506 for Hokianga county and 130,786 acres for Mangonui, of which 22,397 and 17,103 acres respectively had been developed.\textsuperscript{186} The areas occupied by 269 and 243 ‘settlers’ were 39,750 and 28,125 acres for the respective counties. Each ‘settler’ had on average 9.5 dependants. Average acres occupied per ‘settler’ were 148 and 116 acres (14 and 11 acres per person), of which about half the area had been developed. Table 11 shows livestock and earnings.\textsuperscript{187}

Table 11 - Livestock and earnings of land development schemes 1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Hokianga</th>
<th>Mangonui</th>
<th>Manukau</th>
<th>Ngataki</th>
<th>Oturu</th>
<th>Panguru</th>
<th>Waima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cows milked</td>
<td>4112</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other dairy stock</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run cattle</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWes bredding</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep dry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses and bullocks</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Butterfat</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poundage</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>608,880 420,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash proceeds</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>38,055 26,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department's portion</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>12,685 11,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wool

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bales</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net value</td>
<td>£ 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department's portion</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock sales</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops &amp; sundries</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash to Department</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in dairy company shareholdings indicates that Māori embraced dairy farming keenly in the far north. Whereas the Tokerau Board’s funding of individual farms had worked well (if not Te Kao’s), there were some farmers who were wary of the Native Department’s financing arrangements and preferred to manage


\textsuperscript{186} Te Kao is not shown separately, and the numbers for Hokianga and Mangonui appear to include individual farms as well as land development blocks.

\textsuperscript{187} Te Kao’s data was not recorded in the report, and Waima ran livestock but was not yet ‘developed’.
independently. For them the outcome appears to have been less negative than for those whose activities were dictated by the state. There was a high level of general dissatisfaction with Māori Affairs’ supervision over debts incurred on behalf of farmers beyond their ability to pay, poor advice, arrogance and disrespect. Most of this dissatisfaction surfaced during and after World War Two.188

Some similarities are apparent (but not necessarily real) between the Māori experience of their relationships with state institutions and the post-communism experience of Polish farmers, whose relationship with the co-operative dairy companies they had initiated became mediated by the state. By World War One, co-operative movements in both Denmark and Poland were sufficiently well established to attract political interest. A full range of political parties (left and right) supported the idea of co-operation in both countries during the inter-war period, with the underlying objective of achieving influence in the movement. Denmark followed a democratic path of economic development after World War Two and continued to foster the co-operative movement. Poland’s co-operatives, on the other hand, faced attack, infiltration and subordination from its changed political regimes. The voluntary organisations were brought under state or party control, with the result that the co-operatives members ‘became accustomed to obeying orders rather than making their own decisions, at the same time destroying the stock of social capital’. There was a sense of loss of ownership of the enterprises that had been built from the bottom up. Massive state intervention established bureaucracies that monopolised the right to approve all actions. Poles became far less likely to trust the four most

188 Matiu and Mutu, pp.193, 24n, 200-201. The Crown’s actions in respect of these schemes gave rise to one of the many grievances that the five far northern iwi took before the Waitangi Tribunal in the Muriwhenua land claims.
important formal institutions (legal system, police, administration and government) than Danes.\textsuperscript{189}

Although the Svendsens were comparing social capital outcomes for capitalist and communist political systems, there is some resonance in their conclusions for the Māori and Pākehā outcomes in dairying. Starting with the Tokerau Māori Land Board’s Te Kao dairy scheme, then moving through the Ngata farm schemes and on to those administered by the Māori Affairs Department, state intervention progressively undermined the sense of enterprise and ownership Māori had in their dairying endeavours. Social capital was damaged in the process. Mason Durie argued that widening of the Māori Affairs Department brief to encompass so many aspects of Māori life encouraged whānau to turn increasingly to it and the state for guidance, support and direction, trading political loyalty for state generosity. In his opinion, while the strategy softened the harshness of poverty, it created an image of Māori as dependent, unskilled workers and eager state beneficiaries.\textsuperscript{190} However, it would be far too simplistic to draw an ‘intervention versus non-intervention’ divide. It was not a matter of if, but of how. In New Zealand the state encouraged and facilitated co-operatives and finally funded some Māori agriculture. Some interventions were positive and useful, many were too little too late, and others were obstructive and destructive.

When the gum industry failed there was no capacity to absorb labour in agricultural work because the agriculture sectors, too, faced the depression. The Unemployment Act 1930 had excluded Māori, but later they could elect to contribute. However, relief payments for Māori were less than for Pākehā, because it was assumed that their

\textsuperscript{189} Svendsen and Svendsen, p.64.
\textsuperscript{190} Durie, p.5.
needs were fewer.\textsuperscript{191} Ngata favoured less dependence on the Pākehā economic system and more self-reliance based on traditional methods.\textsuperscript{192} Three avenues of relief were open to Māori after 1935, but contract work on Māori land was preferred by the government because it was full-time work.\textsuperscript{193} It was under this regime that the continuing difficulties at Te Hapua were addressed. Whereas Te Kao’s scheme had been an immediate response to the collapse of the gum industry and an end to the population’s free enterprise, Te Hapua was approached as an unemployment issue.\textsuperscript{194}

**Te Hapua’s farm scheme**

When Judge Acheson first visited Te Hapua in 1925, the condition of the kainga was even worse than Te Kao’s. By 1936 some benefits and pensions had been paid to its inhabitants but, without a land development scheme, conditions were little, if any, better. While Te Kao’s health had improved, one quarter of Te Hapua’s children still died before the age of five and 75% of its population was tubercular.\textsuperscript{195} Eru Ihaka still held out hope.

Our settlement on the southern side of Parengarenga Harbour is a purely Maori one of 350 people. It is the headquarters [sic] of the Aupouri Tribe. On the north side of the Harbour is Te Hapua with over 400 Maoris and no whites except the School staff. These two groups have held fast to their ancestral lands and await the day now almost at hand, when the many hundreds of Aupouris scattered in the south will return home.\textsuperscript{196}

\textsuperscript{192} sorrenson, ed., Na to Hoa, Vol. 2, pp.43, 148.
\textsuperscript{193} Orange, ‘A Kind of Equality’, p.66.
\textsuperscript{194} Denoon, ‘Settler Capitalism Unsettled’, p.141. ‘The English word “unemployment” did not come into general use until the mid-1890s’ … To use the term for any earlier period or outside a fully industrial economy is ahistoric. Michael Piore argues that the modern concept of unemployment cannot be applied to mainly agricultural societies, even when some industrial work is also performed. Those workers adapted to the job market by adjusting their household activities. ‘Unemployment’ assumed its present meaning – involuntary idleness – only 100 years ago, and in advanced industrial economies. The modern concept ‘derives from one particular employment relationship, that of the large, permanent manufacturing establishment. [Such employment] involves a radical separation in time and in space from family and leisure time activity and was (and is) relatively permanent’.
\textsuperscript{195} Allen Bell to Property Supervisor, Native Department, 2 April 1936, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
\textsuperscript{196} Ihaka to Savage, February 1936, ACIH 16036, MA 1 364 19/1/210, ANZW.
The government saw the situation and solution differently. At the close of the study period of this thesis, in 1937, Te Hapua received its ultimate farm development scheme, close to an ultimatum in fact. By comparison with Te Kao’s, Te Hapua’s scheme was simple. According to the ‘experts’, the land at Te Hapua was not suitable for any type of development – the soil was poor, there was no adequate supply of water in the summer and the ground around the settlement flooded in winter; it was difficult to drain or irrigate. The solution was to relocate the population to Ngataki, where the land could support farming. This solution would also achieve the government’s other significant objective of controlling Te Hapua’s finances, as it had Te Kao’s by less direct methods.

The Departmental policy is to control all Government moneys going into the settlement, i.e. Pensions and Unemployment and to see that it is expended on the right lines on.
1. Food and clothing.
2. Improved living conditions.
It is not intended to expend capital moneys in the settlement if it can be avoided. Repairs to houses are to be done out of the owners incomes only as far as conditions will permit and in a more or less temporary manner.
On application we will make Mr. Watt agent for Pensions and Unemployment moneys.

From the collapse of the gum industry in 1926 through to 1939, Te Hapua’s economy was predominantly informal. It was reliant on scrapings of gum income, a little seasonal farm labouring at Te Paki station, some government benefits, and spasmodic unemployment relief work constructing roads, but otherwise what could be gleaned from free-roaming livestock on what little land remained to them, cultivating small plots of low fertility garden and the still rich bounty of beach and sea, although even

---

197 A. H. Watt to Registrar Tokerau Land Board, Auckland, 22 July 1937, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
198 Under Secretary, Native Department to Registrar, Native Land Court, 2 June 1937, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
that was threatened.\textsuperscript{199} Some were offered unemployment relief on government infrastructure projects out of the area. The government’s position was that Māori who remained in Te Hapua could earn sufficient income from gum, supplementing other sources, for their immediate needs. Officials considered that they squandered earnings, particularly on old cars, bicycles and home brew.\textsuperscript{200} Consequently, applications for unemployment relief were often rejected. But Māori experience was that gum-digging was a precarious existence; there was no certainty of being able to sell diggings at all, let alone what price level might be achieved.\textsuperscript{201} Dalmatians had deserted the gumfields in droves in the 1930s for these reasons.

Hardship had been exacerbated by the death of the Yates couple. Despite suggestions that Sam acquired land in satisfaction of gum debts, he appears to have been well respected. Although, like other gum traders and storekeepers, he recorded debts owing by Māori to him through the court system, in contrast with other traders of the area, with few exceptions, his claims were settled out of court.\textsuperscript{202} But ‘Sam came out of it all right. He and his Maori friends saw to that’,\textsuperscript{203} quite probably in a non-monetary manner. Following Ngawini’s death in 1910, and the sale of the property to

\textsuperscript{199} Rata Murupaenga, chair of Te Hapua Maori Labour Committee, to Savage, Peter Fraser, Frank Langstone and Patrick Webb, 10 January 1939, (translation) BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA. ‘We wish to have the europeans debarred from continuing to fish commercially in the Parengarenga river. We fear the exhaustion of fish supply … this is our regular source of food’. Savage replied, 22 May 1939, ‘The amount of commercial fishing done in your harbour should not be detrimental to the maintenance of the fish stocks. … If you find that any illegal methods are being adopted you should get into communication with the local Inspector of Fisheries’.

\textsuperscript{200} Dale, Assistant Supervisor, Kaitaia, 24 May 1937, and Coughlan, Supervisor, Kaitaia to Registrar Native Land Court, 13 October 1938, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA. The coastal passenger service had been stopped in 1931 thus curbing the mobility of Te Hapua’s inhabitants. Hence the attraction of cars. Explicit instructions had been given to the driver of Te Kao’s truck not to backhaul homebrew ingredients.

\textsuperscript{201} Rata Murupaenga, chair Te Hapua Maori Labour Committee to Savage, Minister Native Affairs, 28 March 1938; H. T. Romana, Secretary Te Hapua Maori Labour Committee and 57 others, to Savage, 7 July 1938, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{202} Kaitaia Civil Record 1895-1905, BADD 10824 1a, ANZA.

\textsuperscript{203} Kereama (Hoeft), p.42.
a Pākehā family, gum trading was taken over by the predatory Parenga Gum Company. Its ascendance coincided with the decline in the gum industry.

The Tai Tokerau Māori Land Board had let vested Aupōuri land on long-term renewable leases to recover survey costs that the owners could not pay. Te Aupōuri Māori understood that no leaseholder was to be allowed an area larger than 2000 acres, but by using a land agent, a solicitor and two accountants to front the transactions, the gum company managed to lease 20,001 acres (Appendix 5), achieved a stranglehold on the local economy, and tried to ‘starve’ Māori residents out. The Tai Tokerau Board, by its own admission, had failed to provide for Māori to dig gum on these lands and the gum company charged each Māori digger ‘a license fee of £1-13-4 per month or a royalty of 10% upon all gum extracted by him from land of which he is an undivided owner’. In return the gum company paid an annual rent of £250, which had to be distributed amongst 1561 owners, equal to 3/3d each per annum. The contrast with the Yates’ relationship with Te Aupōuri and Ngāti Kuri was devastating, personally and economically.

When the Yates’ store passed to the Parenga Gumfield Company, Te Hapua’s inhabitants invited a Mr Cheeseman to open a store on the north side of the harbour, but before long the temptation of the monopoly position led to vastly increased prices for goods. Disenchanted locals supported the establishment of informal stores by Māori and Dalmatian entrepreneurs. But even with competition they were vulnerable

---

204 Commissioners Stout and Ngata to Carroll, Native Minister, 15 May 1908, Parengarenga and Pakohu Blocks, BAAI 1030 127c 26/40, ANZA.
205 Edwin T Wilson to President Tai Tokerau Native Land Board, 9 March 1915, Parengarenga and Pakohu Blocks, BAAI 1030 127c 26/40, ANZA.
206 Judge Acheson to Under Secretary Native Department, 12 September 1926, BAAI 1030 127c, ANZA.
207 President Tai Tokerau Land Board to Under Secretary Native Department, 14 August 1916, BAAI 1030 127c 26/40. The inspector of the Tai Tokerau Board suggested breaches of the Truck Act in that prices exceeded Auckland prices by 50-100%. Cheeseman was associated with Auckland gum merchants.
to exploitation because of their isolation. When a sick man, recently discharged from
hospital and unable to work, faced confiscation of his car, the rest of the community
contributed to paying his debt.208 There were exchanges of correspondence between
government departments about establishing a government-run community store,
similar to Te Kao’s. The scheme was to extend to controlling all government money
(pensions and benefits) coming into the community by appointing the storekeeper
agent. But without a land scheme to encourage loyalty, officials assessed (probably
correctly) that Māori would be unlikely to patronise a government store. Appointment
of an agent ultimately proved to be outside their authority to impose.209

The Ngataki solution – that is, relocation – was put to meetings at Te Hapua and Te
Mingi in 1937. It met strong (anticipated) resistance from elders. The government
strategy was to target younger men, to lure them away with the possibility of earning
their own farm by labouring on the project.210 To be eligible to join the scheme, the
men had to register as unemployed. There had been persistent resistance to
unemployment registration by some who preferred to retain financial
independence.211 The logic of conditional entry was to enable the Native Department
to gain control of the finances and mobility of participants in the scheme. If men
remained living in Te Hapua, they were deemed to be ‘employed’ in gum digging,
therefore ineligible for unemployment and ineligible for the farm scheme.212 The
Department also did not accept applications for unemployment relief from women,

---

208 Murupaenga to Acheson, 14 July 1938, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
209 Under Secretary Native Department to Registrar Native Land Court, 28 June 1937; 25 March 1938,
BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
210 A. H. Watt, Welfare Officer, to Registrar Native Land Court, Auckland, 22 July 1937, BAAI 1030
371a, ANZA. The approach resembled Wakefield’s ‘systematic colonization’, wherein working class
immigrants’ wages were made sufficient to act as an incentive to hard work and thrift in order to
become landowners eventually. Lloyd and Metzer, ‘Settler Colonization and Societies in History’, p.23.
211 Property Supervisor to Registrar Tai Tokerau Land Board, 5 March 1937, BAAI 1030 361b 21/10
FP1, ANZA.
212 Coughlan, Supervisor, to Registrar Native Land Court, 13 October 1938, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
unless they could prove they had been working in paid employment in the past year. It appears that for this purpose, however, gum digging did not count. Women were not eligible for employment at Ngataki but could accompany their husbands and were encouraged to cultivate vegetable plots.\textsuperscript{213} One woman who applied for her family to join the scheme was deemed ineligible because she was married to a European, and the official view was that a woman took her husband’s ethnicity on marriage.\textsuperscript{214} Inconsistently, the ethnicity did not seem to extend to children, who were deemed to be Mäori.\textsuperscript{215}

The Ngataki scheme, developed on Crown land, planned to employ and accommodate 12 men initially, with accompanying families building the total to 50. The supervisor undertook to admit no more than this number when concern was expressed about potential overcrowding. Within a year from late 1937, 155 Mäori from Te Hapua migrated, including many who had been involved in the axing of Te Kao’s meeting house ten years earlier. The predicted overpopulation eventuated, no bathing facilities were constructed until April 1938, borrowed tents were leaking, and as many as 14 people in one family occupied one Public Works Department one-roomed hut and a 10’ x 8’ tent.\textsuperscript{216} A. H. Watt protested that Mäori should be treated with respect. The government response was that their living conditions at Ngataki were better than at Te Hapua or on the gumfields.\textsuperscript{217}

Out of these conditions a new community was built drawing on the inherently strong bonding capital and customary informality. Tom Murray started a passenger service.

\textsuperscript{213} Registrar to Coughlan, 20 June 1939, BAAI 1030 361e, ANZA.
\textsuperscript{214} Supervisor, Native Department Kaitaia, to Registrar, Native Land Court, Auckland, 2 June 1939, BAAI 1030 361e, ANZA.
\textsuperscript{215} For example, Walter Petricevich, son of Lawrence Petricevich and Makareta Raharuhi, was eligible.
\textsuperscript{216} Coughlan to Registrar Native Land Court, 17 March 1939, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
\textsuperscript{217} A. H. Watt to Minister of Health November 1938; Registrar to Under Secretary Native Department, November 1938, BAAI 1030 371a, ANZA.
Mrs Rehi Peti Murray offered to conduct a post and telephone office.\textsuperscript{218} A European school had been built at Ngataki in 1912, in response to a petition from Pākehā gum settlers. In 1939, 70 Māori pupils (no Pākehā) overcrowded the school building. The Education Department initially resisted an application to convert it to a Native School, suggesting that Ngataki’s Māori pupils could be transported to Te Kao. Such a solution was insensitive to the frictions between the two groups arising out of the meeting house and related issues. Conversion to a Native School was approved in 1941.\textsuperscript{219}

During the 1930s period of turmoil in Te Hapua, two of its young women, born in 1920 and 1921, were completing their secondary education at Queen Victoria school in Auckland. In 1944 Miraka Petricevich (Mira Szaszy) would become the first woman graduate of Māori descent in New Zealand; she was also the first Māori, male or female, from the far north to obtain a university degree.\textsuperscript{220} In 1928 Reverend Panapa had been the first Māori to achieve a Licentiate of Theology (LTh), but other Māori clergy did not follow his tertiary academic success until the 1960s.\textsuperscript{221} The second young woman from Te Hapua, Merimeri Rapata (Dr. Penfold), would go on to spend more than 40 years in primary school teaching and lecturing Māori language at Auckland University.\textsuperscript{222} In the early 1940s, these achievements would have been seen as the acquisition of Pākehā cultural capital. In retrospect they were early indicators of a Māori renaissance in the north, which would unfold in more liberal times following World War Two. Aspirations to renaissance appear in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{218} Supervisor to Registrar Native Department, 14 February 1939, BAAI 1030 361e, ANZA.
\item \textsuperscript{219} Maori Schools – Building and Site Files – Ngataki, BAAA 1001 371b 44/4 Part 1, 1910-1945, ANZA. A new concrete-block meeting hall, Waiora, was constructed in the 1960s-70s.
\item \textsuperscript{220} Auckland University College, Calendar / Auckland University College, University of New Zealand, Auckland, 1884-1957.
\item \textsuperscript{221} Blain.
\item \textsuperscript{222} Amongst a raft of other activities, the two women would form a team of chairwoman and secretary for the Māori Women’s Welfare League in the 1970s.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
correspondence from Eru Ihaka in 1936, when he wrote to Prime Minister Savage requesting a grant from the Maori Purposes Fund for training Te Aupōuri people in Māori crafts. The response to the request was that there were areas with greater need. Yet in 1940-41 a Rarotongan builder, Jack Paitai, built a Whare Matua and a dining area for Te Paatū’s Oturu marae, with their financial and labour resources.

Rural women had two major organisations of support: Country Women’s Institute (1921) and Women’s Division of the Farmers’ Union (1925, later Federated Farmers). Māori women did not participate as much in the latter as in the former, for which separate Māori Women’s Institutes began in 1929. Exceptionally, Whina Cooper founded, and became the first president of, the Whakarapa branch of the Farmers’ Union. Participation of women in Māori women’s institutes in the 1930s might also have been seen as emulating Pākehā, and yet the institutes were precursors of the Maori Women’s Welfare League (1951). In 1936, 500 representatives of 36 institutes (Paparore being the oldest) from the four northern counties, gathered at Pukepoto. These voluntary associations played a significant bridging and transitional role for some Māori women, familiarising them with Pākehā-style group organisation, and introducing them to new forms of home economics. The secretary of the Christchurch branch of the Māori Women’s Welfare League noted, in the 1950s, that those Māori women who joined Country Women’s Institutes, the Women’s Division of Federated Farmers, Townswomen’s Guilds and various other church and local organisations were constantly in touch with European life and society, and felt
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223 Eru Ihaka to M. J. Savage, February 1936; Savage to Ihaka, 12 March 1936, ACHH 16036, MA 1 364 19/1/210, ANZW.
224 Nopera, p.34. The building was named ‘Mataara’ in honour of the builder’s son who was killed in action.
225 Parker, Portraits from the Past, p.201.
226 For example: knitting, crochet and other methods of making clothing, jam-making and preserving fruit.
comfortable among Europeans. Together with live-in experience sponsored by missionaries and Native School teachers, these associations provided opportunities for women in the Päkehä economy, which were not as readily available to men.

Given the increased value of women’s work in dairying, wartime and manufacturing, as well as the leadership of Mäori women in far northern education, it is tempting for an outside observer to argue that the post-war, far-northern-Mäori renaissance was female-led. In 2002, Belich posed the conundrum: ‘The twentieth-century Mäori shift towards accepting female leadership remains, to my knowledge, unexplained. But it does demonstrate that Mäori attitudes to gender are capable of changing themselves’. However, Tariana Turia questioned women’s leadership: ‘Is this a new role for women, or is it that our tikanga are finding new expression under changing circumstances?’ In similar vein to Margaret Mutu, she disagrees with ‘Western feminist thinkers [who] might think that women have less influence in the whanau or the hapü because they do not whaikorero’. Judith Binney quoted Heni Sutherland as commenting, ‘Without a doubt, it is the women who have the strengths. … you will find it is we, the women, who are the ones who really motivate our men’. Judge Acheson certainly held that opinion of far northern women in the 1930s. Women had played an active role in pre-contact group decisions that was diminished, but not destroyed, in the early contact period. Competitiveness and a thirst for new ideas offered by Päkehä women’s groups, the less visible and less regulated dynamic of both Päkehä and Mäori women’s groups (their freedom from

228 Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.196.
male-dominated marae protocols), shifts in gender roles during World War One and World War Two (both similar to and different from their Pākehā counterparts), the higher survival rate of Māori women than men in the 1918 flu pandemic, and increasing life expectancy and educational aspirations, combined with force of personality arising from traditional mana wahine to influence the shift to a stronger role for Māori women in the twentieth century.

Alternative professional career choices for Māori had slowly opened in the far north from the late nineteenth century. Teaching under the state system started to become an option after Native Schools had been operating for a period from 1867. The CMS mission had engaged Māori men as lay-teachers from early in its far northern programme. By the late 1860s a stable group of 40 teachers and monitors from Parengarenga, Whangaroa, Hokianga, and all points in between, continued to meet regularly. When one died, another stepped forward to take his place. In the far north, the transition from mission schools to state schools was reasonably smooth, with the missionaries actively involved in their initial establishment and even inspection. Schools at Awanui, Pamapuria, Pukepoto and Ahipara operated continuously from before 1879 until the Native School system was terminated in 1969. Teacher assistants were appointed from the senior classes and, in 1902, the far north pioneered the ‘experimental school’ system of appointing Māori as head teachers.

James Pope, organising inspector of native schools, had ‘for sometime thought it desirable to at least make a trial of a Maori Master for a Maori School – Te Aute
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233 W. G. Puckey, diary note 27 January 1871, CMS Missionaries and Employees Papers.
234 Ahipara, at least, erratically from 1867, closing again temporarily in 1868.
experience seems to show that good teaching work can be done by Maoris. The first such school was at Rangiawhiao, with Wiremu Hoani Taua (W. Johnson, Ngāti Kahu) appointed as its first teacher in 1902. Although the conditions were hardly comparable with Te Aute, inspectors’ reports show a high standard of teaching was achieved. Rather than discouraging te reo, as was generally practised at the time, Taua encouraged its use. Miss Hilda Paul was appointed head teacher at Māthetēhe, Hokianga, in 1904, and after her marriage, her sister Julia succeeded her.

The experimental schools degenerated into under-funded surrogates for the Pākehā-staffed Native Schools. One of the worst examples was that of the Werowero school, which struggled in appalling conditions for 13 years, from 1918 to 1931, in unfinished buildings condemned by several health inspections. Taua’s two daughters, Heni (Jane) and Parehuia, were successive teachers. They managed without water tanks until 1929, and even without toilets for the pupils until 1931. That teachers, pupils, and parents persisted with such conditions is a measure of the value they attached to education. When the school was moved to a new building at Lake Ohia, and a Pākehā man was appointed teacher, conditions improved – his request for hot
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235 Pope to Inspector General, 18 June 1900, Rangiawhiao School, BAAA 1001 500b 44/4 Pt 1, 1895-1904, ANZA.  
236 Taua’s wife’s brother was to have been the first teacher, but regulations required that the schoolmaster be a married man, and he wasn’t. He undertook to fulfil the requirement in time for the appointment, and achieved consent to engagement by a young woman. To the consternation of the Education Department the young woman was not Māori, which went against their intentions that the position be filled by a Māori couple, although that had been assumed rather than articulated. In the event the regulatory requirement was not achieved, and the position was taken by Taua. Maori Schools – Rangiawhia, BAAA 1001 500b 44/4 Pt 1, 1895-1904, ANZA; McConnell, Taua of Kareponia.  
237 Personal communication Rev. Timoti Flavell, 2 August 2006.  
238 Maori Schools Building and Site files – Māthetēhe, BAAA 1001 342a 44/4Part 1, 1889-1908, ANZA.
and cold water was immediately approved. A third daughter of Taua, Ramari (Emily), took over teaching at Whatuwhiwhi when he died.

The Department of Māori Affairs employed some Māori managers from among former officers of the Māori Battalion. Harding Waipuke Leef, became a health officer in North Auckland for the Department of Maori Health on his return from World War One. Retaining this position he was appointed a field supervisor in the Department of Māori Affairs and assisted the scheme at Te Kao for a time.

Whereas Māori women had worked as nurses from missionary times, and had entered the nursing profession before the Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act 1909, under that Act a hospital board could appoint district nurses to attend the sick (Māori or Pākehā) elsewhere than in an institution. In 1907 Riapo Puhipi had appealed for a nurse for the north, and in 1911 two Pākehā were sent to Ahipara during a typhoid epidemic there. They were assisted locally by Miss M. Ngapo, who was not hospital trained but had received instruction from a registered nurse. One of the visiting nurses reported she did splendid work. In 1912, guidelines for appointments to Māori communities specified that positions were ‘open to Maori and European nurses. First preference, however, will be given to Maori nurses who have shown their ability for sick nursing’. If two nurses were appointed to a district then
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one was to be Māori and the other European.\textsuperscript{245} By 1914 there were 12 health nurses serving Māori, stationed mainly in the central North Island and East Coast. The most northern station was at Kawakawa.

Although most nurses were Pākehā, by the 1920s there were three or four qualified and active Māori district nurses, of whom two were Ngapori Naera (Te Rarawa and Ngāpuhi) and Mabel (Mepara) Mangakahia (Te Rarawa and Ngāti Whanaunga). Ngapori was daughter of Tiopira Naera and Wirihita Te Paa (daughter of Wiki Te Paa).\textsuperscript{246} She was registered as a nurse in 1915 and completed her midwifery training at St Helen’s in Auckland in 1916, thereafter serving as a native health nurse in the Hokianga until 1923.\textsuperscript{247} Mepara, fourth daughter of Meri Te Tai (the first woman to speak in the Kotahitanga parliament), was appointed to Rawene as assistant district health nurse for Hokianga in 1925.\textsuperscript{248} Besides attending the sick, the nurses gave health talks and demonstrations in schools. Mepara undertook midwifery training in 1928, was the pioneer district nurse of Te Araroa near East Cape in the early 1930s,\textsuperscript{249} and in 1936 she was appointed district health nurse in Hamilton. In 1939 Mepara was granted leave and a bursary to attend a postgraduate course, but in the year following completion she died of cancer.\textsuperscript{250} In 1933, Ngapori and Mepara were

\textsuperscript{245} ‘Nursing for Maoris’, \textit{Kai Tiaki: The Journal of the Nurses of New Zealand}, V, 2, April 1912, pp.26-7; McKegg, p.78.
\textsuperscript{246} The Te Paa whānau was another of the priestly families. Rev. Wiki Te Paa served in the Hokianga and was very much involved in promoting the Māori health programmes. Raeburn Lange, \textit{May the People Live: A History of Māori Health Development 1900-1920}, Auckland, 1999. See Appendix 6.
\textsuperscript{249} Although Ballara refers to Mepara as having been the pioneering nurse at Te Araroa in the 1930s, there were nurses appointed to Te Araroa in 1912. McKegg, pp.78-79.
\textsuperscript{250} Ballara, \textit{Mangakahia, Mabel Te Aowhaitini 1899-1940}. 
still the only readily identifiable, registered Māori nurses connected with the far north.\textsuperscript{251}

World War Two was a second opportunity for Māori to extend their engagement with the Pākehā economy, to which they committed as they had to the first. First volunteers were required to be single and aged 21-35 years, but this was soon extended to married men of the same age with no more than two children. On 2 May 1940, the 28\textsuperscript{th} Māori Battalion, comprising four tribally-based companies, departed overseas. Volunteers from Northland’s iwi made up A Company, nicknamed ‘The Gum Diggers’.\textsuperscript{252} Although conscription was introduced for Pākehā in June, Māori participation remained voluntary. However, Northern Māori MP, Paraire Paikea, who was taken into the War Cabinet late in 1940, conducted a publicity campaign encouraging recruitment and other war efforts.

Nominal roll data for World War Two exhibits distinct differences from that for World War One. The proportion of labourers was higher, and proportions of bushmen, timber-workers and gum-workers was correspondingly lower; non-labouring occupations had diversified into manufacturing; and outward migration, which escalated after the War, was already evident – one timber mill hand was working in Putaruru. Several factors contributed to the higher proportion of labourers (55% of World War One volunteers and 80% at the start of World War Two): a higher proportion of volunteers in the early stages of their working lives; volunteers being drawn from labouring rather than other occupational groups (farming was

\textsuperscript{251} Register of nurses, No. 29, \textit{New Zealand Gazette}, 1993, Vol. 1, pp 831-1035. There might have been one other, Adah Lillian Harris, registered 1919 and practising at Kohukohu (p. 908), but I have not been able to confirm positively that she was from this area and of Māori descent.

\textsuperscript{252} In addition to the well-known 28\textsuperscript{th} Battalion, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Battalion (North Auckland) became the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Māori Battalion in New Zealand from 1942 for one year.
classified as essential wartime work); the decline of self-employment in the timber, flax and gum industries; and concentration of Māori in labouring work.

Figure 66 - Occupation distribution of World War Two Māori volunteers to March 1941

![Occupation distribution graph]

Source: Nominal Roll 28th Māori Battalion

Only the farmers and the storekeeper were self-employed, although some of the farmhands worked on family farms. The storekeeper also ran a truck-contracting business. The butchers, carpenter, and mechanic represented trades. Captain Harawira, Padre to the Māori Battalion, and Captain Leef (Health Inspector) had served in World War One.

Women enjoyed extensions of their roles during the war. For instance, another of the Taua whanau of Ngāti Kahu, Corporal Norma Subritzky (daughter of teacher Ramari
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 Taua and Harold Subritzky), served as a signaller in the postal section of four
Northland and Waikato army camps and was awarded British War and New Zealand
War Service medals.\textsuperscript{254} Her cousin, Private Ngaire Subritzky, completed a radar
course, was posted to Whangaparoa, Rangitoto and Trentham, and received the same
medals. The young women had worked as clerk and shop assistant, respectively, and
Ngaire had held the rank of sergeant in the Women’s War Service Auxiliary before
they enlisted. The Subritzky family has a strong military tradition traced back into
Poland’s warring history of the 1500s. Whether of only Pākehā or of both Māori and
Pākehā descent, family members participated significantly in both world wars, and in
subsequent engagements of New Zealand’s armed forces.\textsuperscript{255} The convergence of two
strong traditions, in the relationship of Māori to this family, reinforced military career
choices of its members.

**Conclusions**

In 1939, New Zealand’s first set of National Accounts recorded money earned from
contributions to Britain’s meat and dairy consumption, and the amounts spent on
ports, roads, fences and drains. Far northern Māori could identify with all these
entries. They had formed roads from bullock tracks, driven their trucks and buses,
plied for hire with oil-engined launches, drained swamps, milked cows, attended
shareholders’ meetings, received cream cheques and paid mortgages. But the
Accounts reflected little of the informal rural economy, which remained important.
True, the output of new dairy co-operatives was tangible evidence of the social capital
value of rural communities. However, the recorded costs were a pale reflection of the
inputs. Together, Māori and Pākehā could achieve more, in the establishment phase,

\textsuperscript{254} Subritzky, p.249; Matiu and Mutu, p.74.
\textsuperscript{255} Subritzky, pp.222-68.
with co-operatives than with a less personal form of collective enterprise. Subsequent rationalisations did not require the same degree of co-operation.

The co-operative dairy companies changed the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy in the period moving forward from the gumdigging era. As suppliers, Māori were part owners of an English-law-based incorporated commercial venture, albeit with almost no direct representation on the boards of directors. Arguably, dairying institutionalised social and economic relationships, simultaneously segregating the two according to Pākehā norms. Māori supplied cream or milk to dairy companies; the companies provided livestock, fertilisers, agricultural equipment, and, following World War Two, a wide range of products through trading stores. Supplies, and sometimes cash, were provided on credit against forthcoming cream cheques. While it was still not fully a cash relationship, all values were expressed in money terms rather than gum credits or equivalent tobacco leaf. The agricultural economy maintained the gift-exchange tradition, the gum industry introduced money and money-equivalent to the valuing of transactions, and the dairy industry cemented it as a business relationship. Cash payments were required for services, rates and taxes. Next, cash payments were made for employment on public works and other commercial activities, and for social welfare benefits. Monetisation would thenceforth dominate the economic relationship.

Although it might be expected that extractive industries would crowd out education, and that sustainable industries would not, in fact, for Māori, both gum and dairying had the same effect. In both cases, children worked in the industries out of economic necessity. Where electricity alleviated the work of dairy farmers who had access either to reticulated power or money to buy diesel generators, the need for children to
work was reduced. However, many Māori-owned farms were remote from reticulation and finance was less available for independent generation. Additionally, larger surviving families, accompanying population recovery, coincided with individualisation of titles and the introduction of dairying. While the large families produced more unpaid labourers (than were needed) for farm work, they also created more work and expense for the household, and consumed more of the farm produce. The small-sized, Maori-owned farms became, in effect, no-cost breeding grounds for industrialism’s labour force and wartime’s warriors.

Te Kao’s dairy scheme had been forged, as a collaborative venture between the Tokerau Māori Land Board and the local community, as much with social capital and informal contributions as with money. The Board provided seeding finance, mediated through Acheson; the pre-existing rūnanga made decisions in conjunction with the Board and advisors; and the whole population worked on the farms and buildings at sustenance rates. By contrast, the Ngataki scheme was not only planned and funded by the Māori Affairs Department, but also organised, managed and directed by its staff, as were wages (relief payments) to individual Māori, their time and mobility. Whereas Te Kao retained a degree of freedom, the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy through the Ngataki scheme was controlled. The tikanga was Pākehā, except for living conditions, which were of a lower standard.

Beyond the reach or interest of authorities, there was scope for Māori to engage in all sectors of the informal economy. In contrast to informal engagement, during and following World War One far northern Māori used formal court processes to establish transactional rights and obligations. The courts applied English-style contract and
labour laws, resulting in a process of formalising and depersonalising economic relationships.

Māori-owned-and-operated transport services provided physical links between Māori communities the operators related to and the Pākehā economy. These entrepreneurs were comparatively free to negotiate their relationship with the Pākehā economy. For aspiring professionals, however, there were barriers to entry, which were almost insurmountable in the inter-war years.

Just as railways did not reach the far north, neither was a rural Māori renaissance experienced. The planned meeting houses and dining halls for six marae, like the planned stations on the far northern line, did not materialise. Crowded out between enervating gumdigging, World War One, the 1918 influenza pandemic, the excitement and demands of a promising new land-based economic opportunity, and the depression, change was directed to things Pākehā. If railways can be taken as a precursor of Pākehā economic development, as Ian Carter argues, and cultural regeneration as an indicator of a Māori renaissance, Maungataniwha held back the tide of both. From the south, rail tracks were laid as far as Rangiahua at the southern foot of the mountains in 1922, but the line was not opened north of Okaihau. From
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256 Deidre Brown, *Tai Tokerau Whakairo Rākau: Northland Māori Wood Carving*, Auckland, 2003, p.61. The wharenui proposed for Ahipara, Panguru, Pawarenga, Peria and Waima were not built, and the Panguru, Waima and Waiomio wharekai were not completed for lack of funds.
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259 None of the north’s representatives to Parliament had the temerity to negotiate a ‘notional railway’ subsidy, of the kind that was awarded the Nelson region when its promised railway project was stopped in 1960. The subsidy provided Nelson industries with freight rates at the equivalent of rail, although product was carried by road. By 1979 this subsidy was costing the country £10 million a year, a sum of the kind that would have greatly benefited the far northern economy. Geoffrey B. Churchman and Tony Hurst, *The Railways of New Zealand: A Journey through History*, 2nd edn, Wellington, 2001 (first published 1990 by Harper Collins Publishers (New Zealand) reprinted 1991), p.173.
the northern extremity of the region Eru Ihaka launched the ‘canoe’ of the Aupōuri afresh ‘upon the sea of life’ in 1927, carrying the people’s hopes and aspirations for a better life, but it foundered on the rocks of bureaucracy and interpersonal conflict.

Whether the taniwha was in the mountain range or in Wellington is open to debate. The mountains were a geographical barrier to the railway. By the time the line was mooted, the wealth had been extracted from beyond. Construction costs would not have been recuperated, and coastal vessels worked efficiently with little to no state funding – the Northern Steamship Company financed the wharves they served. The region beyond the mountains had become peripheral to the country’s economic interests.

True to Ngata’s threat, the much-bitten tail of Maui’s fish was cut off (under-funded) and left to rot … or sprout, sink or swim. State neglect, economic necessity, new opportunities and indomitable spirits drove choices of far northern Māori. The rural informal economy provided some resilience, but alternatives increasingly pulled Māori away from their land, either as individuals or as family groups. After the 1940s outward migration, rather than transience, became the norm.
Chapter 7 – Conclusion

When the French frigate *Recherché* came near the North Cape of New Zealand in March 1793, Māori approached in two canoes loaded with bundles of flax, boarded the vessel and traded all they had carried.¹ From the 1830s, northern-most Māori communities encouraged European settlement, responding to economic opportunities offered by the arrival of Pākehā with enthusiasm and optimistic expectations. Early economic engagement has been widely acknowledged in New Zealand’s historiography, and there is now some recognition of Māori successes up until 1860, but much of the writing suggests these efforts collapsed in the wake of the New Zealand Wars. Against this trend, Māori in the relatively peaceful far north maintained active economic engagement with Pākehā throughout the radical transformation of New Zealand’s economy from 1860 to 1940.

Pākehā immigration to the far north was slow, their numbers only matching the Māori population at its nadir in the 1890s, and thereafter maintaining rough parity. But local Pākehā were not the main consumers of the economic output of Māori; agricultural and extractive industries supplied a large export market. The volume of business that Māori conducted required effective co-ordination of effort and connections with the market, but adoption of a purely capitalist system was not requisite to such effectiveness. Far northern Māori were able to retain a degree of autonomy (self-regulating rather than self-governing autarchy) into the early twentieth century.

¹ M. Armand Leverd, 'The Visit of Dentrecasteaux to the North Cape, New Zealand, in March, 1793', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, XXVIII, 1919, p.118.
In his retrospective calculation of New Zealand’s GNP from 1859 to 1939, Keith Rankin did not include the Māori population because ‘from the Land Wars in the 1860s until the 1940s, there was little integration between the indigenous and settler economies.’ Although he acknowledged the extent of Māori activity before 1860, his methodological approach implied that Māori were irrelevant to the country’s economy, and made no contribution to GNP over the 80 years to 1940. Ignored by his perspective is a subtly different concept: the formal/informal economy dichotomy. Defined by National Accounts, and referred to as *The Economy*, the formal economy devalues other economic activities, including the Māori economy, as immaterial, inconsequential, and peripheral, and those involved in them as marginalised – of no value or account.

Participants in the informal economy have been written out of *The Economy*. And yet recent estimates (1989-2002) suggest the value of the informal economy could be in the range 9-12% of official GDP, and that it is very responsive (inversely) to GDP – one analysis suggests a dollar decline (rise) in official GDP is accompanied by a shadow expansion (contraction) of 31 (25) cents. How much larger would the shadow have been, historically, when the transitional economy was much less formalised, and official measures captured less than they do now? In order to truly understand any economy, it is important to know both what is recorded and what is not.

The extent of Māori involvement in all the dominant (formal) economic activities of the far north 1860-1940 clearly indicates their efforts were integral rather than peripheral to the Pākehā economy. Exports of kauri and gum are the most obvious examples. The

---

2 Rankin, p.65.
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export value of Northland’s gum ranked between first and fourth out of the port of Auckland over the five and a half decades 1861-1915, and third to seventh out of New Zealand for the four and a half decades to 1907. During this peak period Māori proportions of the far northern population ranged from 90% in 1870, to 60% in 1890, and 48% in 1910. A higher proportion of the Māori population worked the fields because whole families were involved. As the industry grew, components of it differentiated, but there was no domestic processing; the product was sold in the condition it was delivered to merchants. Pākehā controlled exports as merchants and shippers and added value through these market connections.

Māori and Pākehā economic systems in the far north were highly integrated. That is not to imply assimilation of Māori into the Pākehā economy; integration was two-way. Neither were Māori exclusive participants in the informal economy. Early settlers were fully incorporated into the Māori economy at first and, along with many later arrivals, maintained active participation into the twentieth century. A shadow economy was built on the substance of the pre-colonial system to become a rural informal economy, which fluctuated with the fortunes and misfortunes of the region.

Māori had choices about how they related to the Pākehā economy, ranging along a continuum from full engagement to complete disengagement. Along the continuum were negotiated positions, such as formulating terms of engagement and attempts to convert unacceptable practices (Chapter 1, Figure 9). Far northern Māori encouraged European settlement from the 1830s by making good land available and providing a comparatively safe environment for early settlers. They negotiated terms of engagement, which became progressively formalised with the Declaration of Independence 1835, the Treaty of Waitangi 1840, the establishment of a Resident
Magistrate 1848, and New Zealand’s first new Māori institution, the official Rūnanga 1859. Indeed, the working partnership between Mangonui’s Resident Magistrate and Te Rarawa rangatira and Assessor Puhipi demonstrated greater possibilities than the formal system provided. Despite government appropriations of ‘surplus’ land in the 1840s, far northern Māori tacitly supported the governor in the Northern War 1845-46. By adopting a strategy of co-operation they sought to differentiate themselves positively from their more numerous and powerful Ngāpuhi neighbours, to secure tenure and mana over land and in expectation of gaining economic advantages. To far northern Māori, the Treaty had a social contractual component. Pre-1840 relationships with CMS missionaries, as representatives of the coloniser’s established church, were part of that social contract. The church relationship became an essential conduit for northern Māori attempts to influence national-level economic policy formulation, once they had parliamentary representation.

The strategy of incorporating land-based sawyers and traders into local Māori families was valuable for immediate expansion of trade, and created a social network which became the foundation for extending future opportunities. With the exception of land from 1840, trade proceeded largely unregulated until the 1860s. As such, Aotearoa New Zealand’s economy was informal. In the unregulated environment, social connections were important. They could ‘substitute for missing, or expensive, legal structures in facilitating investment and other financial transactions’. During the unregulated period, far northern Māori were able to expand their economy as a result of the co-operative social structure of work, and diversion of time and energy away from war. Through social connections they procured farm implements, steel flour-mills, livestock
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and know-how. Although surpluses of flour and agricultural products were produced, the demands of the few, relatively poor, settlers were unpredictably variable. In contrast, whaling ships’ victualling requirements were predictably seasonal, and exports of flax, timber, and (increasingly) gum provided more reliable trade. Despite the range of trade, reports of the relative poverty of far northern Māori indicate that they did not enjoy an early period of prosperity, as did iwi closer to larger centres of Pākehā population.

Far northern Māori had started to invest in income-producing assets – flax mills, bullock teams, and other livestock – before regulation of trade began in the 1860s. The need for money to meet costs associated with selling and keeping land, 1860-90, coincided with a shortage of money and pressure to expand their investments leading up to the flax and timber exports’ peaks (1873, 1885) and as gumdigging intensified. By the 1880s they had invested in whaling vessels and equipment, and shore-based processing plants. There were new requirements for equipment for gum extraction and preparation for market, and for larger bullock teams. As steam was introduced from 1870, larger-scale flax and timber mills became the exclusive domain of Pākehā, but numerous small-scale operations could continue. Mechanisation of gum extraction was not nearly as capital-intensive as for gold, and was therefore not beyond the means of modest investors.

For far northern Māori, balancing competing needs was challenging. Increasing cash requirements were met by land sales and the efforts of a mainly self-employed, tribally-organised labour force. Most Māori worked the gumfields, but also in the 1880s the Resident Magistrate estimated that a large portion of the money spent on public works was earned by Māori, who tendered for contracts on the same footing as Pākehā. Māori
favoured a group-oriented approach over individualistic economic growth. Although joint tenure of land and other assets might have inhibited the motivation of individuals to better their own economic position, the traditional rūnanga provided mechanisms, controls and incentives for the group to use its resources to improve the group’s position.\(^7\) Regulating society in this way had optimised the pre-colonial economy, and enabled adaptation for successful engagement with the unregulated and lightly-regulated colonial economy.

In 1840 far northern Māori had anticipated a range of economic activity, although probably not the scale that eventuated, and gum had not been recognised as a tradable commodity, but as much benefit was expected from literacy and other educational opportunities. If there were any competition between hapū, it was not so much for income-producing assets as for chapels and schools. Developing literacy and technical skills and nurturing religion were considered to be valuable investments in future generations and community cohesion. They expected their children to participate across a broad spectrum of roles in the Pākehā economy, involving a range of skills. When the state took over schooling from missionaries, far northern Māori exerted pressure on government officials for education that would prepare their youth intellectually, culturally and socially for trades and professional engagement. That the state did not share the same vision of their destiny caused immense frustration. Attending church schools strengthened the link with the parent institutions and inculcated cultural capital of a very particular kind.

It was not the introduction of regulation, as such, that started to change the ways far northern Māori participated in the Pākehā economy after 1860, not ‘one law for all’, but differential regulation. The regulatory regime was biased towards an individualistic

\(^7\) Merrill, p.407.
economic approach and differentiated between colonisers and colonised. Whereas Māori institutions might have impeded individual advancement but facilitated economic growth based on kinship-group action, institutions that facilitated individual advancement could impede group action. Regulations that created and controlled market structures in Māori land and commercial fishing progressively disadvantaged Māori in ways they could not counter formally.

As the effects of the Native Land Court became worryingly adverse, and the succession of ineffectual new institutions 1860-90 frustrated attempts to retain management of land transactions, far northern Māori altered their approach. Rather than being the turning point that Raymond Firth claimed offered new hope, 1880 signalled a period of frustration. Contemporaneously, ever-swelling numbers of itinerants, rather than settlers, flocked to the gumfields, putting pressure on one of the few sources of cash available to meet increasing fees, rates and taxes. Far northern Māori switched to a combination strategy of active, selective, co-operative engagement, persistent negotiation, and both active and passive resistance if or when negotiations failed. Some of the more obvious examples of organised resistance were the institutions of Te Kau ma Rua (1880) and the Kotahitanga movement of the 1880s and 1890s, and the 1898 Dog-Tax War.

Much though Kotahitanga and the Young Māori Party had ideas in common, there was a conflict of approach between the two groups. The member for Northern Māori, 1893-1909, Hone Heke Ngapua, represented Kotahitanga. In the bye-election following his death, the Young Māori Party appear to have introduced their non-northern candidate surreptitiously. Not only was northern representation rendered impotent, but also serious resentment reverberated into the interwar period. As the new century dawned,
another set of Māori institutions was established. These suffered the same fate as their predecessors. The traditional rūnanga prevailed for far northern Māori decision-making. In the absence of effective partnership, they would manage as many of their affairs as they could, independently of the state.

The gum industry was at its most intense 1890-1910. Following the trading examples of some Māori descendants of the early sawyer/trader settlers, but adapting implementation to tikanga Māori, a number of rangatira established co-operative stores to facilitate trade and minimise ‘leakage’ of community funds. The stores represented a practical and successful nexus between two economic systems – communal and capitalist – for a time. A hybrid economy could be negotiated between parties who were free to act independently from state or other institutional intervention, and hybrids could be successful while two kaupapa regulated the economy. More of the gum proceeds were invested in schools and churches, some in race-horses and other livestock, some in harbour freight and passenger launches, and a lot was spent on consumables, and survey costs and title fees to make land available for settlers. Even as their numbers reached their lowest in the mid-1890s, far northern Māori were building their livestock holdings. As the population recovered, from the first decade of the new century, they were amongst the first dairy factory suppliers in the west of the region.

The influx of Dalmatians to the gumfields presented challenges and opportunities for Māori. Far northern Māori felt an affinity for those who came with little, were prepared to work hard, have fun and live simply. Both peoples were subjects of unwelcome regulations. Out of their combined resentment and sense of daring grew a shadow economy in alcohol and gambling, alongside the substantial gumdigging and trading they already practised together.
Far northern Māori volunteered promptly and in numbers for World War One. The war effort offered a rare opportunity to extend the scope of their engagement with the Pākehā economy, and to gain social capital credits. Those who remained at home adapted their range of activities to the absence of many able-bodied men. During the war, the government responded to disruption of the gum industry by employing diggers, thus converting what had been self-employment into paid labour. As the gum industry went into severe decline, and the country headed into depression, labourers were diverted to drainage schemes to convert swamp to pasture-land, and to roading for increased motor traffic.

In the wake of declining gum extraction, itinerants deserted the north, and far northern Pākehā society evolved into established communities. In the less formalised economy of the far north, personal rather than impersonal transactions continued to facilitate Māori engagement with the Pākehā economy. Although access to the most economically well-connected Pākehā social networks was restricted for Māori, the Pākehā economy could still be reached through some networks after World War One. Three networks with which Māori had built social capital, while Māori were still important to Pākehā, were the sawyer/trader and missionary descent groups, and the Dalmatians. Māori were part of the sawyer/trader descent network, whose storekeeping and hospitality endeavours endured beyond the gum industry era. The missionary descent network continued to be of some use in farming. Anglican and Methodist churches fostered priesthood vocations into the twentieth century, and supported Anglican Māori representation in Parliament. The relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy through the Dalmatian network tightened after 1910 as more Dalmatian men chose to settle in New Zealand, and to marry Māori women.
After the war, investment by individual Māori in dairying and commercial fishing increased. These undertakings were often not sufficient to sustain the increasing size of Māori families; the norm was economic pluralism and use of child labour, which detracted from children’s education. Without trade training and with diminished land-holding, opportunities for self-employment for Māori were limited, but some extended their transport businesses off the gumfields. Without professional training, opportunities for well-paid employment were practically non-existent. Even the salaries of the dedicated few ordained clergy and teachers were low. Disillusioned with their plight and lack of support from those networks in which they had invested social capital, many far northern Māori signalled passive resistance to the capitalism that orthodox Christian churches represented by converting to Ratana.

From the 1920s, the remaining lands of remote communities in the Hokianga, and at Te Kao and Te Hapua could not sustain their increasing populations under existing use patterns – standards of health and infant mortality were poor. The Tai Tokerau Māori Land Board, under the chairmanship of Judge Acheson, granted Te Kao finance to start a dairying scheme in 1925, and seeded some individual farms; others in the Hokianga received support from Mill Hill father Kreijmborg. Backed by funding from the Native Affairs Department from 1929, dairying throughout the far north increased. By 1930, Māori comprised 30% of shareholders in the region’s four dairy companies, and held around 20% of shares. As part of the land development schemes, Ngata negotiated some rates’ remissions. While this was helpful, outside the Hokianga Ngata’s influence in the far north was often disruptive, and his restriction of funding militated against a renaissance.
Throughout the north, pushed by dissatisfaction with non-delivery from previous political allegiances (in particular, the bi-cultural chiefly élite that Ngata represented), and pulled by hope offered by a new politico-religious ideology that appeared to align sufficiently with policies of the Labour Party, Māori elected the Ratana candidate, Paraire Paikea, to the Northern Māori seat, in 1938. In the same year, many younger Te Hapua inhabitants responded to an opportunity to relocate to a farm scheme at Ngataki, making the best of the tough conditions and eventually establishing a community they could come to see as their place to stand. Despite all there might have been to discourage and demoralise them, the region’s first student of Māori descent graduated from Auckland University in the 1940s – one of the first signs of a renaissance the far north had yet to experience.

As the Pākehā economy formalised in the far north 1860-1940 Māori altered their responses. A common thread was the diversity of strategies, including active (sometimes selective) engagement, persistent negotiation, and passive through to active resistance to those changes that benefited Pākehā at the long-term expense of Māori. Changes after 1940 can help to interpret responses during the study period. Urban migration 1940-70, triggered by wartime needs, was reinforced by a rural economic push, and an urban economic and social pull. Forestry in the far north, and renewed cultural awareness, exerted a reverse rural pull from the late 1960s. Economic restructuring in the 1980s pushed far northern Māori out of urban centres back to tribal lands. A large-scale, highly market-driven, monetised, and illegal cannabis economy attracted and repelled different segments of Māori society.
Much of the New Zealand historiography on the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy has been dominated by the impacts of the wars of 1845-46 and 1860-72, and the actions of the Young Māori Party, and has been influenced by writing of contact histories in other colonised countries. Superficially, the history could be perceived to have followed a general ‘fatal impact’ pattern described for other colonised countries – the destructive impact of introduced diseases, white rule, sweeping land expropriations, soil deterioration, the cash nexus dissolving the old self-sufficient economic order, rising consumption needs unbearably burdening a subsistence economy, opportunities to generate a surplus being diminished by further integration into the national economy and the imposition of taxes and fees. But perceiving history in this way would ignore the diversity of ways in which Māori negotiated the introduced economy. Although it is appropriate for historians to refer to the major national and international events, to focus exclusively on them obscures the contribution to a composite Aotearoa history that histories of localities less influenced by them might make. As previously noted, ‘an inability to understand local systems will lead to poor characterizations of larger ones’.

Local histories must be seen in their general contexts. But far northern Māori, like those in other localities, have a specific history, which differentiates theirs from the general. Although they engaged enthusiastically in early trade, northern Māori do not appear to have enjoyed as much ‘prosperity’ as those of Waikato or Hauraki because they were too far distant from large Pākehā population centres. On the other hand, while others were engaged in war, far northern iwi chose not to participate, preferring to concentrate their efforts on meeting the increasing overseas demand for kauri gum. Having reaffirmed loyalty to the government in 1870, they did not withdraw from things Pākehā following the New Zealand Wars; prophetic movements in the Hokianga were
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9 Blanton, et al., eds, pp.5-6.
mainly south of the harbour, amongst Ngāpuhi. Although armed and able to fight, and sympatheising with their Ngāpuhi kin, far northern Māori did not take arms in the 1898 Hokianga resistance. Instead, those living in the Mangonui County successfully negotiated a workable compromise with their council.

Ever-expanding gum demand, and peaks in timber and flax exports, masked the effects of the long stagnation of the 1880s and 1890s, which were experienced elsewhere in the country, and internationally. The same economic difficulties attracted an influx of itinerants to the north, putting pressure on local resources. Rather than being a turning point of hope, 1880 heralded a period of frustration, which was expressed through the Kotahitanga movement, but its aims came into conflict with the aspirations of the Young Māori Party at the turn of the century.

Even before the post-1890 demographic revival, the Māori population was not swamped in the far north; Māori retained a majority, or rough parity, of numbers, throughout the study period. The beginnings of population recovery coincided with the gum industry peak. During the first few decades of the recovery, farming also intensified. Although money issues, which surfaced during the gum peak, were problematic, far northern Māori retained an economic presence; they might have been exploited, but they were not conquered by commerce.

Iwi in the north committed unreservedly to the first war effort. Following World War One, with the exception of the abrupt curtailment of the gum industry exacerbating the interwar depression, the economic experiences of far northern Māori followed the general pattern elsewhere in the country. Mason Durie described these as Tūpunga Ahuwhenua: Rural Development 1925-1950, and Te Hekenga-Mai-Kainga:
Urbanisation 1950-1975. Reverse migration and economic marginalisation in the last quarter of the twentieth century was more exaggerated for those from the north.

The findings of this study have implications for wider New Zealand history and international studies. A better understanding of far northern differences suggests more diverse characterisation of the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy, nationally, than has thus far been portrayed. These differences arose, and were sustained, under the same institutional jurisdiction as for Māori in other parts of the country. What differentiated the far north was not institutions but the local factors, such as geography, resources and social networks. The characterisation of economic history needs to incorporate not only local factors beyond institutions, but also the larger economy beyond that represented by National Accounts. Numerous commentators have criticised the limitations of GDP as the representation of a nation’s economy and as a proxy for standards of living. Rather than labour the inadequacies of the formal economy concept, here I argue for the substance of the shadow economy.

Graeme Snooks has argued strongly for the inclusion of the forgotten household economy in the economic history of Australia.10 There is an even stronger argument for New Zealand’s economic history to reconsider the part played by extended Māori families. Family-based Māori groups were significant contributors to, and consumers in, the Pākehā economy, formally and informally. However, the definition of the formal economy placed unpaid work, including work according to kaupapa Māori, in the informal sector. Thus agricultural and pastoral farm work carried out by men, women and children, which met community needs on an exchange, or non-cash

10 Snooks.
redistribution basis, but did not produce for market, were considered informal, regardless of how extensive. The kinship basis of Māori social relations (whanaungatanga) doubtless sustained Māori in this informal economy at the same time as they engaged in the formal Pākehā economy. But, as explained earlier, Māori were not the only participants in an informal economy.

Not only did the informal rural economy provide, for both Māori and Pākehā, some resilience to external market forces, but also there is much to suggest that a shadow economy can help to stimulate economies in transition, as Aotearoa New Zealand’s was 1860-1940. Markets can be created, and entrepreneurial experience gained. Money earned in the informal economy, and spent in the formal, increases official growth and tax revenues. Competition to the official sector is increased, and bureaucratic opportunism curbed. It helps maintain economic activity, when rent-seeking and corruption raise the cost of official production.11 From this perspective, rather than seeing the characteristics of the informal economy as evidence of its inferiority, they represent an unregulated micro-entrepreneurial sector.12 The existence of a substantial informal economy could well have underpinned the development of Aotearoa New Zealand’s formal economy historically. It certainly did in many rural areas. As the country’s economy was agriculturally based, that underpinning was significant. The co-operative dairy company movement, alone, relied heavily on the social capital of rural communities. Such is the substance of the shadow.

Several influences converged to reinforce the role of the informal economy. Besides differing levels of acceptability of regulations, some choices were less available to Māori for practical or ideological reasons. For instance, lack of financial capital, and

---

11 Eilat and Zinnes.
ideological and practical difficulties associated with moving themselves or their economic activity out of the jurisdiction of the formal economy. Neither did Māori have an equal voice in the formulation and change of regulations. Therefore, the exercise of their options was likely to have been more constrained than for Pākehā, and might have inclined more towards equivocal acceptance or refraining from participation. It is no coincidence that the lowest level of informal economic activity internationally is in Switzerland, where all significant decisions are made by referenda.

The imposition of custom-based British law, which paid no heed to Māori custom, was not fully accepted by Māori. In effect, a dual kaupapa persisted. Where there was conflict between laws and kaupapa, compliance with one could lead to defiance of the other, and Māori custom might take priority. Regulations restricting traditional practices, for example native bird hunting or use of flax fish nets, forced a choice between compliance and defiance – the latter would place the activity in the irregular sector of the informal economy. Discriminatory regulations, for example restrictions on sale of alcohol to Māori (regardless of how well-intentioned), left a choice of compliance or defiance. There were many Pākehā and Tarara willing to collaborate in defiance.

Finally, limited access to knowledge and capital would restrict access to the formal economy. The Tunisian study referred to in Chapter 2 suggested an historical correlation between informal economy participation and access to capital and knowledge, which it identified with class.\footnote{Diemer and Van der Laan, pp.161-72.} Class and access to knowledge and capital need to be distinguished as two separate, but in some ways connected, issues. They are connected in the classic Marxian two-class context of capitalists and labourers, where access to knowledge and capital was assumed to be the sole preserve of capitalists, but
human, cultural and social capital theories admit wider ranges of choice. Access to knowledge and capital could be acquired, to some extent, independently of class. I have argued against pursuit of mana as the dominant explanation of how far northern Māori approached their negotiations, and suggested instead that they sought a diversity of roles in the Pākehā economy equivalent to the roles they held in their own. However, social connections influenced not only which parts of the formal and informal economies Māori participated in, but also the kinds of knowledge and capital accessed.

Correlation of the informal economy with access to capital is explained more fully than the Tunisian study did, by referring to a range of different kinds of capital. Capital can be seen as human (acquired knowledge and skills), cultural and social, as well as financial. Access of Māori to financial, human, cultural and social capital in the Pākehā sphere was restricted – the first by finance market structuring; the second by limited educational opportunities; the third by a combination of limited higher education, and access to Pākehā institutions (with the notable exceptions of churches, particularly the Anglican Church’s political connection); and the last by exclusion from Pākehā social networks once Māori were no longer needed by them.

A worker with few skills (human or cultural capital) that would be rewarded in formal work might prefer to be independent. The informal option might actually offer a measure of dignity and autonomy that the formal job did not. This was a crucial aspect of the kauri gum industry for some Māori in the far north, as one participant explained: ‘I loved the gumfields and digging gum with my father and relations. There was hardly any work then anyway, and this way I was my own boss, not digging drains and chopping tea tree for another fulla’. The industry effectively straddled the
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informal and formal economies, chronologically and practically. It became more monetised over time with increased scale and pressure for cash sources. In practice, although output ultimately entered the formal market, family groups pooled labour, exchanged gum for commodities, or used it for gambling, as well as receiving some cash for investment or distribution amongst members.

From among the reasons described above, several were peculiar to Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. These reasons indicate an ethnic basis for informal economy participation in addition to the class basis noted by others. Other reasons were general. I noted in Chapter 2 that irregular sector activities are responses to taxes and other forms of control over the use of resources. Irregular and illegal sector activities can also be responses to restricted access to the formal economy, and have been correlated with increasing income disparity, and casual and part-time work, encouraged by economic restructuring. The choice for informal economy participants was not necessarily a case of opting out of the formal economy; labour surpluses denied many the opportunity to opt in. When the death throes of the extractive and flax industries coincided with the interwar depression – and when post-1984 economic restructuring ‘rationalised’ manufacturing and farming – people were evicted from the formal economy. ‘People have to survive. If they can’t survive on what the Government gives them, they have to do so by any other means’. There was scope for entrepreneurship in the shadow economy. There is even international debate about if, and how, the
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shadow economy could be fostered as an opportunity to expand economies,\textsuperscript{19} as has been shown for transitioning economies.

The history of the relationship of Māori to the Pākehā economy in the far north demonstrates some differences from the general pattern elsewhere in the country. From a better understanding of the differences of local systems comes the ability to refine characterisation of the national economic system. Acknowledging differences between localities under the same institutional jurisdiction highlights other factors, such as geography, resources and social networks. Just as it is important to expand the vision of economic history beyond institutions, so is it important to see the economy beyond the formal economy as represented by National Accounts. The relationship of far northern Māori to the Pākehā economy cannot be understood without reference to the interplay between informal and formal economies. The four sectors of the informal economy (household, informal, irregular and illegal) provided resilience to market forces, a degree of independence from the Pākehā economy, and a measure of autonomy, particularly during the transition period and in other times of economic stress. Such autonomy as far northern Māori retained into the twentieth century owed more to their relative isolation, numerical parity, and adaptation and expansion of their own economic system, than to emulation or adoption of the Pākehā system. The social organisation of work, the kaupapa of the informal economy, the diversity of strategies and tactics, and relationship building (both bonding and bridging social capital) were Māori strengths used in their relentless engagement with the Pākehā economy. In effect they played an invisible hand of cards, invisible, that is, to studies of the formal economy.

\textsuperscript{19} Fleming, Roman, and Farrell; Eilat and Zinnes; Maloney.
The informal economy, and in New Zealand particularly the rural informal economy, contributed (and still contributes) quantitatively to the national economy. In rural areas, where most Māori lived, this informal rural economy had its roots in a pre-colonial economy based on social relationships. When the part social relationships between Māori and Pākehā played in shaping the economy is better understood, the substantial part Māori played in forming the rural economy can be brought out of the shadows.
## Appendix 1 - List of official positions 1863-67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pay rate pa</th>
<th>1863 &amp; updates to 1865</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pay rate pa</th>
<th>4 November 1867</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pay rate pa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraone</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhipi Te Ripi</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pororua Wharekauri</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paora Putete Ururoa</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohepa Poutena</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaka Te Kawau</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipene Te Taha</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingi Wiremu</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi Kingi</td>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare Reweti Hukahu</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetito Te Huhu</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetito Te Huhu</td>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pene Te Tai</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahi Te Huhu</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone Taua</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiremu Naihi</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepia Te Morenga</td>
<td>Assessor on Probation</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhua</td>
<td>Assessor on Probation</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timoti Ngatote</td>
<td>Assessor on Probation</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruina</td>
<td>Assessor on Probation</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngapipi Mumu</td>
<td>Assessor on Probation</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka Rangaunui</td>
<td>Kaitiaki</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reihana Kirwi</td>
<td>Kaitiaki</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heremaia Te Ara</td>
<td>Kaitiaki</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapine</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minarapa</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahie</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komene</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raharuhi</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruteni</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timoti Popata</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reihana te Huhu</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohaia</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hataere</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noper Puau</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihia</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone Paitai</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamehana</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohi</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaimanu</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemi Rihari</td>
<td>Sometimes Karere</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natanahuia</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piri Raiti</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henare Te Waha</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahipene Te Pai</td>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi Waihi</td>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mangonui Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook¹

¹ Resident Magistrate’s Letterbook, BAFO 10852 2a, pp.259, 555, ANZA. The term ‘pensioner’ refers to a ‘chieflly retainer’. A kaitiaki is a guardian (of what is not specified).
Appendix 2 - MHR Ngāti Kahu and Ngā Puhi descent lines

Sources: Te Whanau Moana; Dictionary of New Zealand Biography.  

Ihaka Te Tai Hakuene was MHR 1884-87, Hone Heke Ngapua 1893-1909. Oliver, Te Tai Hakuene; Matiu and Mutu, p.59.
Appendix 3 - Relationships of Ngāti Kahu ordained Anglican clergy, and Matenga, Popata and Paerata families.

Sources: *Directory of Anglican Clergy; Te Whanau Moana*, Popata family book.3

3 Blain; Matiu and Mutu; Nopera, p.75.
### Appendix 4 – Value of Exports from Mangonui and Hokianga Ports 1853-1887

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mangonui</th>
<th>Hokianga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mangonui</th>
<th>Hokianga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source of data:
Statistics of New Zealand, Part II, Registrar General, 1853-1887.
## Appendix 5 – Parengarenga and Pakohu Blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Orginal lease</th>
<th>Original rental</th>
<th>Transferred to</th>
<th>For benefit of</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>part Parengarenga 3)</td>
<td>18736</td>
<td>Karena Wiki</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>5/6/8</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>5/6/8</td>
<td>7/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Parengarenga 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Parengarenga SB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Parengarenga SB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Parengarenga SA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>part Parengarenga SB2</td>
<td>12765</td>
<td>Joseph Evans Senr</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>Surrendered and held by Tai Tokerau M L Board</td>
<td>all Native owners in Parengarenga SB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>part Parengarenga SB2</td>
<td>4563</td>
<td>Lancelot A Yates</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>1-Jul-12</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 31 Dec 1919</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Parengarenga SA3</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Lancelot A Yates</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>1-Jul-12</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 31 Dec 1919</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>part Parengarenga SA1</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>Francis Sinclair Yates</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 1 Jul 1918</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Parengarenga SA3</td>
<td>9028</td>
<td>Francis Sinclair Yates</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 1 Jul 1918</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>part Pakohu 2B1</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>Francis Sinclair Yates</td>
<td>£130</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 1 Jul 1918</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Pakohu 2B2</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>Francis Sinclair Yates</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 1 Jul 1918</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>part Pakohu 1</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>Daniel Alexander Gray</td>
<td>£57</td>
<td>16-Aug-10</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 1 Jul 1918</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Pakohu 2B1</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Daniel Alexander Gray</td>
<td>£57</td>
<td>16-Aug-10</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 1 Jul 1918</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>part Pakohu 3A</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Josephine Rongo Yates</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 31 Dec 1919</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Pakohu 3B</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>Josephine Rongo Yates</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 31 Dec 1919</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part Pakohu 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Josephine Rongo Yates</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>1-Jul-14</td>
<td>for renewal 10 years from 31 Dec 1919</td>
<td>no further transfers or sub-leases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parengarenga SB1</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>Clarence Edgar Keene</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>19 years from 23 Nov 1920</td>
<td>with right of renewal for further 18 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parengarenga Gum Company</td>
<td>total leaseholding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Parengarenga and Pakohu Blocks, BAAI 1030 127c, ANZA; Stokes, _Muriwhenua Land Claims Post-1865_, pp. 189-197.
Appendix 6 – Te Rarawa network

Sources: DNZB, Anaru Ngawaka; Personal communication Dr Jennifer Te Paa, *Te Whanau Moana.*

---

1 Personal communication Dr Jennifer Plane Te Paa, April 2006; Henare, *Ngawaka, Anaru Iehu 1872-1964; Matiu and Mutu,* p.58.
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