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ABSTRACT

‘Shifting Grounds’ looks closely at three iconic Auckland landscapes — the Auckland Domain (Pukekawa), Maungakiekie (which encompasses two adjacent parks, Cornwall Park and One Tree Hill Domain) and the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. Approaching each site as an archive and examining the experiences embedded in each place, the thesis examines how history, memory and materiality have evolved in these three places.

While New Zealand historians have explored relationships between people and their material worlds in wilderness and rural areas, relatively little work has been done on urban environments. ‘Shifting Grounds’ enters the landscapes of the country’s largest city, builds on existing scholarship on cultural and environmental history and extends the discussion into areas that have received relatively little attention. In the course of creating a fine-grained analysis of each site, it forges new historical connections across Auckland as well as nationally and internationally that are hard to see and understand in more generalised accounts of the city.

Spanning the length of human occupation in Auckland, the thesis focuses on particular moments in each landscape across time, and considers how they have evolved and continue to interact with understandings of place, time and identity in the city today. ‘Shifting Grounds’ shows ways that the city has been profoundly shaped by its natural environment and by its long Māori tribal histories and dynamics. The study also brings into focus diverse communities and networks that have operated alongside mainstream British settler processes in Auckland. These landscapes reveal multi-faceted and forgotten histories that need to be understood alongside the more familiar, prominent stories of Auckland’s past.

‘Shifting Grounds’ also explores the intersections of history with other disciplines that have examined cultural and material dimensions of social life. Māori narratives, archaeology, material culture, geography, visual culture and written sources allow for an expansive view of the past in which the tangible and ephemeral connections between people and places can be connected with broader questions relating to cultural processes, power relations, the role of locality in history, materiality and multiple agency.
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GLOSSARY

Ahi kā – fires of occupation – title to land through occupation
Ariki – paramount chief, leader
Atua – ancestral beings
Hapū – descent group, section of a tribe
Hawaiiki – place of origin
Kāinga – home, settlement
Kaumātua – elder
Kaitiaki – guardian
Koiwi – human remains
Iwi – tribe, set of people bound together by descent from a common ancestor or ancestors
Kuia – grandmother, elderly woman
Mana – authority, status, prestige, power
Mana Whenua – hapū or iwi members with customary land rights in a defined area
Noa – ordinary
Ora – health, prosperity, well-being
Pā – fortified refuge or settlement
Pākehā – non-Māori, usually of British ethnic origin or background
Papakāinga – original home, home base, village
Pukapuka – written document
Rangatira – chief, leader, chieftainshi
Rohe – district, area, region, boundary
Tāngata whenua – people belonging to a tribal region
Tangi – wake, funeral
Taonga – treasure, highly prized
Tapu – imbued with ancestral power, sacred
Te reo – the (Māori) language
Tipuna – ancestors
Wāhi tapu – sacred places
Whare – house, dwelling
Wairua – spirit
Whakapapa – genealogical lines
MAPS OF AUCKLAND

Map of Auckland showing the location of the three case-study landscapes. Google maps 2018.
Map of Auckland Domain (Pukenawa) and Surrounding Locations. Google maps 2018.
Map of Maungakiekie (One Tree Hill Domain and Cornwall Park). Google maps 2018.
INTRODUCTION

‘[T]here is no richer, more complex, more subtly suggestive or revealing historical document in all the world than a landscape ... Each landscape has endless stories to tell if only we understand the codes that render their details, their surfaces and depths, their peculiarities and contradictions legible’.¹

In Auckland, New Zealand’s largest city, there are places where the past still speaks to the present in ways that constantly surprise: place names that evoke a forgotten past, outlines on the land that trace a former presence, trees that mark a home or garden long since gone, rock walls that organise the land according to earlier senses of belonging. These sites hint at the stories of people who crafted connections with particular places over time, but whose histories have not made it into monuments, museums and history books. ‘Shifting Grounds’ explores landscapes where stories have often been hidden, but where traces of them can still be found and given voice.

This account examines three landscapes with rich and unique histories, each of which illustrate the ever-changing relations between people and places in Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland: the Auckland Domain (also known as Pukekawa), Maungakiekie (which encompasses two adjacent parks, Cornwall Park and One Tree Hill Domain) and the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. In each of these three places, people have negotiated narratives, lives and meanings in very different ways, often serving a number of purposes across time. Such places reveal not only the stories that have been celebrated, maintained and remembered, but also remnants of stories that have been forgotten, neglected or erased. The vestiges left behind in these landscapes reveal complex and disparate local understandings of place, time and identity. What happens if we follow the connections between people and place that are woven through these landscapes? What can they tell us about the ways in which people have understood and engaged with the world around them? And how have these places shaped, reinforced or disrupted people’s understanding of Auckland’s past?

For perhaps seven centuries, people have been making places in Auckland/Tāmaki Makaurau. Successive communities have forged tangible and ephemeral connections with the land by constructing pā (fortified refuge or settlement) and houses, planting gardens, assembling rock walls, erecting monuments, burying loved ones and crafting names, stories, paintings and

karakia about places. The ways in which people have constructed places reveal deeply
grounded senses of identity and belonging. These practices are closely linked with the ways
in which people define themselves and others. They can tell us who people want to live with,
who they want to remember, and who they would rather exclude and forget. ‘Human
endeavours’, writes Tim Ingold, ‘are forever poised between catching dreams and coaxing
materials. ... It is precisely where the reach of imagination meets the friction of materials, or
where the forces of ambition rub up against the rough edges of the world, that human life is
lived’.

In a city that has destroyed much of the physical remains of its past, these long,
complex connections between people and place are sometimes still traceable in Auckland’s
public spaces. Our parks, so often valued for their natural features, are also rich repositories
of stories about the past.

The three landscapes selected for this thesis are all iconic in their own way, yet each has
aspects that are little understood. ‘Shifting Grounds’ examines sites of history and memory in
landscapes to investigate how they have helped to shape and reflect the formation of
identities, but also how non-linguistic dimensions of human experience, such as material
culture, bodily performance and the physical environment, influence everyday senses of the
past. Using landscapes as an archive, the research draws on Māori narratives, archaeology,
geography, botany, material culture and written sources to examine the tangible and
ephemeral connections that individuals and communities have forged with places over
time. By examining these connections, this work aims to provide a glimpse of the complex,
subtle and evolving processes of history in particular locations in Auckland, and connect them
with broader historical questions relating to cultural processes, power relations, the role of
locality in history, materiality and multiple agency. The chosen landscapes are not intended
to be representative of the history of the city, although each of them speaks to important
aspects of Auckland’s history. Rather than trying to reconstruct cohesive, coherent civic or
national identities, this research seeks to explore how people and places shape each other, or
are co-constituted, to form fine grained, nuanced and shifting narratives that are continually
negotiated and reconfigured.

Auckland Domain in central Auckland was the first park formed after Governor Hobson
acquired land from Ngāti Whātua o Ōrakei in 1840 for the town of Auckland. The park
includes the explosion centre and tuff (crater) rim of Pukekawa, one of Auckland’s oldest

---

3 See R.C.J. Stone, From Tamaki-Makau-rau to Auckland, Auckland, 2001, p.11, for further discussion on the
destruction of Auckland’s heritage.
volcanoes. The Auckland War Memorial Museum, one of Auckland’s most iconic landmarks, is situated in a prominent position in the park on the crater rim. The Museum is surrounded by extensive sports grounds as well as large areas of indigenous and exotic forest and formal gardens, complete with glasshouses and duck ponds. While its narratives have been crafted around a civic identity based on twentieth century European notions of commemoration and recreation, there are earlier stories in the Domain that are harder to discover, but that complicate and at times disrupt these histories.

A little further out of town, in the central suburbs of Auckland, stands another volcanic cone called Maungakiekie, also known as One Tree Hill. The summit of the volcanic cone and portions of its lower flanks are encircled by two adjoining parks; One Tree Hill Domain, which is owned and jointly managed by Auckland Council and Tāmaki iwi (tribes), and Cornwall Park, which is owned and managed by the Cornwall Park Trust. Maungakiekie, one of the largest Māori pā in New Zealand, is another iconic landmark. The summit is a site of complex and at times controversial Māori and European settler identities, with its prominent obelisk dedicated to Māori, the grave of the ‘The Father of Auckland’ Sir John Logan

---

Campbell, and the site of the tree which gave the cone its European name (which has been cut down and replanted several times). Maungakiekie is also renowned for its pastoral landscapes, grazing farm animals, mature trees and sweeping views across Auckland. Together, the two parks are seen as places of leisure and recreation. According to one popular history, ‘Cornwall Park and One Tree Hill are so predominantly rural, so spacious, so immensely suitable and popular for simply enjoying the sheep, the rolling landscape, the views and the walking, jogging and cycling’. John Logan Campbell, a leading figure in nineteenth century Auckland, gifted Cornwall Park to New Zealand in 1901. Yet even in this well-known landscape, there are forgotten places that make us look at these iconic sites and people anew, along with the master narratives that accompany them.

Still further out of town, next to the Auckland airport in Māngere, is the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. This 100-hectare site is one of two remnants of the lava field gardens that once covered much of the 8000-hectare lava fields in Tāmaki, as Auckland was known prior

---

to European settlement. The Stonefields are covered in volcanic rock, which people have picked up, moved and placed to form garden walls, houses, drainage systems and walkways since they first arrived in the area in around the fourteenth century. Created as a reserve in 1999, this landscape is less well known and understood by most Aucklanders than the other two parks examined in this work. The descendants of those who gardened on the Stonefields and surrounding area for hundreds of years still live in Ihumātao and Pūkaki villages next to the Stonefields. Their histories tell a long and forgotten story of Auckland, one that is largely overlooked by historians but that continues to shape life in the city in a way that many are not aware of and do not understand.

Ōtuataua Stonefields. Photograph by Lucy Mackintosh, 2016.

---

Histories of Auckland

According to Russell Stone, the most prolific historian of Auckland, this city ‘has not been well-served by historians’. Subsequent historians have agreed, with Helen Laurenson commenting, for instance, that there are fewer histories of Auckland than other major urban centres in New Zealand, while Ben Schrader notes that Auckland in particular lacks a substantial city biography. Academic and public histories of Auckland tend to revolve around particular meta-narratives, some of which have been repeated since the mid-to-late nineteenth century. ‘Shifting Grounds’ engages with these thematic histories, and challenges some of them, but does not aim to replace them with an alternative authoritative history of the city. Rather, it seeks to show how a close analysis of people’s engagements with particular places reveals complex, nuanced and multi-faceted histories that often get overlooked in grand narratives.

Public historians have perhaps produced the most work on relationships between people, places and identity in New Zealand, but there is little published work that focuses on Auckland. Notable works that address landscapes in Auckland include art historian Linda Tyler’s essay on visual representations of landscape in Auckland and historian Caroline Daley’s work on gender and leisure in the Auckland Domain. One of the best books to explore the history of Auckland through people’s engagement with the land is Volcanoes of Auckland: The Essential Guide, by Bruce W. Hayward, Graeme Murdoch and Gordon Maitland. Books such as A Field Guide to Auckland, West: A History of Waitakere, and

---


Urban Village: The Story of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and St Mary’s Bay also provide a rich source of diverse narratives crafted in particular places over time.13

Outside of academia, of course, stories of connections between people and places in Auckland have always been told, remembered or performed. Kaumātua (elders), local historians, archaeologists, community members and custodians of public sites have engaged in linguistic and non-linguistic practices of remembrance through story-telling, ritual, examining material culture, and visiting places. These articulations are often dismissed by academic historians for lacking an ‘analytical edge’, or presenting places as fixed, stable entities that do not relate to national questions.14 Consequently, such works are often overlooked in New Zealand historiography.15 By relegating these local narratives to a field outside of ‘real history’, however, historians can miss diverse, nuanced local perspectives on the past that are not visible in the archival sources on which historians rely.

‘Shifting Grounds’ delves deeply into specific places but also investigates the broader questions that arise from them. It engages with Auckland not as one ‘place’ but as many places, each with its own array of social networks woven together at a particular locus. While it draws on the depth and specificity of local histories in Auckland, this work approaches places as fluid, unstable and evolving sets of processes, rather than fixed points on the land. In the course of creating a fine-grained analysis of each site, it forges new historical connections across Auckland as well as nationally and internationally that are hard to see and understand in more generalised accounts of the city.

‘Shifting Grounds’ seeks to encompass human experiences that span the entire length of human settlement in Auckland, linking these with the earlier and ongoing processes of natural history, so that we can better understand the longer arcs of history that continue to shape this city. In their book The History Manifesto, American-based historians David Armitage and Jo Guildi argue that historians need to re-engage with long-run history. Historians, they maintain, are increasingly taking short term, specialized perspectives on the past and are

ignoring important long term changes, or the ‘vibrations of deeper time’, as they describe it.\textsuperscript{16} By extending the historian’s timescales, we can better understand the multiple pasts that have led to the conflicted present.\textsuperscript{17} In New Zealand, with its comparatively recent human history, historians have a unique opportunity to adopt this approach, since New Zealand was the last major land-mass to be found and settled by people. Speaking about the Ōtuataua Stonefields in 2016, archaeologist, David Veart, commented: ‘People in New Zealand often say we’ve got no history … Well, what we’re looking at is the end point of the exploration of the planet … There are all sorts of things we can learn here, because it’s all so relatively recent, [things that are] very difficult to see elsewhere.’\textsuperscript{18} By following the temporal trajectories from past to present in each landscape, this work argues that it is important to understand how histories and processes have built on each other and evolved over time. While taking a long-run approach to history, however, this account does not follow the broad geographical approach to history that Armitage and Guildi also propose.\textsuperscript{19} Rather than denying the importance of broader histories, it seeks to understand the unique trajectories formed between people and their environments in particular places.

**Place-based history: global and local perspectives**

Since the 1970s, scholars in the social sciences and humanities have shown that places and spaces can tell us much about human experience. Geographers such as Yi Fu Tuan and Edward Relph are credited with ‘discovering place’.\textsuperscript{20} Drawing on philosophical approaches such as existentialism and phenomenology, they have argued that places are not empty, fixed locations on a map, but subjective, experienced concepts, often associated with intimacy and domesticity.\textsuperscript{21} In the 1980s and 1990s, with the rise of critical theory, academics began to consider places as socially constructed phenomena that could be analysed as sites of power, oppression, privilege and exclusion.\textsuperscript{22} At the same time, others including Robert Sack and Edward Casey argued that places are not simply socially constructed but can also play a part

\textsuperscript{17} Guldi and Armitage, p.i.
in producing the social, natural and cultural spheres. They throughout these debates some geographers and philosophers, including Allan Pred, Nigel Thrift and Henri Lefebvre, emphasised the importance of considering performance and practice in the way that places are made and re-made. In the 1990s, anthropologists Barbara Bender and Christopher Tilley analysed landscapes in terms of people’s diverse understandings of the world, while Arjun Appadurai emphasized the networks and circuits that connect people and places.

While these debates largely took place outside of the discipline of history, a few environmental historians, notably William Cronon and Richard White, argued that histories cannot be written without paying attention to our relationships with the non-human world. These historians emphasised the important role of geographical and biological explanations in history, while also recasting Native Americans as active participants, rather than passive recipients, in shaping the landscape and establishing agricultural and trading practices.

In the 1990s, Doreen Massey and others described places as open, undetermined and porous. This provided a productive framework for scholars from diverse disciplines to bring place and space into their work. Massey argued that ‘places’ may be imagined as particular articulations of … social relations, including local relations ‘within’ the place and those many connections which stretch way beyond it. … This is a notion of place where specificity (local uniqueness, a sense of place) derives not from some mythical internal roots nor from a history of relative isolation — not to be disrupted by globalisation — but precisely from the absolute

---

particularity of the mixture of influences found together there’. More recent works have moved even further towards relational conceptions of place, describing them as moments in networks or nodes in relational settings.

These more open notions of place worked well with the cultural turn of the late twentieth century, which emphasized intersections, interactions and processes rather than dichotomies and master narratives. In environmental history, the cultural turn has led historians to analyse ways that narratives not only reflect, but also shape multiple perspectives on nature, and to argue that nature itself is often constructed physically and culturally rather than simply being preserved in a state of wilderness. Outside the field of environmental history, cultural historians have begun to blur existing scholarly boundaries and to engage with the specifics of geography, particularly around the subject of materiality and memory. Understanding the ways that people engaged with the environment, argues Australian historian Grace Karskens, is crucial for understanding human experiences in the past. Cultural historian Lawrence Glickman noted in 2010 that ‘Just as the process of cultural construction has materialized through an emphasis on institutions, so too has place provided concrete sites to observe it’. Works such as Paul Carter’s The Road to Botany Bay, William Deverell’s Whitewashed Adobe and Kirk Savage’s Monument Wars have demonstrated how public spaces can provide rich sites of analysis for historical and cultural processes.

These historians, and others, have shown that paying attention to the relationships between time, people and place can yield new perspectives on the past. Using textual, material and ephemeral sources, their work has provided a rich historical context with which to examine issues at the forefront of debates in the social sciences and humanities. Yet many historians

continue to treat the material world as an inert and passive backdrop to historical events. In 2010, White commented that ‘(t)he problem with citing exceptional spatial histories … is that these histories are exceptional. Historians still routinely write about political change, social change, class relations, gender relations, cultural change as if the spatial dimensions of these issues matter little if at all’. 36 ‘Shifting Grounds’ draws on the more open, multi-disciplinary approach to places that these relatively few, but influential, historical works have employed to understand how Auckland’s landscapes might cast new light on the city’s past.

In New Zealand, scholarship on place and space has also been interdisciplinary, and relatively sparse in the field of history. Non-historical works of note include Herbert Guthrie-Smith’s early and influential work, Tutira: The Story of a New Zealand Sheep Station, which connected social change with physical changes on the land, 37 and ecologist Geoff Park’s more recent works on landscapes which intertwined New Zealand’s human history and ecology. 38 Two books on place and people, published in 2010 and 2011, and both edited by Janet Stephenson, Jacinta Ruru and Mick Abbott, highlight the emerging interest in this subject across the social sciences in New Zealand. 39 The essays in both collections, written by geographers, legal experts, art historians and others across the social and environmental sciences demonstrated the rich material and diverse methodologies that can be deployed to explore place and space.

Over the last fifteen years, a small but growing number of historians in New Zealand have begun to address the spatial dimensions of history. In 2002, historian Tom Brooking and geographer Eric Pawson edited Environmental Histories in New Zealand. It was one of the first historical works to argue that ‘[t]he making of environments is a social process’ and to provide an interdisciplinary perspective on the relations between people and environments in New Zealand. 40 Cultural historians have also begun to make inroads into exploring the relationships between people and place in New Zealand. Giselle Byrnes’s book Boundary Markers: Land Surveying and the Colonisation of New Zealand, published in 2001, documented the role that British surveyors played in the construction of cultural landscapes,

---

focusing on ‘their reading of the land, their writing over and about the land, and their negotiation of physical and cultural boundaries in New Zealand’. Tony Ballantyne and Judith Bennett’s edited work Landscape/Community, published in 2005, also explored concepts of identity, place and people within the broader notion of landscapes as complex, fluid places, while Damon Salesa emphasized the importance of ‘encounters in place’ in his work on racial crossings in the Victorian British Empire.

Tony Ballantyne’s 2012 book Webs of Empire extended the discussion on the role of place and space in cultural history by exploring local developments on the ground with imperial connections and global forces. His work on Gore, in particular, highlighted the possibilities of examining networks and flows of information from a specific location and argued for the importance of grounding historical analysis. In his essay ‘Thinking Local’, Ballantyne claimed that ‘[o]ur understandings about “community”, “knowledge” and that key contemporary touchstone “identity”, need to be much more attentive to questions of place and space, connection and conflict, and the abiding importance of the locality’. New Zealand historians, he argued, need to look ‘under the nation’ as well as beyond the nation, to reassess the traditional boundaries of town, region and nation that have produced histories that ‘privilege the nation’. These broader national histories, he noted, have tended to move ‘scholarly focus away from the specific places where people have lived and built their homes and the very particular locations where the consequences of state policy or circuits of mobility have played out’.

Overall, environmental historians have focused heavily on rural or wilderness settings in New Zealand, with relatively little work on urban environments. An updated edition of Environmental Histories of New Zealand, published in 2013, entitled Making a New Land, is still dominated by rural and wilderness subjects, but shows the beginnings of a new shift into urban environments. Eric Pawson, in his chapter on urban landscapes, observed that in the last ten years American historians have begun to respond to Cronon’s observation that cities deserve more attention. These American works have shown how urban environmental

---

44 Ballantyne, Webs of Empire, pp.269-70.
45 Ballantyne, Webs of Empire, p.273.
history can be at the forefront of the field’s recent focus on hybridity, cultural processes and social division. However, there is little evidence of further work being done in this area by New Zealand historians.

Urban histories have been under-represented in New Zealand generally, though Schrader’s recent survey of colonial city life made a significant contribution in this area, arguing for the centrality of cities in New Zealand history, and placing them within a broader comparative perspective. ‘If we are better to understand what is happening in New Zealand society in the present’, argued Schrader, ‘then historians need to enter the city streets, lanes and cul-de-sacs of its past’. ‘Shifting Grounds’ enters the landscapes of our largest city, building on existing scholarship on cultural and environmental history in New Zealand and extending the discussion into areas that have received relatively little attention.

**History, Memory and Materiality**

Landscapes are rich repositories of textual, visual, material and ephemeral sources that allow the historian to reach beyond the walls of traditional historical and cultural institutions and archives, and consider the production of meaning in the places and spaces we engage with every day. These complex assemblages offer a nuanced, personal and rich insight into human experience, revealing not only collective experiences of place, but also the experiences of those often left out of broader historical texts. The term landscape emerged from the development of landscape painting in renaissance Venice and Flanders, and referred to a part of the earth’s surface that could be viewed from one point. As such, it has traditionally been associated with visual conceptions of land. John R. Stilgoe has defined landscape as ‘shaped land, land modified for permanent human occupation, for dwelling, agriculture, manufacturing, government, worship, and for pleasure’. However, the term has become increasingly difficult and ‘slippery’ to define over the last twenty years or so.

---

49 Schrader, *The Big Smoke*, p.19. See also pp.17-23 for a broader discussion of urban history in New Zealand.
51 Cresswell, *Place*, p.10.
Increasingly, scholars in New Zealand and abroad are beginning to reject firm divisions between people and landscapes. As Stephenson, Abbot and Ruru wrote in their conclusion in *Beyond the Scene*: ‘[r]ather than being an external resource from which to extract value, landscape is something within which we are enmeshed, and may be even something of which we are part. In this regard landscape is not just a visible ecology of landforms, fauna and flora, but also a richly woven human ecology of people, activities, ideas and cultures. Through the mutual dialogues between these, landscape becomes emergent – something more than the sum of its parts. It becomes an active generator of identity, localness, belonging and community'.

These more recent approaches to landscape open up possibilities for accessing new perspectives and understandings on the past. Anne Salmond commented in 2003, ‘In landscape, there is no radical division between nature and culture, and European history, colonial or post-colonial periods – just one long, intertwined narrative, woven from different strands of land and ancestry in different parts of the country, layered on the land in a stratigraphy of stories.’ While ‘Shifting Grounds’ addresses historical questions and maintains a historical emphasis on context, narrative, agency and a wide range of sources, it also explores the intersections of history with other disciplines that have addressed the cultural and material dimensions of social life. By opening up the sources, the historian can explore how methodologies from the fields of material culture, anthropology, Māori studies and geography might contribute to the field of history, and how historical approaches might bring new perspectives to key debates in the social sciences.

In order to address the ‘where’ in history, the historian is required to move beyond textual analysis, and engage with non-verbal sources that include material culture, the environment and performance. ‘Historians are, by profession, suspicious of things. Words are our stock-in-trade’, American historian, Leora Auslander, noted in 2005. As historians, we tend to rely on textual documents held in archives to inform us about the past, yet experiences are also recorded in buildings, trails, plantings, sounds, absences and other material and ephemeral ways. These ‘wordless’ recordings can bring voices of the past into the historical conversation that may not be accessible in written, spoken or pictorial sources.

Attention to place also allows for an examination of the mutual entanglement of people and their material worlds. Material things, and particularly the way that people engage with them, have made these tangible sources increasingly attractive to cultural and social historians, although the scholarship is still fairly sparse, particularly in New Zealand. Historians argue that people engage differently with the material world than they do with language; this material engagement can provide tangible, sensory and otherwise inaccessible human expressions of meaning. According to historian Karen Harvey, material culture provides historians with ‘a superb opportunity to focus closely on integrated social and cultural practice’. Including these sources in the historical analysis can generate questions that might otherwise go unasked, and reveal historical connections that may reinforce or undermine the stories that we create about the past.

This study also explores the ways that the past has been reworked in various forms of cultural heritage, while other, more ‘problematic’ narratives have been neglected, forgotten or erased. It asks how forgotten places might provide resistant or disruptive narratives or ‘countermemories’. ‘Memory attaches itself to sites, whereas history attaches itself to events’, observed Pierre Nora, in his seminal work, Les Lieux de Mémoire. By encompassing not only the prominent memorials and structures but also the neglected places, landscapes allow an exploration of the ways in which narratives of identity and belonging have been conserved or removed from the physical environment.

Within each landscape, ‘Shifting Grounds’ considers the extent to which things – rocks, memorials, artefacts, structures, archaeological sites — can inform us about the narratives that people have constructed over time and the ways in which these narratives have continued, transformed or been silenced. It examines places on the land that have accrued meaning over time (such as the Auckland Museum, the ‘ideal home’ in the Domain, and the tree at the summit of Maungakiekie), as well as ‘forgotten’ or ‘silent’ places (including archaeological remains, rock walls, terraces, battle sites) that have been erased. It also examines distributed places (quarried volcanoes, urupa and artifacts, for example) and the spatial arrangement between them across (and beyond) the landscape. Monuments and buildings have been

59 Pierre Nora, Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire, Representations, 26, Spring 1989, p.22.
erected to celebrate certain people or events, and in the process have altered or erased places and narratives beneath them. Certain places are well-maintained, while other places in the landscape are left to decay. Paths direct visitors to certain places and lead away from ‘other’ places. Rocks have been moved and removed, arranged and rearranged by people for hundreds of years; they have been used for walls, as boundary markers, employed to build houses, mound gardens, and roads. Terraces have served as defensive structures, gardening beds, platforms for homes, grazing areas and bicycle jumps. Artefacts and taonga (treasures, highly prized items) have been found, taken, kept, discarded, re-buried. Regardless of their current use, all carry narratives and understandings with them.

As well as examining the material remains and absences in each landscape, this study consults visual and textual representations of place. Newspapers, local histories, maps and the colonial archive are powerfully constrained by ideological constructs that reveal the crafting of selected (often authorized) narratives about place, while diaries, letters and sketches provide a more personal, subjective interpretation of place. These representations offer an important balance to the physical remains on the landscape, providing first-hand contemporary perspectives and experiences of each landscape over time.

But ‘Shifting Grounds’ also endeavours to look beyond material and textual productions of meaning, to consider meanings produced through ephemeral activities like meeting, walking and speaking. Oral traditions, songs, place naming, rituals and movement across the land reveal long and continuing connections with place, often not visible on the landscape, that can elucidate different concepts of time, space and belonging. To engage with these longer, non-modern histories, historians need to look beyond the traditional tools of their trade. American historian Greg Anderson has recently argued that our conventional historicist models and categories limit the kinds of stories we can tell about the past to those that fit within the bounds of a single, universal world of time, space and experience.60 Historians, writes Anderson, ‘translate’ all past experiences into post-Enlightenment terms, which are governed by modernity’s objectivist standards of truth and realness. By analysing the past in this way, according to Anderson, we end up denying past and present peoples the power to determine the truth of their own experiences. In other words, we miss the heterogeneities of human pasts by translating them into our terms, and we separate historical subjects from important conditions of their existence.61 Māori ancestral relationships and histories have not only been

written down, but also remembered, performed and made. By opening up the stories we choose to tell about the past, to include oral, indigenous and material histories, we might gain insight into histories, experiences, meanings and even worlds that fall outside the historicist tradition, but are nevertheless important components of the past.

The issue of material agency is particularly contentious for historians, who have traditionally viewed historical sources as evidence of the past, rather than active agents in social lives. While for Māori, certain things have always had power and efficacy (in that they can do things, they do not just signify or mean things), European scholars have long debated the possibilities and limits of material agency. In 1954, Marcel Mauss argued in *The Gift* that material things, including taonga, were in some ways person-like.\(^62\) Scholars have since debated the work of Mauss and others who followed in his wake. Marilyn Strathern and Roy Wagner have written about the ‘distributed personhood’ of bodily substances and other material extensions of the body; Alfred Gell argued that objects could ‘act’ as social agents, exercising secondary agency; and Bruno Latour questioned the distinction between things and people, arguing that they are in fact enfolded into one another.\(^63\)

Recently, scholars from various disciplines have sought to move beyond the dualistic and dialectical approaches in material culture to give methodological attentiveness to things, arguing that ‘objects do far more than represent’.\(^64\) Historian Robin Bernstein, for example, has written about ‘scriptive things’ that can prompt or choreograph behaviour; feminist theorist Karen Barad has conceptualized matter as a doing, rather than a thing; and anthropologists Amiria Henare, Martin Holbraad, and Sari Wastell have argued that things, rather than serving merely to illustrate the social system, can in fact instantiate different ontological ‘worlds’ or ‘natures’.\(^65\)

---


This recent scholarship on relationships between the human and material world provides a strong challenge to disciplines across the humanities and social sciences, which have traditionally assumed rigid divisions between people and things, subjects and objects, and meaning and materiality. According to Head, much of the work on cultural landscapes has been oppositional, in that it ‘has put people and culture into landscapes that have been considered empty and natural’ and cast landscapes as an exclusively human achievement, thus reinforcing the binary between material and culture.66 Recent writers on landscape, notably Tim Ingold and Sarah Whitmore, have sought to dissolve these distinctions, by emphasizing ‘dynamic, embodied and less dualistic engagements between humans and non-humans’.67 These approaches address not only the tangible but also intangible connections to the land, which as Head argues, may have their own materiality, ‘inscribed in bodies, sweat and the elusive DNA of yam species dug for thousands of years’.68 Following on from such scholarship, ‘Shifting Grounds’ approaches the material and human worlds as fabricated together, both active participants in the creation of history, materiality and memory.

Henare, Holbraad and Wastell have built on the ontological turn in anthropology to put forward a methodological project that takes alterity or difference seriously, proposing that ‘thinking through things’ might generate a plurality of ontologies or worlds rather than different representations of the same world.69 These authors, working on the premise that concepts and things interlock, argue that different worlds can reside in things. In order to see, or conceive of these worlds, they argue, we must accept the limitations of our own assumptions and attempt to ‘think through things’ as our informants (or sources) do, with conceptual creativity. In this way some of our own presuppositions may become visible, allowing new insights to emerge. This methodological project might be a productive way for historians to explore the conceptual possibilities of landscape. Understanding that European assumptions about land, identity, time and culture are not the same as Māori understandings, for instance, might be a starting point for beginning an attempt to conceive of the generative and conceptual potential of land and other taonga as instantiations of ancestral effect.70

---

68 Lesley Head, ‘Cultural Landscapes’, p.429.
**Shifting Grounds: An Outline**

The structure of this thesis revolves around several narrative moments. Rather than producing an epic review of historical events in each landscape, it aims to provide kaleidoscopic glimpses of the things, thoughts and memories that have gathered together in particular configurations at specific moments in each landscape and explore their connections to broader networks, circuits and threads. In each chapter, a particular period is investigated through the mutual entanglements of people, place and identity in one of these landscapes. The thesis follows a broadly chronological framing, spanning from the early migrations of Polynesians to New Zealand in around the fourteenth century to the mid-twentieth century. Each chapter considers the ways in which these narrative moments have evolved and continue to interact with understanding of place, time and identity today. Every chapter focuses on different aspects of materiality in the landscape, - a rock wall, a house, a garden, a mission station, a grove of trees or a monument so that throughout the thesis an expansive source base is engaged with that includes textual and visual representations, material and ephemeral sources.

The first chapter examines the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve and the wider area of Ihumātao from the time of first Polynesian arrivals in Tāmaki, through to the establishment of the European town of Auckland in 1840. Drawing on indigenous histories, archaeology and historical works, this chapter explores the earliest relationships between Māori and their environment on the lava fields and the ways that these evolved over time. This chapter argues for the importance of early histories, or ‘deep time’, for understanding Auckland today, and emphasizes the continuities of these longer histories after the arrival of Europeans.

Chapter Two focuses on the Auckland Domain in early colonial Auckland, from 1840 to 1860, when the colonial government was based in Auckland. It explores the establishment of the government gardens in the Domain as well as the construction of a cottage for the Waikato chief, Potatau Te Wherowhero in 1845. The chapter suggests that the Domain operated as a site of important civic, scientific and cultural interchange in early colonial Auckland and tracks how these histories have since been remembered or forgotten.

The third chapter returns to the Ōtuataua Stonefields to examine the Wesleyan Methodist mission station at Ihumātao and the adjacent stonefield gardens from 1846 until the outbreak of the Waikato War in 1863. Unlike most places in colonial Auckland, Māori continued to occupy and cultivate their ancestral lands at Ōtuataua throughout the 1840s and 1850s. This chapter examines the relationships forged between Māori, missionaries, European settlers and the colonial government during this period. It argues that at Ihumātao, there was no sudden
break between Māori (or pre-European) and European history when the town of Auckland was established in 1840, contrary to most histories of the city. Rather, this shift occurred at Ihumātao with the outbreak of the Waikato War in 1863, which led to the confiscation of the Stonefields from Māori, a moment that has largely disappeared from public memory and from histories of Auckland.

Chapter Four moves to the olive grove at Cornwall Park in the late nineteenth century. Examining this forgotten corner of an iconic landscape opens up a more complicated story of settler identities, which often is forgotten in historical works that emphasise the tightening of links with Britain during this period. John Logan Campbell operated the olive grove for almost twenty years, creating connections with Italian, American, and Chinese immigrants in Auckland, as well as international connections beyond the British Empire. These Mediterranean links are important for understanding the multiple colonial spheres of Auckland, even if they did not ultimately continue into the early twentieth century.

Chapter Five examines the Chinese market gardens operating on and around the Auckland Domain at the turn of the twentieth century. Drawing on archaeological findings and historical sources, the chapter explores the home, business and international networks generated by Chan Ah Chee and his family on the market gardens. Alongside the market gardens, the chapter also examines the Auckland Exhibition of 1913-14. It explores concepts of home, belonging and identity on both sites at the turn of the twentieth century, suggesting that civic identities were more heterogeneous than the Exhibition and its commemorative building, the tea-house (widely known as the ‘Ideal Home’) might indicate.

The final chapter explores the construction of the obelisk at Maungakiekie within the historical and physical context of the wider landscape of the mountain. Beginning with John Logan Campbell’s speech to celebrate the opening of the road to the summit of the mountain in 1907, it examines other sites, ‘relics’ and concepts that sit alongside the obelisk, and considers how these deeper local historical contexts might help re-frame this iconic landmark.

Places such as the early Māori gardens of the Ōtuataua Stonefields, Te Wherowhero’s cottage, the Ihumātao mission station, Campbell’s olive grove, Ah Chee’s market gardens and the volcanic cone of Maungakiekie allow us to glimpse the very different ways in which people have made sense of their worlds and the worlds of others at particular moments, through verbal and material processes. Investigating the layers upon layers of place-making in each landscape brings to light earlier senses of connectivity to places that complicate and
transform them. These histories still resonate through Auckland, whether or not most of us are aware of them.
There are no sculptures, museums, or clearly defined pathways on the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. As you pass through the first wooden farm gate at the entrance to the reserve, the neat, reconstructed Scottish drystone walls and straight asphalted path quickly give way to a vast, indecipherable landscape of rock. The path becomes a grassy track that follows the contours of the land. The orderly rock walls crumble into the landscape and are disrupted by rows and piles of rocks at unexpected angles. Fields of pasture drop away suddenly into depressions. Boulders block the path and rocks trip you up. The promise of a volcanic cone, suggested by the rise of its lower slopes, is snatched away by a quarry, leaving a gaping hole where Ōtuataua Mountain once stood.

Looking west across the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. Photo by Ian Lawlor, Auckland Regional Council.

Like the landscape itself, narratives are hard to read on the Ōtuataua Stonefields. Woven through this landscape, farmed by British immigrants for almost 150 years before it became a historic reserve in 2001, are the remnants of earlier histories, with different systems, ideas and understandings of place that have been dismantled, rearranged, and built upon over time. For around 600-700 years, people here have been picking up rocks, carrying them, turning them in their hands, arranging and re-arranging them to make walls, garden structures, houses, pathways, roads and airport runways. Narratives have been crafted through stone, soil,  

---

1 Radiocarbon dates for the wider Māngere area indicate human occupation from around 1450, but whakapapa (genealogical lines) suggests earlier occupation dating back to at least the arrival of the Tainui canoe in around 1300 to 1400. Clough & Associates, ‘Archaeological Investigations at Timberley Road, Mangere: Final, Report for Auckland International Airport Ltd, 2015, p.115; Atholl Anderson, Judith Binney and Aroha Harris, *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*, Wellington, 2014, pp.65-6
water, as well as in written and spoken stories. These narratives reach back beyond the written sources that historians traditionally rely on, back to the first human inhabitants of the place we now call Auckland. They have continued to build, evolve and reveal themselves over time, forming but little-known foundation stories of Tāmaki, and Auckland, as it became known. Walk through this landscape today, and it is difficult to see where the ground ends and the stone walls begin, where a volcano stops and a quarry starts, where one story finishes and another begins. History here is not monumental — there are no fixed beginning or endings, grand narratives or imposing structures. Narratives on the Stonefields are shifting, fine-grained and multiple.

The Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve is situated on the Ihumātao Peninsula in the large culturally diverse suburb of Māngere, around fifteen kilometres south of the Auckland city centre. The reserve is near Auckland Airport, and although thousands of people fly over or drive past it every day, few beyond the local community have ever heard of it. Located in a rural area, and bounded on three sides by the Manukau Harbour, the Ihumātao Peninsula has always been considered to be on the margins of Auckland. Aucklanders, tourists, and historians alike tend to focus their attention on the urban areas of Auckland and its northern coastline, the Waitematā Harbour. Although the reserve is situated well within the boundaries of Auckland, it still feels off the beaten track. And in many ways this is the case.

---

2 Tāmaki was also known as Tāmakimakarau, or ‘Tāmaki, desired by many’.
Time, place and identity are hard to grasp on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, and this may be why they have stayed largely outside the consciousness of most New Zealanders until recently. The Stonefields are, in many senses, a borderland, and as American historians Pekka Hamalainen and Samuel Truett have pointed out, ‘[f]rom the crow’s nest of borderlands history, one sees how much epic left behind, tangled up in the contingencies of the world’. Here, at the edge of Auckland, people encountered very different physical and social environments to those in what is now considered ‘central Auckland’.

At Ihumātao, identities in have been forged not so much by the single points of rupture that are often highlighted in histories of Auckland, but rather by a longer, wider and more complex array of turning points. The Māori community who still live alongside the Stonefields, at Ihumātao and neighbouring Pūkaki, have ancestral links to this area that stretch back to the first people to arrive in Tāmaki. These people, who became known as Te Waiōhua, did not disappear when Te Taoū (the tribal grouping that became collectively known as Ngāti Whātua) and others invaded Tāmaki in the eighteenth century, despite claims to the contrary. Nor did they cease to exist in 1840, when the British Government purchased the first block of land from Ngāti Whātua to establish the town of Auckland. The year 1840
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5 Ihumātao papakainga (original home, settlement) is also known by its ancestral name, Puketapapa.
was not, as one historian put it quite recently, ‘the end of Māori Auckland’. While 1840 was significant for both Māori and Pākehā, it was not experienced as a sudden shift on the Stonefields and surrounding Ihumātao area. Even though most of the Māori land in the wider Auckland area was alienated in the 1840s, there were still some places, now well within the city of Auckland, where Māori continued to live in their rohe (ancestral district, area).

Vast areas of rock cover the Ōtuataua Stonefields. Photograph by Lucy Mackintosh, 2016.

This chapter focuses on the early history of the Ōtuataua Stonefields, from the first human inhabitants in the area in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, to the establishment of the town of Auckland in 1840. It is a long history, and some of the stories are not easy to reach with the standard tools of the historian, but there are a growing number of historians who argue that we can and should endeavour to engage with these stories if we are to better understand the places we live in and the diversity of human experiences woven through them. To

---

retrieve the ‘lost worlds of the past’, writes historian Greg Anderson, historians need to attempt to make sense of non-modern pasts on their own ontological terms, as real worlds in their own right. While such histories may no longer be commensurable and mutually intelligible, they are more ethically defensible, theoretically robust and historically meaningful.

Though scholars in the humanities have traditionally separated the material and cultural realms, the lines between social, material and ecological are also becoming increasingly folded together. Archaeologist Tim Ingold, for example, has argued that materials are not attributes, as archaeologists and scientists have tended to approach them, but histories, or paths through a maze of trajectories. ‘Making’, he says, 'creates knowledge, builds environments and transforms lives'. Archaeologist Rodney Harrison uses the term ‘multiple overlapping ontological fields’ to describe this dissolving of disciplinary boundaries and it is a term that works well for thinking about the Ōtuataua Stonefields. In these lava fields, the written and spoken histories, the rocks, the gardens, and the spaces in between, all reveal multiple and overlapping forms of knowledge and continuities, many of which have been overlooked by historians.

There are, of course, multiple beginnings to the many layers on the Stonefields. In geological terms, the landscape on what is now the Ōtuataua Stonefields was formed by lava flows from the two volcanic cones on the reserve, Ōtuataua and Puakeiti (also known as Puketapapatanga a Hape), which erupted around 30,000 years ago. Ōtuataua and Puakeiti are just two of about 50 eruptions that occurred within a 20-kilometre radius on the Auckland volcanic field over the last 250,000 years. These eruptions were caused by a hot spot about 100 kilometres below the ground, which melted the rock around it and caused the liquid rock (magma) to rise to the surface. Auckland’s volcanoes have produced 4.1km$^3$ (approximately 160 000
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14 Ingold, Making, p.i.
15 Harrison, ‘Beyond ‘Natural’ and ‘Cultural’ Heritage’, p.33.
Olympic size swimming pools) of volcanic material, which spread across the landscape forming around 8000 hectares of lava fields across Auckland.\textsuperscript{19}

![Geological map of Auckland showing volcanic cones and lava fields](image)

This geological map of Auckland vividly shows the volcanic cones (in red) and the large areas of solidified lava streams and volcanic tuff (in pink) across Auckland. 'The Isthmus of Auckland with its Extinct Volcanoes', 1859, by Dr Ferdinand von Hochstetter, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 5694b, Auckland Libraries.

The lava pouring out of the vents of Ōtuatua and Pukeiti flooded the existing rivers and valleys. As the lava cooled, it began to solidify and became frozen in time. It created a landscape covered with loose rock, full of ‘sunklands’, where lava had dammed up then released quickly, ‘buckled ridges’, where rock had gathered together, ‘fractured joints’, ‘raised bubbles’, and lava tubes, where the outer surface of the lava cooled and solidified while the molten lava underneath continued to flow and drain away.\textsuperscript{20}


Underneath the lava fields, the pre-volcanic landscape of the Ōtuataua Stonefields remained intact. The rivers and streams that cut deeply into the silts and clays from the earlier Pliocene and Pleistocene age still flow below the surface of the ground. These waterways collect the rainwater that drains through the joints in the basalt and carry it into the freshwater springs at the edges of the Stonefields. This earlier landscape, still present but no longer visible, helps make the Ōtuataua Stonefields dry and warm, with free-draining soils and no surface water.  

Part of the forest growing on the Ihumātao peninsula at the time of the eruptions was preserved by the eruption of nearby Maungataketake (or Ellett’s Mountain), which is thought to have erupted at a similar time. Particles from the eruption covered and preserved a section of the forest, which included rimu, miro, hinau, tanekaha and kauri trees. The trees are now exposed in the mudflats of the Manukau Harbour and in the ash cliffs along the coastline. Fossilised leaves and trunks show the impact of the initial blasts, which ripped leaves off trees, toppled tree trunks and blasted off the tops of trees, before burying them with ash, which fossilised them. Holes in the volcanic tuff hold the memory of fallen trunks, preserved in water until the water table dropped and the wood rotted away. An earlier kauri forest also remains perfectly preserved, buried on the foreshore of the harbour under the peaty swamp that formed when the harbour was a forested river valley. As the coast continues to change
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21 Searle, *City of Volcanoes*, p.139.
and erode over time, these deeper, longer histories that lie under our feet are revealed, reminding us that places have never been fixed points on a map but are always evolving, in ways over which humans often have little control.

Māori traditional histories of Ihumātao and the wider Tāmaki and Manukau area also stretch back to the formation of the land. Some of these histories have been written down, while others have been told, remembered, or made with rocks and soil. Europeans have been recording Māori oral traditions in Tāmaki since the 1820s, when missionaries first began visiting the area. From the mid nineteenth century a number of scholars, notably John White, Elsdon Best and Percy Smith, began to synthesize these very complex and varied traditions from different areas of New Zealand, compiling them into cohesive, continuous histories of New Zealand in the tradition of European historiography. These synthesized

---


25 For examples of tribal histories recorded during court hearings, see Orakei Minute Books (3 vols), Native Land Court 1866-8; Compensation Court Records, 1866, Archives New Zealand, Auckland and Wellington; *Daily Southern Cross*, 21 April 1866, p. 5; *Daily Southern Cross*, 24 April 1866, p.5. For discussions around nineteenth century European scholarship on Māori oral traditions, see Anderson et al, *Tangata Whenua*, pp.52-3; A. Sullivan, ‘Māori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840: Volume 1, Traditional, Ethnographic and Other Historic Documentary Sources’, unpublished manuscript, Department of Maori, Victoria University, Wellington, 1983, p.42; R.C.J. Stone, *From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland*, Auckland, 2001, p.10.
histories became hugely influential and widely regarded as fact by scholars and the wider public for much of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.26

Late nineteenth century scholars writing about Auckland drew primarily on the chronological summary of Māori history in Tāmaki published by Judge Francis Dart Fenton in 1879, following the Ōrakei case in the Native Land Courts.27 This evidence, mainly given by Māori chiefs of various tribes, was valuable and important, but also contained conflicting testimonies from different claimants and misinterpretation of the material by court officials.28 The testimony was also dominated by the narratives of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrakei, who had defeated Te Waiōhua in the mid-eighteenth century and overridden many of Te Waiōhua oral histories relating to earlier occupation in Tāmaki.29 In the 1890s, George S. Graham, an amateur ethnologist, also began collecting traditional narratives from Māori elders of various tribes around Auckland.30

Scholars including George Fenton and Graham drew heavily on Smith’s framework, helping to create a number of meta-narratives about the early (or pre-) history of Auckland.31 These narratives included the story that Māori in Tāmaki were in a constant state of warfare prior to the arrival of Europeans, that the Tāmaki people known as Te Waiōhua ceased to exist after their defeat by Te Taou in the eighteenth century, and that Tāmaki was no longer occupied by Māori when Europeans arrived in the 1820s and 30s.32 Subsequent histories of Auckland drew heavily on the frameworks established by Smith, Fenton and others. In her book about the local histories produced by European settlers in New England in the USA, historian Jean O’Brien has called this process ‘Firsting and Lasting’. Her observation that these histories ‘formed a vernacular historical sensibility of enduring influence, as their work, however fanciful or erroneous, became blueprints for understanding the past’, can equally be applied to local histories of Auckland.33

26 Anderson et al, Tangata Whenua, pp.52-3.
29 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-raw to Auckland, p.29.
32 For a more detailed analysis of these meta narratives see Sullivan, ‘Māori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840’, pp.19-23.
From the 1960s, scholars began finding serious inconsistencies and errors in the synthesized narratives of Smith and others, and since then many historians and anthropologists have remained wary about using traditional Māori narratives as historical sources. More recent histories of early Tāmaki, particularly Russell Stone’s book, *From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland*, draw out some of the complexities of early Māori histories, and address some of the myths about early Tāmaki. Stone drew on the written records of the Māori Land Courts, but cautioned that they could be unreliable and were dominated by the Te Taoū version of events, ‘the victors, so to speak, in the historical process’. Nevertheless, places such as Ihumātao, which do fit into the meta-narratives that dominate the written record, still get left out of these broader histories.

In a recent work, archaeologist Atholl Anderson emphasized the importance of placing Māori traditions back into their physical environment. Reliable and authentic traditions, says Anderson, were told by people in positions of authority, located in specific named places that often survive in modern maps, and were associated with particular individuals. Though oral histories can be partial and contradictory, like any historical source, Anderson argues that whakapapa (genealogical lines) can provide a broad temporal framework if it has connections across lineages and regions. By putting traditional histories back into place, they become not simply a narrative that can be fitted into a cohesive history that reflects European preoccupations, but a way of providing insight into Māori cultural processes in which stories are co-constituted with the physical landscape and form an integral component of the construction of identity.

Though there is little published work in Auckland, or New Zealand, based on the careful analytical work that Anderson proposes, there are a number of unpublished sources that provide invaluable assistance for navigating traditional histories relating to Ihumātao. Archaeologist Agnes Sullivan’s unpublished thesis on gardening in Tāmaki, written in the 1980s, closely analysed Māori traditions relating to Tāmaki according to their links with other
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narratives, providing an important resource for assessing reliability of written sources.\textsuperscript{41} Māori traditional histories specific to Ihumātao and the surrounding area have been told by kuia (elderly women) and kaumātua of Pūkaki Marae and Makaurau Marae in Māngere.\textsuperscript{42} Traditional histories have also been recorded by historian Graeme Murdoch, who has a life long association with the communities concerned, and learned these stories in a traditional manner from kaumātua, orally and in the Māori language.\textsuperscript{43} These works, together with other primary and secondary sources, all help traverse the written records and the histories that have not made it into the archives but have been remembered and passed down into the present.

Surviving Māori histories of the region begin with the formation of the wider Manukau area by powerful ancestors. One of the earliest narratives recorded by Europeans in the Tāmaki area is that of Aihepene Kaihau, a Ngāti Te Ata rangatira (chief, leader) from Waiuku, who was later involved in events at Ihumātao.\textsuperscript{44} In 1838, the missionary William Wade, who was visiting Rev. James Hamlin at Moeatoa mission station (near Waiuku), recorded a lengthy conversation with Kaihau, who he described as ‘an intelligent and well-behaved old man, whose accounts of by-gone days might be depended on’.\textsuperscript{45} Kaihau began his account with the meeting of Rangi (Rangiatea the sky-father) and Papa (Papatūānuku the earth-mother) and the five children they had together. He then described how many generations later, Maui captured fire from his father and used his jaw bone as a hook to fish up land, which rose and spread, becoming the mountain of Taupiri in the nearby Waikato district.

Kaihau’s narrative is a local variation of the commonly known story about the creation of the North Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand by ancestral beings. The story of Maui’s fishing expedition has often been regarded by scholars as no more than a romantic tale in New Zealand’s ‘pre-history’, but historian Nēpia Mahuika has argued that this narrative reveals

\textsuperscript{41} Sullivan, ‘Māori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840’.
\textsuperscript{42} See, for instance, ‘Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Manukau Claim (Wai 8)’, Waitangi Tribunal, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, Wellington, 1985; Maurice Wilson, interview, Oral History Collection MNP OH8, 2004, Central Research Library, Manukau Libraries; Sworn Affidavit of Haki Wilson, ‘In the Matter of The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, An Application for an Urgent Inquiry into the Crown’s actions concerning the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 and the development of the Ihumatao Special Housing Area by Haki Wilson, Bobbi-Jo Pihema, Qiane Matata-Sipu, Pania Newton, Waimarie McFarland, and Moana Waa on behalf of Makaurau Marae and Ngati Te Ahiwaru (the Claimants)’, Wai 2547 #A1, 7 December 2015.
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important Māori notions of collective identity prior to the arrival of Pākehā.46 The stories of Maui in various tribal regions, according to Mahuika, are narratives of home and place handed down through generations that reveal both deep connections with specific locations and long existing networks amongst tribal groups around the country.47 In Aihepene Kaihau’s narrative, Rangi, Papa, Maui and other origin ancestors are intimately linked with the formation of the wider Manukau area and also connect this area with tribal groups in the neighbouring Waikato area.

Another very early oral tradition records the origin of the name Ihumātao. In this tradition, the ancestor Mataaaho created all of the volcanic formations of Tāmaki. Mataaaho’s features were recorded in the landscape, including at Ihumātao or Te Ihu a Mataaaho, which means the nose of Mataaaho. Other features formed by Mataaaho include Te Pane a Mataaaho, the head of Mataaaho (Māngere mountain); Te Tatua o Mataaaho, Mataaaho’s belt (Three Kings); and Te Kapua Kai o Mataaaho, Mataaaho’s food bowl (Mount Eden).48 Like the tradition of Maui, the story of Mataaaho links the formation of the physical environment with powerful forebears. In this narrative, the rocky landscape of Tāmaki is perceived not as a distinct event, separated from the present in space and time, but as a living, breathing ancestor, instantiated in the landscape, who continues to govern and shape life’s processes and outcomes in Auckland. Mataaaho was responsible for creating the fertile volcanic soils, forming volcanoes (such as the eruption of Rangitoto, which Māori witnessed in around the fourteenth century), causing occasional shudders in the ground and forming the rain (the tears of Mataaaho). 49

Furthermore, the tradition of Mataaaho provided a collective identity for early Tāmaki residents, defining it as a place unified by its volcanic features and by a common ancestor long before Auckland expanded to encompass most of the volcanic plateau.50 Although the two largest volcanic cones on the Ihumātao Peninsula, Maungataketake (later known as Ellett’s Mountain) and Ōtuataua (later known as Quarry Hill), have now been almost completely quarried away, they still serve as locators for mana whenua (hapū or iwi members with customary land rights in a defined area).51 Even without its volcanic cones, Ihumātao

48 Though some of Graham’s work has been found to be unreliable, Agnes Sullivan assessed this narrative as authentic because of its narrative structure and place names. Sullivan, ‘Māori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840’, pp.46-7; Hayward et al, Volcanoes of Auckland, pp.44-5.
50 Hayward et al, Volcanoes of Auckland, p.11.
continues to have a presence in Auckland as part of the genealogy of the city, both physically and historically, in the form of Mataaho, who is now commemorated in Auckland at Maungawhau, where the crater (the food bowl of Mataaho) is tapu (imbued with ancestral power) and can no longer be accessed by the public.

Around the fourteenth century, a number of voyaging canoes arrived in Tāmaki from East Polynesia.52 The Tainui canoe arrived on the east coast of New Zealand and headed north to Tāmaki, before travelling down the west coast and eventually landing at Kawhia. Tainui traditions vary on the route of the canoe, but a number of narratives state that the crew carried the canoe across the portage at Ōtahuhu in Tāmaki, stopping at Māngere before entering the Manukau Harbour and continuing down the west coast, naming all of these places as they passed through.53 Some of the crew-members remained behind in Tāmaki when the Tainui canoe left the area, including Rakataura, the leading tohunga (spiritual leader) of the Tainui, who was also known as Hape, because of his limp.54 Hape apparently waited on a small volcanic cone while the Tainui canoe was carried across the portage. This cone, subsequently named Puketapapatanga a Hape, or ‘the hilltop resting place of Hape’, is located on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, where it is more commonly known as Pukeiti, or ‘the little hill’.55 These stories of early ancestors position Ihumātao as part of the geographical and ancestral landscape of Tāmaki, but also as a place connected with the movements of the Tainui canoe and its crew-members, and a site at the northern edge of the Tainui territorial boundaries. Those who shaped the land were forebears of its later inhabitants, linked with them by whakapapa, tying the world together as a vast kin network.

The stories and achievements of ancestors over generations were not only spoken, they were also recorded in the landscape itself. Over time, according to academic Rawinia Higgins, these recorded histories move from broad definitions of large landmasses to micro definitions

of local geographical points. 'As the landscape becomes more defined and specific names are applied to areas of whenua’, writes Higgins, ‘so too is the organisation and development of Māori societal structure’. These ongoing connections between ancestors and the land through time provided Māori with the unique matrix of their identity.

The knowledge that Polynesians had developed over hundreds, possibly thousands of years, was transferred into the lava field gardens of Tāmaki. As their descendants developed techniques and processes in the local environment, the garden systems continued to evolve. Archaeologists have recorded complex systems on the Ōtuataua Stonefields that stretch from the volcanic cones of Ōtuataua and Pupeiti to the coast of the Manukau Harbour. The horticultural systems include boundary walls, garden mounds, stone mounds, stone wall enclosures, stone alignments, stone-faced terraces, drainage features, pits and sunken enclosures. Semi-rectangular walled structures on the lava fields have been interpreted as clusters of houses. Archaeologists describe the Ōtuataua Stonefields as ‘a vast cultural landscape that once supported the economic basis for one of the most densely settled areas in New Zealand’.
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58 Higgins, ‘He Tānga Ngutu, He Tuhoetanga Te Mana Motuhake o te Tā Moko Wāhine’, p.152.
Māori field systems with rows, alignments, mounds and terraces built up from the surrounding basaltic rock, once covered most of Auckland’s 8000 hectares of lava fields but almost all of these landscapes have now been destroyed by urban development.62 ‘The growth of the metropolis of Auckland’ wrote Russell Stone, ‘has obliterated most of its archaeological sites and all but a remnant of the evidence of local Maori material culture’.63 Today, only 200 hectares of these garden systems remain, 100 hectares of which are on the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve, making it one of the few places in Auckland where the long-run narratives of Māori history are still recorded in the landscape.64

As well as providing rare glimpses into its human histories, the Ōtuataua Stonefields also provide insight into Auckland’s natural histories. Auckland’s lava fields were once covered with forests, but almost all of these have been now been destroyed by gardening, then quarrying and urban development. Only a few small pockets of remnant rock forest remain in Auckland, one of which is on the Ōtuataua Stonefields. Botanists only became aware of this remnant in the 1990s, when Ewen Cameron found a small area of volcanic forest, containing
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62 There were extensive stone garden systems at Maungakiekie (One Tree Hill), Maungarei (Mt Wellington) and Maungawhau (Mt Eden), and smaller gardening areas around other volcanic cones across the Tāmaki isthmus. Agnes Sullivan, Stone Complexes of Central Auckland, *New Zealand Archaeological Association Newsletter*, 15, 4 (1972), pp.148-60; Furey, ‘Maori Gardening’, p.59; Rod Clough and Mica Plowman, ‘Independent Comparative Archaeological Study of Stonefields in the North Island, New Zealand’, Manukau City Council, 1996, p.3.


karaka, titoki, pūriri and whau on a steep slope amongst the volcanic boulders. Amongst the trees, Cameron also found the mawhai (the native cucumber), which had long been considered extinct.66

The work of archaeologists, mostly unpublished and often presented in archaeological reports or Statements of Evidence to Court, allows the historian to follow longer temporal trajectories and systems of material interactions over time. The scientific approach to the physical world adopted by archaeologists is often seen as incommensurable with Māori traditional narratives. However, in Tangata Whenua, a major recent account of Māori history, Anderson, Binney and Harris argue that in some cases, material things provide insight into Māori cultural processes: ‘What can be pieced together about te ao tawhito is in large part limited by the cultural remains of that most distant set of ancestors. Yet even for their Māori inheritors in the present, the parts of the past they worked into wood and stone and landscape carry an ihi, a power, that transcends the view of artefacts as lifeless or irrelevant relics.’68 If we approach the Stonefields as ontological fields, to borrow Harrison’s term again, where multiple forms of existence are enacted in concrete practices, then the lava fields reveal not only a ‘socio-economic system’ as some archaeologists have described it, but a glimpse into the multifarious ways that time, place and identity were experienced in the past.69

Archaeologists believe that Māori were present on the Māngere-Puhinui coastline by around 1450 and established settlements in the area later in the fifteenth century. Early settlements are thought to have been scattered, small coastal cultivation areas on volcanic lands with

---


68 Anderson et al, Tangata Whenua, p.488.


access to fresh water and good anchorage for canoes.\textsuperscript{71} Radio carbon dating indicates that gardens on the Ōtuataua Stonefields date back to the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{72}

The volcanic soils of Tāmaki are crumbly, well drained, fertile and warm compared with the heavy clay soils that separate them. These soils were light enough to be turned with wooden implements and were well suited to the crops brought over from tropical Polynesia.

Archaeologist Helen Leach has outlined how the Polynesians brought with them not only a range of crops but also a ‘cultural inventory’ of ways to maximise the growth of these crops using irrigation systems, stone walls, gardening mounds and terraces.\textsuperscript{73} The more pronounced seasonal temperature changes of temperate New Zealand meant the new immigrants had to make significant modifications to their gardening techniques to allow the tropical plants to thrive. They gathered up the loose volcanic rock to clear the ground for cultivations and built up walls around them on rocky outcrops or ridges. Guided by the existing ridges and gullies on the landscape, they built boundary walls, terraces, windbreaks and drainage systems for their gardens, as well as houses and cooking areas across the Stonefields.\textsuperscript{74} Elsewhere they added gravel, sand and mulch to the soils to create warm, moist, fertile beds for the crops and provide storage for the kūmara tubers.\textsuperscript{75} Some of the plants the Polynesians brought with them probably did not survive, and by the time Europeans arrived in the mid-late eighteenth century, only a few imported cultigens were grown; kūmara (sweet potato) and gourd, and to a lesser extent taro, yam (uwhi), ti pare and aute (paper mulberry).\textsuperscript{76}

Archaeologist Ian Lawlor, who has studied the lava fields of Auckland for over 30 years, has proposed that early Māori settlement on the Ōtuataua Stonefields focused around the freshwater springs at the edges of the lava fields, where Māori planted their subtropical cultigens on the warm volcanic soils, and harvested the marine resources of the Manukau Harbour and the forest resources of the subtropical coastal rock forests on the lava field.\textsuperscript{77}

Most of the forest, says Lawlor, would eventually have been removed and replaced with

\textsuperscript{73} Helen Leach, \textit{1000 Years of Gardening in New Zealand}, Wellington, 1984, p.32.
\textsuperscript{75} Furey, ‘Maori Gardening’, p.10.
\textsuperscript{76} Leach, \textit{1000 Years of Gardening in New Zealand}, p.56; Louise Furey, pers. comm., 22 August 2018.
\textsuperscript{77} Ian Lawlor, ‘Heritage Effects Assessment’, p.124.
gardens and vegetation cover that was regularly burnt. In Lawlor’s view, large-scale subdivision of the Stonefields began in the middle of the fourteenth century, with systematic occupation and intensive gardening extending from the volcanic cones to the coastline. The volcanic cones on the Stonefields would have been fortified and occupied from around the middle of the seventeenth century, at the same time as numerous other pā in Tāmaki.


Some archaeologists have argued that Māori gardened for social and cultural purposes as much as for survival, and similarly, built the stonefield systems not only for gardening and housing purposes, but also to produce meaning by naming, defining and ordering the spaces they inhabited. The landscape of the Stonefields is as much a place of memory as it is of rock. Kuia and kaumātua from Māngere helped explain this to amateur archaeologist Geoff Fairfield in 1938, when he was examining a system of stone walls and garden features on Puketūtū Island, approximately one kilometre offshore from the Ōtuataua Stonefields. While Fairfield drew on George Graham and Elsdon Best’s interpretation of stone structures to describe the structures on the island, he also consulted with local kuia and kaumātua about the names and functions of the features. In an article, Fairfield explained that each cultivation and sheltering wall was named after a particular ancestor or historical event, and
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81 Furey, ‘Maori Gardening’, p.9; Leach, 1000 Years of Gardening in New Zealand, p.56.
83 Fairfield’s main source was Kahupaake Rongonui (Whareiti). Kahupaake was an elder of Pūkaki who died in 1943. Fairfield, ‘Puketutu Pa on Weekes’ Island, p.128; Sullivan, ‘Māori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840’, p.27
that these named walls gave a family group their rights to occupy a certain part of the gardens. In the corners of each of these named walls there were upright stones which were considered tapu and were never moved. These stones marked the limits of each family unit, and within these plots the occupation rights of each group were maintained through tikanga (customary usages). Piles of stone filled with sea-shells, found across the fields, were identified as puranga (offerings) of crops to particular ancestral beings. The people who built the gardens on Puketūtū were the same people who built the gardens on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, and archaeologists have identified the same garden structures on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, which suggests that the walls, stones and mounds across these lava fields were not only garden structures but also carefully arranged instantiations of ancestors and events which helped govern important modes of being and form identities in this area.

![The first aerial photograph of the Ōtuataua Stonefields, by Geoff Fairfield, 1937. F.G Fairfield Photograph Album, p.4, Auckland War Memorial Museum.](image)

Among the garden systems on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, archaeologists have also found some stone structures that they believe were undefended settlements. Though gardening appears to have been the main activity on the Stonefields, the settlements help tell the stories of long, peaceful periods in Tāmaki, which have largely disappeared from written sources and the physical landscape in Auckland. The settlement areas provide an important balance to the more prominent remaining volcanic cones throughout the city, with their impressive defensive earthworks. These more visible landmarks have perpetuated the notion that warfare was
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constant in the Tāmaki area, but they provide only a partial picture of Māori settlement. In recent years, some archaeologists have begun to argue that pā may have served primarily as places of display and status rather than as isolated places of large permanent populations. These archaeologists emphasize the importance of considering the close relationship between pā on volcanic cones and the areas of agriculture and settlement surrounding the pā.

The Ōtuataua Stonefields are one of the few places left that provide the wider physical and historical context of Māori occupation on Auckland’s volcanic cones, and show the importance of the large agricultural and undefended settlement places that surrounded the pā. Today, our eyes are drawn to the stone structures on the lava fields, but it is the space in between where much of the human and non-human history resides and continues to unfold. The gaps in between the rocks on the Stonefields can tell us as much about history as the rocks themselves. Pathways guided people through the landscape, helping them navigate through tapu and noa (ordinary) areas. As visitors continue to walk these pathways today, through the ridges and stonework, they unwittingly follow these earlier systems formed by ideas and practices that are hundreds of years old.

![Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. Photograph by Lucy Mackintosh, 2016.](image)

Long and evolving histories, connections to the land and relationships with other places and other people - all important components of Māori identity - were crafted under as well as
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above ground. The dead were buried in the lava caves and tubes, returned to Papatuanuku (the earth mother), so that the past, present and future could continue to grow and bind together.\textsuperscript{90} Every now and then, these burials come to the surface, and remind people of the long, intimate, hidden histories that co-exist with newer senses of place, and remain present in both physical and ontological layers across the landscape.\textsuperscript{91}

In 2008, archaeologists uncovered 88 koiwi (human remains) adjacent to the Stonefields on the Ihumātao Peninsula during archaeological excavations as part of the Auckland Airport northern runway development.\textsuperscript{92} It is the largest assemblage of koiwi excavated and analysed by archaeologists in New Zealand. The archaeologists also identified a number of different burial practices at the site. These included graves with complete remains, others with partial remains, and others still with no remains but burial features such as stones and shells present instead.\textsuperscript{93} Archaeologists interpreted the differing burial practices as potentially connected with the person’s relationship to the Ihumātao Peninsula. Those that had lived and died at Ihumātao may have been buried complete, while those who had relationships to other places may have been represented by partial remains, or empty graves with shells or stones from other places. Some graves, for instance, contained partial remains that had been uplifted from somewhere else and placed with a toheroa shell or a stone from another location.\textsuperscript{94} Those who were from Ihumātao but had died elsewhere had graves that contained no human remains but included symbolic materials instead.\textsuperscript{95}

Some of the graves had been reopened at a later date to inter the remains of other people or to remove some human remains.\textsuperscript{96} This suggested to the archaeologists that the community living at Ihumātao during this period knew the location of the burials and actively managed the networks of kinship and alliance that ordered the Māori world through ongoing burial practices.\textsuperscript{97} Through the physical world, Māori recorded, remembered and managed the specific relationships of individuals with place, actively linking together the whakapapa of the
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dead and the living. They were, as archaeologist Matthew Campbell observed, ‘writing their identity in the ground with their burial rite’.  

Campbell surmised that the burial grounds may have been active when the chief Hua Kai Waka forged alliances with other Tainui tribal groupings to form the loose confederation of Te Waiōhua in the seventeenth century. According to traditional narratives of mana whenua, the descendants of the Tainui canoe and others in the Māngere area eventually became known as Ngāoho and subsequently Ngāti Poutūkeka. In the seventeenth century, a powerful descendent of Ngāti Poutūkeka, named Hua Kai Waka, ‘Hua the eater of canoes’, who lived at Ihumātao as well as Māngere, Maungakiekie (One Tree Hill), and Maungawhau (Mt Eden), brought the various hapū (descent groups) across Tāmaki together, and following his death the loose confederation of tribes descended from Tainui became known as Te Waiōhua. 

The burial grounds at Ihumātao help demonstrate the fluidity and flexibility in Māori histories and identities in Auckland that are often left out of narratives about this area, which have emphasized static periods, punctuated by major warfare. The human remains show no evidence of warfare, but rather suggest that identities were evolving through peaceful times, as related groups from scattered areas were brought together under the umbrella of Te Waiōhua. It is important to note that those who gave evidence to the Native Land Court in Auckland recalled times of peace as ‘he whenua rangatira’ – a chiefly land, where people lived without fighting. The land itself was calm, fertile and at peace. Identities at Ihumātao were co-constituted with the physical environment, with bodies returned to the atua (ancestral beings) that formed the land, and the ground safely holding the bodies, as well as their existing relationships with people and places; their presence securing the future of those who continued to live there.

OOOOO
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In the late eighteenth century, Te Taoū (Ngāti Whātua) and other sub-tribes from the Kaipara area north of Tāmaki, attacked and defeated Te Waiōhua. European historians of Tāmaki, drawing on the oral traditions of Te Taoū in the nineteenth century court hearings, have repeatedly claimed that Te Waiōhua became extinct following this invasion. George Graham, for instance, one of the most influential scholars in early twentieth century Auckland, declared that the Te Taoū invasion ‘end[ed] the ancient tribes of Tamaki’. Yet at places such as Ihumātao, and neighbouring Pūkaki, Te Waiōhua hapū returned to their ancestral lands and intermarried with those Te Taoū who stayed in Tāmaki. According to mana whenua at Ihumātao, Te Waiōhua recovered its position quickly and those from Te Taoū who remained in the Māngere area intermarried with Te Waiōhua over successive generations to maintain peace, adopting the earlier Tainui tribal name, Nga Oho. One of the children of these marriages, the rangatira Apihai Te Kawau, who played such a prominent role in early colonial Auckland, was born at Ihumātao, and it was the combination of those Tainui and Ngāti Whātua lineages that made him such a influential presence and gave him the name ‘the man of many cousins’.

In his 2001 history, Russell Stone described the Te Taoū conquest of Tāmaki as ‘a great watershed in Māori Auckland’, but disputed the often-repeated statement that Te Waiōhua had become extinct, saying that instead that their hapū structures and customary rights to land were eliminated and they became absorbed into a new tribal grouping. Most of the oral histories of Te Waiōhua, he wrote, were lost after their defeat, and the traditions later recorded in the Compensation and Native Land Courts were dominated by the Te Taoū version of events. Though Stone mentioned that some of Te Waiōhua returned to Tāmaki and reoccupied their lands, these places received very little attention, as his history focused on the central parts of the Tāmaki isthmus rather than the places on the edge of the city. Yet, according to historian Graeme Murdoch, Te Waiōhua remained intact in the Manukau,
Franklin and Hunua areas. As recently as 2007, debate erupted about the historical narrative that formed the basis of Treaty negotiations between the Crown and Ngāti Whātua, which the *New Zealand Herald* declared ‘at best … is incomplete - especially in terms of other tribes’ occupation of Auckland.’ Historians and iwi with claims to Tāmaki argued that there was no dominant tribe in Auckland pre or post 1840. Rather, they argued, there were several tribes with different relationships to the land of the central isthmus.

By following the history at Ihumātao, the continuities, fluidities and complexities of histories in Auckland become apparent, providing an important counter-balance to histories that continue to emphasize the dominant narratives forged through particular moments of rupture in Auckland’s history. Place names, oral histories, and archaeology reveal a continuity of occupation by the same broad group of people for hundreds of years up to the present day. The people who live next to the Stonefields today claim ancestral ties with Tainui, Te Waiōhua, Ngaohi, Kawerau a Maki, Te Taoū and Ngāti Whātua. Te Warena Taua, a kaumātua at Makaurau marae, commented in his statement of evidence in 2010, that ‘As mana whenua of Ihumatao, we have a unique relationship with the whole of the Auckland region. Puketapapa kainga is also the largest and most ancient papakainga in the Auckland region, where ahi kā (the fires of occupation) has endured since our ancestors first landed here in Aotearoa.’ These marginalized histories open up a longer, more heterogeneous history of Auckland, and depict it as a place that was not only a ‘highway’ for tribes, in which tribal groups constantly came and went, as it has often been described, but as a place with a deeper, richer, more complicated history. While the defeat of Te Waiōhua by a combined Te Taoū force caused a major disruption in Tāmaki and introduced Te Taoū and other tribes to the area, Te Waiōhua hapū continued to occupy their lands, maintain ahi kā and remember their histories. Their histories may be harder to locate in the written records, but they have been remembered and told by kuia and kaumatua from local marae, and they have been ‘made’ in local landscapes that still survive, such as the Ōtuataua Stonefields.
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While the year 1840 was a significant signpost for both Māori and Pākehā, it was not experienced as a sudden shift on the Stonefields and surrounding Ihumātao area. The socio-cultural transformation of Tāmaki Makaurau had begun well before this time, with the introduction of European crops, animals, guns and iron hatchets in the early nineteenth century. Throughout the 1820s and 1830s the inter-tribal musket wars, instigated by Ngā Puhi after the tribe acquired muskets from the Europeans, caused considerable disruption in Tāmaki. During the 1820s, the Tāmaki tribes suffered heavy defeats and spent periods away from their lands, but they continued to return regularly to fish, plant gardens and harvest crops. From 1831 to 1835 Ngā Puhi and its allies carried out more sustained attacks on the Tāmaki, Hauraki and Waikato districts, and the Tāmaki tribes were forced to live in exile in the Waikato region under the protection of the Waikato chief Potatau Te Wherohero.

During this period the tribe visited Tāmaki to fish and forage for fern root but did not plant cultivations. This latter period, writes historian Angela Ballara, is the only time that Tāmaki could be considered ‘abandoned’, as histories of Auckland have described the area when the town was established in 1840. The Tāmaki tribes returned to their territories in late 1835 to early 1836, escorted by Te Wherowhero, and replanted their gardens at Ihumātao. In 1838, Te Taoū moved its main base from Māngere on the Manukau Harbour to Ōrakei on the Waitematā Harbour.

During times of peace in the early nineteenth century, the Manukau tribes continued to practice their seasonal movements, staying at certain places within their tribal territories or in other territories through arrangements with neighbouring tribes at particular times of the year. These movements revolved around the rhythms of planting, fishing, harvesting and filling the storage pits. On archaeologist Agnes Sullivan’s map of these movements, Ihumātao is shown as a point of convergence each spring for a number of Tāmaki and Manukau tribes, all related through shared ancestors, who planted gardens there for fishing parties and occupied
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the area during the summer. Far from being static and empty, as the Tāmaki of 1840 has been portrayed, it was in fact a place full of movement across the land and waters in long-lasting patterns.


After the town of Auckland was established in 1840, most of the Māori land in the wider Auckland area was alienated to Europeans, but on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, Māori continued to garden the lands they had occupied for hundreds of years and still wielded influence in the area. In the mid 1840s, they invited missionaries to establish a station in Ihumātao, as will be discussed in Chapter Three.

OOOOO

Though much of the earliest history of Auckland has either been forgotten or destroyed, there are still places where fragments of these early histories survive, where rock, plants, and stories with long histories have continued to wear away and emerge, interwoven and shaping

each other in ways that are difficult to understand but worth the effort. The continuous presence of the descendants of these early Tāmaki ancestors at Ihumātao and Pūkaki tells a longer, fuller story of Auckland one that has been largely overlooked by historians. The long, complex histories of this area have continued to shape the settlement patterns and identities of local communities and the wider Auckland community. Māori settlements, established hundreds of years ago, are still in the same places today. The pathways between these settlements have now become roads. Māori garden walls have become property boundaries. Much of the way this area has evolved can be traced back to Māori concepts of place, time and identity.

In the Reserve there is one paddock that appears, at first glance, to look like all the others on the Stonefields. But if you pause and look more closely, a pattern of dark green long grass interspersed with lighter green, shorter grass becomes visible. As you walk across the field you notice the ground underfoot is bumpy and rippling. In the 1980s when archaeologists first began to realise that the Ōtuataua Stonefields had once been Māori gardens, this field was identified as a mound garden. Here, many hundreds of years ago, Māori collected the loose rock strewn across the fields around them and built a series of ring borders across the landscape using large stones. Then they piled soil, loose rock, and scoria pebbles on top of the stones to create fertile, warm and moist gardens beds for kūmara.124 Today, the grass in the deeper soils between the mounds is taller and more vigorous than the grass on the mounds themselves. Like a pentimento, these traces of earlier histories have been made visible over time by natural processes and stock navigating their way through the landscape. These earlier histories appear to us in inverse form, like the negative of a photograph. We need to look at the gaps in between the mounds to understand them. Connections with early place-making, that reach back through time, in some cases back to Hawaiiki, can be revealed in ways that we least expect.

Along with the physical organization of the landscape, stories that have been crafted here over time still influence the identities of those who live in the area and beyond. Volcanic eruptions, ancestral connections, tribal dynamics, missionary activities, and later events at Ihumātao, are still very much alive and present here, although seldom spoken about. As Haki Wilson, of Makaurau marae, stated in 2015, ‘It is from this long history of connection with the whenua at Ihumātao that the wāhi tapu [sacred places] and taonga have been formed, and it is from these wāhi tapu and taonga that our duty as kaitiaki [guardians] arose, and which continues to this day.’

These stories continue to ripple through wider Auckland and New Zealand. To understand the national headlines about protests at Ihumātao against the planned subdivision of land next to the Ōtuataua Stonefields, for example, you have to know the deeper histories of this place. To understand how 88 burials could be discovered underneath the planned runway at Auckland Airport in 2008, you have to know the history here. To understand the Tāmaki Collective, the group of hapū and Iwi leaders that now co-governs many of Auckland’s iconic volcanic cones, you have to know about places such as Ihumātao. In order to know Auckland, you have to investigate these places on the edge, to get off the beaten track. The
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125 Sworn Affidavit of Haki Wilson, ‘In the Matter of The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, An Application for an Urgent Inquiry into the Crown’s actions concerning the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 and the development of the Ihumatao Special Housing Area by Haki Wilson, Bobbi-Jo Pihema, Qiane Matata-Sipu, Pania Newton, Waimarie McFarland, and Moana Waa on behalf of Makaurau Marae and Ngati Te Ahiwaru (the Claimants)’, Wai 2547 #A1, 7 December 2015, p.1.
narratives on the Stonefields refuse to slip comfortably into the dualistic categories that still shape much of our scholarship. Terms such as ‘prehistory’ and ‘history’, ‘traditional’ and ‘historic’, ‘nature’ and ‘culture’, ‘Tāmaki Makaurau’ and ‘Auckland’, do not make much sense here. The Ōtuataua Stonefields are multiple, overlapping, ontological fields where narratives are co-constituted with the physical environment, where different knowledge systems have evolved and co-existed, and where the past continues to reverberate across time.
CHAPTER TWO
A Strange Sight: Te Wherowhero’s cottage and the Auckland Domain 1840–1860

The Auckland War Memorial Museum sits prominently on the crater rim of Pukekawa, the volcanic cone in the Auckland Domain. This striking building, looking out to sea with an Ionic colonnade across its front elevation, is the centrepiece of the park and a major landmark in Auckland.¹ Built in 1929 to commemorate those that died in World War One, the building’s neo-classical façade projects a strong statement about identity in New Zealand and its European origins and loyalties, forged through the tragedy and grief of war, and remembered each year in ANZAC parades outside its front entrance. The Museum is a focal point for memory and history, often framing the way we see and experience the Domain as a place of patriotism, pride and commemoration.

The Auckland Museum is monumental, in many senses of the word. As anthropologist Tim Ingold has argued, monuments have a permanence and solidity that make them fixed autonomous structures, separate from the evolving world around them. With their set dates of construction, they are complete finished products that can become stuck in the past, while time moves on around them.² But if the Museum is understood as part of a web of connections across the Domain, rather than as a single fixed building disconnected from its context, then the building becomes part of a more expansive history.³ Amidst the carefully crafted prominent narratives in the Domain, there are other places that are less visible, but reveal more complex traces of time, place and identity in Auckland. Māori place names, archaeology, remnants of plantings and landforms tell little known, forgotten and sometimes erased stories. These histories, which sit alongside and sometimes beneath the more conspicuous places in the Domain, feed into, influence and at times disrupt the grand narrative of a civic identity based on twentieth century European notions of commemoration and recreation.

This chapter focuses on places crafted in the Domain in the early colonial period, from 1840 to 1860. During this time, the Auckland Domain was owned and managed by the colonial government. Although it was officially declared a public park in 1844, the Domain continued to operate as part of the Governor’s grounds for many years. In the early 1840s, parts of the Domain were rapidly transformed from fern, trees and wetland into a fenced and orderly terrain of pasture, botanical gardens and exotic specimen trees. Within this colonial landscape, however, there was also a cottage that belonged to Pōtatau Te Wherowhero, a leading Waikato rangatira. Te Wherowhero stayed in the house periodically over several years, when he regularly received other tribal leaders, held large gatherings to discuss the Treaty of Waitangi and brought the Ngāti Toa chief Te Rauparaha to live with him for a year.

The material traces of these early histories in the Domain have now largely disappeared, and little research into them has been undertaken by historians, with the exception of John Adam who has researched the botanical history of the Domain.4 In most histories of nineteenth

---

century Auckland, the Domain gets no more than a brief mention as a place of recreation or the source of the town’s first water supply.⁵ The Auckland Domain Masterplan, commissioned in 2015 by the park’s current owner Auckland Council, lists heritage as one of the priorities for the Domain but includes less than a page on the history of the park.⁶ Unravelling the thread of early encounters in the Domain, however, opens up the colonial history of Auckland to include longer narratives and wider trajectories of co-existence, fighting, commemoration, scientific experiment and civic engagement.

The Auckland Domain was part of the first 3000-acre parcel of land purchased by the Crown in 1840 from Ngāti Whātua to establish the town of Auckland. The Domain was intended as a place for leisure and recreation, but it was a very different kind of park from the one we see today. The Royal Instructions for establishing the colony of New Zealand required the Surveyor-General to recommend lands for reserving ‘as places fit to be set apart for the recreation and amusement of the inhabitants of any town or village’.⁷ Like the recently established parks in Melbourne and Sydney, Governor Hobson planned the Auckland Domain as a space that included a recreational area, a botanical garden and the governor’s house.⁸ The first plan of Auckland, produced in 1841, shows a grid of streets forming the town of Auckland. At the eastern edge of the town, an undefined, unnamed expanse between the planned streets of Auckland and the boundary of the parcel of land lies where the Domain is now located.⁹ In the middle of this space, the plan included a u-shaped structure labelled ‘proposed site of Government House’. Although a house had already been built for the Governor in the township of Auckland (on the site where Old Government House now
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stands), the Governor planned to build his permanent home in the Domain by the fresh water springs (where the duck ponds are now located).¹⁰

One of the earliest plans of the town of Auckland, showing the planned site of Government House in bottom right corner of the plan, in the Auckland Domain. ‘Plan of the Town of Auckland’, Felton Mathew, 1841, Sir George Grey Special Collections, 4-164, Auckland Libraries.

Though the Domain was open to the public from 1840, and officially declared a park in 1844, in practice it operated as part of a wider civic space in Auckland. In the first few years of European settlement the Domain was known as the Government Domain.¹¹ The park was separated from the small township of Auckland by a large swamp in the valley (now occupied by Stanley Street), but functioned as part of the Governor’s grounds, which extended from Constitution Hill (on the current site of the University of Auckland) to the coast at Mechanics Bay (known to Māori as Waipapa) and across to the current southern boundary of the Auckland Domain.

¹¹ See, for example New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator, 19 January 1842, p.2; New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator, 2 March 1842, p.2.
In the first few years, Governor Hobson spent a considerable amount of money transforming the Domain into pasture for his horses, creating an extensive garden, and building a laundry in the grounds.\textsuperscript{12} A map illustrating key natural features in Auckland shows why the Governor might have chosen the Domain for his future permanent home. The 1857 map shows the Domain located on a north facing slope leading down towards the town and the harbour, bordered by rivers.\textsuperscript{13} In addition, the Domain had one of the few fresh water springs in the town, which flowed from the collapsed crater of the volcanic cone. These springs were important resources as most rainwater in Auckland drained quickly through the volcanic soils and disappeared from the surface. The springs provided a constant water supply for the Governor’s horses, the government gardens, and the Governor’s laundry. The Domain was also one of few areas on the Tāmaki isthmus that still had remnants of mature forest, along with large areas of fern.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\caption{Detail of ‘Map of Waitemata’ by Commander Drury, showing the north facing slopes of the Auckland Domain on volcanic soils in the centre of the map. ‘Map of Waitemata’, 1857, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 3908a, Auckland Libraries.}
\end{figure}

The Domain was one of the earliest areas in Auckland to be converted into grass, providing forage for the governor’s three horses, which are likely to have been kept in the government

\textsuperscript{12} New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator, 27 October 1841, p.4; New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator, 6 November 1841, p.3; Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle, 4 June 1842, p.52; John P. Adam, ‘Parks and Public Gardens’, p.84.
\textsuperscript{13} ‘Plan of the Town of Auckland’, 1840s, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 4643, Auckland Libraries; ‘Waitemata Harbour’, surveyed by Commander Drury, 1857, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 3908a, Auckland Libraries.
\textsuperscript{14} ‘The Government Domain’, Roll 61, 1840s, Archives New Zealand, Auckland Office.
stables in Mechanics Bay.\(^{15}\) It was a process that took several years, and involved burning off the fern and other plants in autumn, harrowing after rain, sowing grass and white clover seed and then waiting until the pasture was well established before allowing sheep to graze it.\(^{16}\) By 1843, there had been at least one crop of oats on the Government Domain, although a local newspaper reported with dismay that the cultivations had been neglected and the ‘fern was allowed again to occupy its former place’.\(^{17}\) The following year, though, the newly established Agricultural Society in Auckland drew attention to a ‘fine sward’ in the Domain as an excellent example of pasture.\(^{18}\)

Alongside the new pasture, in the western part of the Domain beside the spring, the Governor began to build the first government-designed gardens in New Zealand.\(^{19}\) Later plans of the remnant garden indicate that it was laid out in a four square pattern, typical of kitchen gardens at the time.\(^{20}\) Dr Munro described the gardens in his journal in 1842:

> The Government has a garden about a mile from the town under the care of Mr Cleghorn from Edinburgh, which is worth looking at as a good specimen of the country. Part of it was in process of being trenched when I went to visit it and displayed a rich brownish black soil at least 4 feet deep … In this garden there was to be seen a large variety of vegetables, flowers, young vines and fruit trees and several plants the seeds of which Mr Cleghorn had brought from Rio de Janeiro. Everything appeared to thrive luxuriantly, with the exception that young plants were much injured by a species of grasshopper which did a great deal of damage …\(^{21}\)

The government gardens included an extensive kitchen garden, which was reserved for the governor’s use only, but they also contained exotic flowers, fruit trees and seedlings. The first fair of the Agricultural Society of Auckland held its cattle show on the Government Domain in 1843, and several plants from the government garden won prizes, including the best


\(^{16}\) *Daily Southern Cross*, 21 October 1843, p.2.

\(^{17}\) *Daily Southern Cross*, 21 October 1843, p.2.

\(^{18}\) *Daily Southern Cross*, 2 November 1844, p.2.

\(^{19}\) Correspondence from Cleghorn, 28 September 1841, IA 1 41/1103, Archives New Zealand, Wellington; *Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle*, 4 June 1842, p.52; John P. Adam, ‘Parks and Public Gardens’, p.84. Adam has pointed out that pasture was often developed alongside gardens, so that the animals grazing the land could provide manure for the gardens. John P. Adam, *Archaeological Infrastructure of Wai-te-mata*, p.8.


\(^{21}\) Journal of Dr Munro, 1842, quoted in R. C. Cooper, ‘Early Auckland Gardens’, Banks Lecture to the Royal New Zealand Institute of Horticulture, Auckland, 12 February 1971, Auckland War Memorial Museum (AWMM), p.2b. The Government Gardens was the first nursery in Auckland, but other privately owned nurseries opened in the 1840s. John Edgerley had established a private nursery nearby in Newmarket in 1843, and by 1846 he was growing apples, pears, plums, cherries, apricots, peaches and nectarines. Dinah Holman, *Newmarket: Lost and Found*, Auckland, 1994, p.52.
cabbage, hops and violets and the greatest array of flowers.\textsuperscript{22} Alongside the permanent staff employed in the gardens, the government also hired Māori gardeners to assist with the formation and maintenance of the paddocks and gardens.\textsuperscript{23}

Trees and seedlings from the Domain were distributed to settlers across New Zealand free of charge, and later, to other public grounds around the country.\textsuperscript{24} Among the trees grown for distribution to the public in 1856, for example, were pines, chestnuts, beech, birch, limes and holly trees.\textsuperscript{25} The colonial government also actively sought to develop relationships and exchange plants with botanical gardens in other countries, to develop ‘the nucleus of good Botanical Gardens, similar to those for which Sydney is so celebrated’.\textsuperscript{26} Throughout the 1840s and 1850s, for instance, the New Zealand government brought over vine cuttings, hibiscus, acacia, roses and other plants from the Sydney Botanical Gardens in exchange for numerous plants from the Auckland government gardens.\textsuperscript{27}

From the very beginning of European settlement in Auckland, the Domain was an important site of experimentation and a centre for the collection and dissemination of plants, knowledge and ideas from around New Zealand and the world. Museum academic Robert Janes has likened museums to seed-banks, as storehouses of both cultural and natural diversity.\textsuperscript{28} The government gardens in the Auckland Domain functioned as an earlier, more literal iteration of the museum’s wider role as a seed-bank today.

\textsuperscript{22} Daily Southern Cross, 23 December 1843, p.3.
\textsuperscript{23} Correspondence Superintendent of Works to Colonial Secretary, 20 April 1848, IA1 1848/848; Correspondence, 22 July 1863, IA 63/2021, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{24} Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle, 22 June 1844, p.64; New Zealand Herald, 29 January 1876, p.1; ‘Received trees and shrubs from Nelson nurseryman Wm Hale’, 30 June 1860, IA 4/13, Archives New Zealand, Wellington; John P. Adam, ‘Archaeological Infrastructure of Wai-te-mata’, p.8. For more information on how the government gardens worked in this period, see John Adam, ‘Paradise Lost’, passim.
\textsuperscript{25} ‘List of plants propagated in the Domain for public, etc’, 10 September 1856, IA1 1856/3261, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{26} William Gisborne (Colonial Secretary), correspondence, 11 September 1856, IA 56/3261, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{27} William Martin (Colonial Secretary), correspondence, 12 May 1846, IA 1 /1846/50, Archives New Zealand, Wellington; ‘Papers Relative to the Botanic Gardens, Sydney’, 1852-3, 11B p.5, ACGO 8333 IA 1, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
In 1844, Robert FitzRoy, who had taken on the role of Governor after the death of William Hobson, officially designated the Domain a park and renamed it ‘Auckland Park’. In the same announcement he declared that the trees in the park were now protected and could no longer be cut down by settlers. The official recognition of the Domain as a park came at a time when health reformers in England and America were advocating the establishment of public grounds in cities as an antidote to the rise of the industrial society. Advocates referred to parks as ‘lungs of the city’, arguing that they had a number of medical, moral and social benefits for city dwellers. Green spaces, they stated, provided fresh air, encouraged exercise and virtuous habits of play (particularly amongst the poor), bound rich and poor in an orderly manner, and encouraged an appreciation of landscape aesthetics. The perceived connections
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between parks and health also help explain why the first general hospital in Auckland was built on the grounds of the Domain in 1847.\textsuperscript{32}

As a park, the Domain was intended to be place of ordered nature, where the physical world was groomed and controlled by humans, rather than a wilderness or unkempt forest.\textsuperscript{33} In the post-Enlightenment era, according to anthropologist Philippe Descola, nature was seen as something entirely separate from humanity.\textsuperscript{34} Nature, he argues, was ‘an autonomous ontological domain, a field of inquiry and scientific experimentation, an object to be exploited and improved’.\textsuperscript{35} As such, urban parks were perceived as ‘pastoral retreats’, places that operated as a middle ground between the wild and the urban, where one could reconnect with one’s self through nature before returning to the city.\textsuperscript{36} The prize-winning violets, the fine sward and the straight fences in the Domain were all idealised versions of how nature might co-exist with urban spaces in the future.\textsuperscript{37} This notion of the Domain as an idealised landscape is captured in Edward Ashworth’s painting of Auckland from the Government Domain 1843 in which a verdant and orderly Domain is shown in the foreground with the bare, brown slopes of the Auckland township behind.\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} Tenders were called for the construction of the building in late 1846, and it began accepting patients before the building had been completed. \textit{New Zealander}, 7 November 1846, p.1; “Hospitals”, from \textit{An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand}, edited by A. H. McLintock, originally published in 1966.

\textsuperscript{33} See Roderick Nash, \textit{Wilderness and the American Mind}, New Haven, 1967, for contemporary ideas of wilderness in the American context.


\textsuperscript{35} Descola, \textit{Beyond Nature and Culture}, 2013, p.69.


\textsuperscript{37} For more about nature as virtualism, a term used by anthropologist James Carrier, see Ezra D. Rashkow, ‘Idealizing Inhabited Wilderness: A Revision to the History of Indigenous Peoples and National Parks’, \textit{History Compass}, 12, 10 (2014), p.819.

\end{flushright}
For early European settlers, the Domain provided a place to walk, meet, reflect and admire the scenery, although it was widely considered that only educated people could appreciate the aesthetic qualities of such landscapes.\(^\text{39}\) John Logan Campbell, who donated Cornwall Park to Auckland in 1901 (discussed in Chapter Four), was a regular visitor to the Domain in the 1840s. He later described these visits to his daughters in his autobiography: “I knew every spot in the Domain that was then accessible through the thick ti tree scrub – my favourite resting place was a great scoria stone at the foot of a large flax bush just where the new hospital is now building and which commanded the view on all sides … And this love of the beautiful scenery of Auckland has so grown upon me, that in all my wanderings over the world I give it the first place”\(^\text{40}\).

The relationships established between European settlers and their material world in the Domain revealed deeply entrenched Enlightenment views about the world that many brought with them to New Zealand. As Anne Salmond notes, these European approaches separated nature and culture, and subject and object, dividing and sorting landscapes, species and other aspects of reality into patterns such as the grid, and ranking people from savage to civilized.\(^\text{41}\) The establishment of gardens, paddocks and boundary fences all fitted within the Order of
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\(^{40}\) John Logan Campbell, ‘Reminiscences’, Auckland War Memorial Museum (AWMM).

Things, as Foucault described a particular framing of reality in Western culture. These material practices formed an unspoken stratum layered across the Domain.

In the first few years of European settlement in Auckland, the government put huge efforts into bringing land, water, plants and people ‘under control’ in the Domain. But in practice the park, located on the edge of town, in a space between ‘civilization’ and ‘wilderness’, ‘nature’ and ‘culture’, also facilitated a more fluid circulation of people, things and ideas than the gridded streets in the centre of town. The Domain was regularly used as a place to resolve disputes. There was, for instance, an infamous aborted duel in the park between two prominent early settlers in 1842. It was also a place of temporary refuge for those in difficult circumstances, as well as a space where people and animals often undid the carefully planned work of the government by removing or destroying the newly planted trees.

Throughout the early colonial period there were numerous complaints about newly planted trees and plants being removed or vandalized by members of the public or trampled by the introduced cattle. In 1856, for example, the Colonial Secretary complained that ‘the only trees in the neighbourhood of Auckland are those in the Domain and they are rapidly decreasing – Cattle destroy them and people steal them on the plea of picking up dead branches’. At one stage, the police were stationed there every weekend to stop people destroying the trees or lighting fires.

Large tracts of the Domain were also leased out to settlers as pasture throughout the 1840s and 1850s. John Murray leased 21 acres in the Domain in 1842 on the condition that he did not cut down the trees and that he would leave if the Government decided to build the new Government House on the Domain. Murray, along with his Māori employees, erected a whare (house) and cut trees in the Domain to build fences, despite repeated warnings. A large area in the vicinity of the eastern playing grounds in the Domain was also leased to

---

44 One settler, for example, leased land in the Domain and built a house and garden in 1843 after his house was destroyed by fire. Ligar Correspondence, 8 May 1843, IA 1 43/932, Archives New Zealand, Wellington; ‘List of Squatting Licenses issued’, 35 July 1844, IA 1 1844/1635 Archives New Zealand, Wellington; Colonial Secretary Minute, 4 September 1856, IA 57/1627, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
45 Colonial Secretary, Minute, 4 September 1856, IA 57/1627, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
46 Naughton (Inspector of Police) correspondence, 30 December 1859, IA1 1859/2245, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
47 William Hobson correspondence, 8 March 1842, IA 1 1842/1399, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
48 Ligar correspondence, 15 August 1842, IA 1841/761, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
working people who had small numbers of stock depasturing licenses during the 1840s and 1850s.49

It was in this ‘in-between’ space, at the heart of the governor’s domain, yet never quite under the colonial government’s control, that FitzRoy decided to build a house for the renowned military leader and paramount chief of Waikato, Pōtatau Te Wherowhero. The house was built between May and August 1845, in the style of a European cottage.50 Its exact location is unknown and has been the source of much conjecture, but a plan of the Domain in around 1860 shows the house close to the pond on its north side, on what now appears to be part of the hospital grounds.51 The presence and use of the cottage in the Domain over the following years reflects the continued presence and influence of Māori leaders in parts of early colonial Auckland, suggesting that something more complex than a replica British landscape was being crafted in the Domain at this time.

51 ‘Map of Auckland Park’ by James Baber, c.1860, SO 13, Land Information New Zealand, Auckland. The Domain Minute book documents that Baber was overseeing maintenance and laying out walkways in the Domain in January 1862, which might indicate that the plan was drawn also at this time. Public Domains Minute Book, PDB 001, Auckland Council Archives.
Contrary to descriptions of Auckland as ‘empty’ and ‘unsettled’ when Europeans arrived, Auckland had been shaped by Māori, and before that by ecologies and geologies formed over millions of years. These long-run histories were key historical factors in the development of early Auckland, continuing to influence the shape of the town and the experiences of its residents throughout its early years. As historian Nēpia Mahuika has argued, the deeper historical roots of Māori in our urban centres have been largely overlooked. Our cities, he writes ‘were, and still are, colonial sites built on the bones and warmth of earlier Māori histories and settlements’. It is only by understanding these earlier Māori histories that we can understand why a house was built for Te Wherowhero, how the cottage was occupied and used, and why it is no longer there.
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52 John Barr, in his 1920 history of the city of Auckland, declared that ‘the greater area of the Isthmus had become little better than a jungle of vegetation’, Barr, The City of Auckland, pp.30, 32. See also John Barr, The Ports of Auckland, Auckland, 1926, p.12; Reed Auckland: The City of Seas, p.26.

As discussed in the previous chapter, in 1836 Pōtatau Te Wherowhero, a leading Waikato rangatira, accompanied a number of tribes back to their ancestral lands in Tāmaki at the end of the intertribal musket wars. In gratitude for his role in negotiating peace and providing ongoing security for the Tāmaki tribes, Apihai Te Kawau, the Te Taoū (Ngāti Whātua o Ōrakei) chief, gifted Te Wherowhero several pieces of land in Tāmaki. Te Wherowhero based himself in whare (houses) at Māngere, Ōnehunga and Koherauunui (Monte Cecilia), and together with members of his tribe, adopted the seasonal patterns of the local Tāmaki tribes, moving between their fishing, gardening and eeling bases across the Tāmaki isthmus. As Agnes Sullivan has noted, this process helped balance the depletion of Te Wherowhero’s own reserves in the Waikato by the Tāmaki tribes during the musket wars.

After their return to Tāmaki in 1836, Te Taoū settled at Māngere initially, but then began to re-occupy areas on the Tāmaki isthmus. Te Ākitai moved back to their lands between Ihumātao and Papakura, while Ngāti Pāoa and Ngai Tai re-occupied their lands on the eastern coastline of the Waitāmatā and the inner Hauraki Gulf Island. Ngāti Te Ata were nearby on the western and southern shores of the Manukau Harbour. Readjustments following the musket wars continued to shape the distribution of people and use of resources in Tāmaki and the wider region for many years. Peace settlements were negotiated between Ngāti Pāoa and Waikato in 1836, and Ngāti Pāoa and Te Taoū in 1840. Continuing political uncertainties, however, prompted Te Taoū to approach Governor Hobson and invite him to establish the British Government in Tāmaki.

Records of the first colonial officers to visit the area in 1840 describe extensive Māori occupation on the future site of the town of the Auckland. There were no parts of the Tāmaki isthmus that were not named, known, owned or used, and there were no ‘wild’ places in the way that Europeans understood them. For Māori, there was no distinction between wild and domesticated, nature and culture – all parts of the land were familiar and domestic.
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60 Ballara, Taua, pp.186-7, 229.
61 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.186.
the *H.M.S. Herald* visited the Waitemata in 1840, bringing Lieutenant-Governor Hobson to select a site for the new capital of New Zealand, Te Taoū were in the midst of preparing the ground at Waiariki (on the eastern slope of present-day Anzac Avenue) for planting potatoes. Paora Tuhaere recalled that when the ship arrived and the sailors came to get water, he and thirty others from Te Taoū were clearing the land.\(^{63}\)

The first survey map of the Waitemata Harbour, drafted by Captain Owen Stanley in 1840, prior to the purchase of the land for Auckland by the Crown, also showed small existing settlements at Horotiu (Commercial Bay), Waiariki (Official Bay) and Waipapa (Mechanics Bay), as well as villages at Remuera and Okahu.\(^{64}\) In late 1840 and early 1841 Felton Mathew, the Surveyor-General of New Zealand, carried out the first detailed survey of the Tāmaki area, following existing Māori tracks along the ridges which skirted around swamps and areas of volcanic rock. He also observed rock walls, fortifications on the volcanic cones and signs of occupation.\(^{65}\) After the township of Auckland was established in 1840, Māori continued to move across their territories and work towards stability amongst the tribes. In 1844, Te Wherowhero and other Tāmaki chiefs held the great peace-making feast at Remuera, only a few kilometres from the Domain, which cemented Māori occupation rights in Auckland.\(^{66}\)
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\(^{63}\) Stone, *From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland*, p.247.

\(^{64}\) ‘Waitemata Harbour’, surveyed by Captain Owen Stanley, 1841, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 3566, Auckland Libraries.


It was within this context of ongoing tribal adjustments that Governor FitzRoy decided to build a house for Te Wherowhero in the Domain in 1845. There are very few traces of the house in the colonial records, but it appears that FitzRoy built the house to cement his friendship with this powerful, influential chief at a particularly vulnerable time for the new capital of New Zealand. Only a few months earlier, in March 1845, European settlers from the northern settlement of Kororāreka (Russell) had flooded into Auckland after war broke out between the northern tribes and British forces in the Bay of Islands. The following month the 58th Regiment of the British Army arrived in Auckland and established themselves at nearby Albert Barracks. FitzRoy was anxious about a potential attack on Auckland by the northern tribes and Te Wherowhero’s support was considered crucial for the colony’s survival. The position of the house, overlooking the township and within sight of Government House, was central to its purpose, as one correspondent in the press observed: ‘[t]he headquarters of the chief of the tribe whose protection we are now courting, and who
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report says is to be located in the domain, is so close to the town, that upon any given signal agreed – say hoisting the Government house flag half-mast high, as a signal of distress, - can, at his present abode be seen; and his powerful and valuable aid immediately afforded' 70

The house was a strong statement of the mana of Te Wherowhero and his close ties with the Governor, but by accommodating Te Wherowhero on the Governor’s land, ‘in the heart of town’, FitzRoy may also have meant to indicate an intention for Te Wherowhero to play a central role in the future of Auckland. 71 When he arrived in New Zealand in 1843, FitzRoy had hoped to forge a peaceful and fruitful relationship between Māori and Pākehā. 72 He envisaged European settlement in New Zealand as islands amongst predominantly Māori territories, and unlike some settlers, he supported the principle in the Treaty of Waitangi that all land in New Zealand belonged to tribal groups, whether or not it had been cultivated. 73 While he was governor, FitzRoy made a number of decisions that supported Māori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi, making him unpopular with many of his contemporaries. 74 Recent historians, however, have argued that FitzRoy did more than any other governor to accommodate Māori in colonial New Zealand, supporting Māori legal rights even when it was politically inexpedient to do so, and attempting to incorporate Māori into the processes of government. 75 FitzRoy did not record his thoughts on the house for Te Wherowhero, but his choice of a site inside the boundaries of the Government Domain, and next to the future site of Government House, is consistent with his vision of European settlement in New Zealand. The symbolism of building a house for Te Wherowhero in the Domain was not lost on the town’s European settlers, many of whom did not share FitzRoy’s approach to Māori. Although historian Ben Schrader has commented that early settlers in New Zealand towns encouraged Māori to participate in civic life, it seems that the presence of a powerful chief in the heart of New Zealand’s capital was a step too far for many. 76 According to one observer, ‘The Governor is building a house for Te Whero Whero, the Waikato chief, in the

70 New Zealander, 19 July 1845, p.3.
71 Te Hurinui, King Pōtatau., p.152; Reed, Auckland: The City of the Seas, p.77.
72 Robert FitzRoy, May 1843, quoted in Paul Moon, FitzRoy: Governor in Crisis, 1843-5, Auckland, 2000, p.81.
75 Moon, FitzRoy: Governor in Crisis 1843-1845, p.8.
76 Schrader, The Big Smoke, p.168.
Government domain. The wisdom of bringing this powerful chief and his people into the town of Auckland is considered very questionable’. Another complained to the *New Zealand Chronicle*, ‘A [further] absurdity to complete that madness of confidence in Maori generosity, gratitude, and forbearance, which has all along marked his Excellency’s conduct, and brought about our present dilemma, is most frightfully evinced by the introduction of a Maori residence of Chiefs in the Government Domain’. Yet another correspondent remarked, ‘Persons have purchased suburban Allotments around the Government Domain, on account of the privacy, and to be free from the annoyance of unpleasant neighbours, and it was never anticipated by them that Maories [sic] would be dwelling in Auckland Park’. There had been no complaints about the European squatters leasing land and building houses in the Domain, but the idea of having a chief of high rank living in the Governor’s grounds was deeply unsettling for many settlers. While it may have been tolerable, even commendable, to have Māori labouring in the gardens, it was not within the Order of Things to have Māori in a position of power living on the Governor’s grounds, in the ‘heart’ of the town of Auckland.

At first Te Wherowhero rejected the house in the Domain, saying it was too small. An offended correspondent noted: ‘It is said that Te Whero-whero has contemptuously refused the dwelling built by the Governor, and offered to his acceptance in the Government domain. He says, it is nuki nuki, too small; he wants a place like Governt [sic] house. If this be true, it is well-served return for his Excellency’s imprudence, and want of judgement in the offer’. Te Wherowhero’s response gives some insight into how he may have understood the house in the Domain. For the Waikato Chief, an initiate of the Tainui priesthood, the house was a manifestation of his relationship with the Governor, so it was important that the physical form of the cottage reflected their relative status accurately. In an equal relationship, his house would be the same size as the Governor’s so that the hau (flow of life) could move unimpeded between them, creating a state of balance that led to ora (health, prosperity, well-being) for both parties.

The Governor appears to have eventually responded to Te Wherowhero’s request. On 9 September 1848, Charles Ligar, the Surveyor General reported ‘I have the honor to forward the accompanying accounts as per Schedule showing the expense incurred by order of His
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Excellency the Governor in Chief in …. fitting up lining and putting in thorough repair Te Wherowhero’s cottage in Government Domain, and submit them for the approval of His Excellency the Hon. Colonial Secretary’. 82 Within days the amount had been approved by the Native Secretary and Ligar reported that the ‘alterations’ were to ‘commence without delay’. 83

In many regards, the house in the Domain served Te Wherowhero well. By 1845, Angela Ballara has commented, Māori chiefs were required to be multi-directional, keeping ‘one eye strained towards the newcomers, while keeping the other trained across tribal and community boundaries’. 84 The house was firmly embedded in a complex and shifting matrix of Māori ancestral events, occupation rights and resources. It was situated beside Pukekawa (‘sour hill’) and Pukekaroa (‘hill of the black-backed gull’), the central scoria cone with its remains of an earlier pā. It was next to a swamp with its birds, eels and fresh water spring. The house was also located near the main Māori paths that led across the isthmus (which are now Manukau Road, Symonds Street and Remuera Road), and overlooked Waipapa, or Mechanics Bay, the main trading port for Māori bringing their produce into town.

The house in the Domain was one of a number of houses between which Te Wherowhero moved on the Tāmaki isthmus, reflecting a very different relationship with the township of Auckland than that of its European settlers. While for the early European inhabitants of Auckland, the Government Domain was a clearly defined area near the boundary of the town, Te Wherowhero did not subscribe to these cartographic conventions. 85 The Government Domain was part of a wider landscape that extended across the Tāmaki isthmus and beyond to neighbouring rohe, as well as stretching through time.

82 Ligar correspondence, 12 September 1848, IA1 71 1848/1983, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
83 Ligar correspondence, 12 September 1848, IA1 71 1848/1983, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
84 Ballara, Taua, p.457.
85 See Tim Ingold, Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description, Oxford, 2011, p.149, for further discussion.
From his house in the Domain, Te Wherowhero could help shape the new tribal dynamics that followed the end of the musket wars, but he could also directly observe and influence the work of the colonial government. The house itself appears to have been built in European style, in contrast to his house in Onehunga, for example, which was a traditional whare.86 Outside his door, Te Wherowhero could see the gardening and agricultural techniques being developed in the Domain grounds, knowledge that was useful for the burgeoning Māori market gardens in Tāmaki and the Waikato. Government House was within sight, just across the valley, which allowed for regular meetings with the Governor. Waipapa, the main trading port for Māori, was at the bottom of the hill and the township of Auckland was within easy walking distance.

While he was living in the Domain, Te Wherowhero gave a new meaning to the existing name for the volcanic cone, Pukekawa, or ‘sour hill’. The name had traditionally referred to the sourness of the soil, which meant that kūmara could not grow in that location, but Te Wherowhero now interpreted the name as ‘hill of bitter memories’, a reference to the many Māori who had died during the inter-tribal musket wars of the 1820s and 1830s.87 Recording ancestral events, ancestors and occupation rights in the names of places was a common and significant way of establishing and maintaining Māori connections to place.88 The commemoration of the musket wars at Pukekawa gives the twentieth century Auckland War Memorial Museum building deep foundations, reaching into the ground below and back across time. The name Pukekawa reminds us of wars that not only had a devastating impact

87 Hayward et al, Volcanoes of Auckland, 2011, p.124; David Simmons, Greater Maori Auckland, Auckland, 2013, p.140. David Simmons notes that Te Wherowhero re-named the hill while he was living in the Domain. David Simmons, ‘Behaviour re Sites in Domain’, n.d., typed manuscript provided by John Adam, 2015.
on people in Tāmaki almost a hundred years before World War One, but are also key foundation stories in the establishment of Auckland.

In the months after the construction of the cottage in the Domain, Te Wherowhero was dealing with a rapidly changing political environment. According to Ned Fletcher, mid 1845 was a turning point in the British government’s approach to Māori property, from one that affirmed Māori property rights to one which asserted that only occupied lands were owned by Māori. The rest were classified as ‘waste lands’ and forfeited to the Crown.\(^9\) In the wake of the Northern Wars, he writes, the Colonial Office began to bow to constant pressure from the New Zealand Company and shifted its policy from one that prioritised Māori interests to one that affirmed the interests of settlers. In doing so, it abandoned a policy inspired in part by a sense of justice in favour of one that was driven by commercial and partisan political interests.\(^0\)

By the end of 1845, Governor FitzRoy had been recalled and replaced by Governor George Grey. Te Wherowhero and Grey met with each other regularly and had a close working relationship, though some historians have argued that Grey developed close relations with Māori in order to maintain the government’s control over Māori while limiting their power.\(^1\) Nevertheless, Te Wherowhero continued to use the Domain cottage for his own purposes. In 1847, he brought the renowned Ngāti Toa chief Te Rauparaha to live with him in the Domain cottage. Te Rauparaha had been imprisoned on board the *Inflexible* for almost a year by Grey, for his role in the Wairau Incident, in which settlers were killed when they sought to survey land they had not purchased. Te Wherowhero convinced Grey to release Te Rauparaha (even though he was a long-standing enemy of Te Wherowhero’s), arguing that his continued incarceration would be viewed as unjust by Māori, and that it could damage the reputation of the Governor and the tribes advising him.\(^2\) Te Wherowhero and the northern chief Waka Nene, offered to vouch for Te Rauparaha’s behaviour if he was released and to watch over him for a period of time.\(^3\) This form of ‘house arrest’, as it has often been called, had its
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precedents in tikanga Māori (Māori justice); Te Wherowhero was operating a Māori system of law in the middle of the Government Domain.\(^{94}\)

While Te Rauparaha was living at the house, Te Wherowhero held a number of large meetings there with other tribal leaders to discuss the Treaty of Waitangi and relationships between Māori and the Crown.\(^{95}\) In particular, rangatira were concerned about a recent statement by the Colonial Secretary, Earl Grey, that uncultivated Māori land could be claimed by the Crown, directly contravening the provision in the Treaty which promised that Queen Victoria would uphold Māori rights to all their lands.\(^{96}\)

A newspaper report described one of these meetings in October 1847:

> On Wednesday, most of the principal chiefs from the Thames and Coromandel Harbour who have been assembled at Mechanic’s Bay since Friday evening last, quitted their encampment, with the wives, children, relations, and dependants, and proceeded to pay their promised formal visit to “Te Rauparaha”, at his official residence on the hill … As the tribes approached Te Rauparaha’s grounds that aged chief advanced a few paces from his lodge to greet them, and after the customary salutations, the whole sat down in a sort of semi-circle, leaving a considerable space vacant in the centre. …[T]hose who were not among the orators listened gravely and decorously, sitting or lying on the ground, some smoking their pipes, others partaking in of a quiet game at cards … while children gambolled playfully among the different groups. Time wore on in this way until past two o’clock when dinner made its appearance, consisting chiefly of an abundant supply of boiled dumplings, served up in mats, with no other sauce than a hearty appetite, and no racier liquors than copious draughts of chrystal [sic]water from the neighbouring spring.\(^{97}\)

It was early spring when the meeting was held, a time of year which ‘much resembles April in England from the operations necessary to be finished before its close’, according to the local newspaper.\(^{98}\) Nearby in the government gardens, Mr Lynch, the Government Gardener, was busy sowing vegetables and pruning trees. The hardier annuals were in flower. New calves and lambs were being born on the surrounding Domain pasture.\(^{99}\) An observer of one of these meetings with Te Rauparaha wrote that ‘[i]t appeared a strange sight, to see that noted


\(^{95}\) See, for example: Daily Southern Cross, 10 July 1847, p.3; Te Hurinui, King Pōtatau, 2010, p.155.

\(^{96}\) See, for example: Daily Southern Cross, 10 July 1847, p.3; NZ Charter, 28 December 1846, quoted in Te Hurinui, King Pōtatau, p.154.

\(^{97}\) New Zealand Spectator and Cook’s Strait Guardian, 9 October 1847, p.2.

\(^{98}\) New Zealander, 8 September 1847, p.2.

\(^{99}\) New Zealander, 8 September 1847, p.2.
individual in the heart of our community’. At that moment, the status and authority of the Māori chiefs gathered at Te Wherowhero’s house must have been palpable, transforming the Government Domain from the ‘heart’ of the European community into a place of Māori authority and effect. Here, in the centre of early colonial Auckland in 1847 were two different worlds, each with its own notions of identity and place, co-existing in the same space. These distinct realities, untranslatable in important ways, at certain moments meshed and became tangled. Both Te Wherowhero and the colonial government, operating under different assumptions but with partly convergent interests, were striving to maintain a fine balance at a critical moment in the formation of Auckland, and of New Zealand.

△△△△△

By 1860, the landscape of the Domain had been transformed, along with the social and political environment. The cottage was now flanked by military blockhouses at either end of the Domain, built amidst rising tensions between the Government and the Waikato tribes. In 1858, Te Wherowhero had been selected as the first Māori King, after the formation of the Kīngitanga, or Māori King movement, which aimed to provide a separate, parallel governing body for Māori and stop the loss of Māori land. Following his election as Māori King, Te Wherowhero moved back to the Waikato, where he died two years later.

In late 1860, the Public Domains Act came into force, which defined the boundaries of the Auckland Domain, Government House Domain and the Government House Domain in Wellington. Although the Domain remained ‘colonial property’, the management of the land moved to a newly appointed Board in 1861, except for the government gardens which the governor retained for his personal use. With the establishment of a more formal infrastructure of the Domain, the park became a less fluid space. Visiting Māori chiefs, for instance, had always left their horses in the Domain while conducting business, but in 1861 the native secretary Donald McLean refused permission for them to do this, citing a lack of water as the reason. When the colonial government moved from Auckland to Wellington

100 Wellington Independent, 31 July 1847, p.3.
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105 Correspondence Donald McLean, April 7th 1861, Archives New Zealand, R22412178, Wellington.
in 1865 the plans for building Government House in the Domain, which had been in play since 1840, were also finally put aside and the new board began to focus on creating a local park for Aucklanders.  

Throughout the 1860s, the board converted large tracts of land in the Domain into sports grounds, including cricket grounds, tennis courts and a bowling green.  

In the meantime Te Wherowhero’s cottage ceased to attract public attention, and began to be forgotten. The last mention of the cottage in the press was in 1852, when a small statement in the local newspaper announced that Te Kati (Kait-takiwā, or Hori Kati) had died in the Domain cottage.  

Te Kati was Te Wherowhero’s brother, who had played a pivotal role in the peace negotiations during the musket wars of the 1820s and 1830s when he married the daughter of a Ngā Puhi chief to help secure peace between the tribes.  

Though this event has traditionally been interpreted by historians as an event of ‘local, Māori interest’, Ballara describes it as one of the most important events in the musket wars because of the far-reaching consequences of the union.  

His death in the cottage is another important moment in the Domain’s history that has been largely forgotten. And it is this moment, as it turns out, that helps explain what may have happened to the cottage.  

In 1860, only a few months after Te Wherowhero’s death, an Auckland settler wrote to the Colonial Secretary asking for permission to rent a cottage in the Auckland Domain. ‘Sir’, he wrote:  

Having observed that a cottage situated in the domain and formerly occupied by the Waikato Chief, had been some years untenanted, and has in consequence fallen into a very dilapidated state, I beg to inquire whether the Government will grant me a lease of the premises as a dwelling house. I am informed that the reason why this building has been left in its present neglected state is, that some Maori chief died there, and it was then taboo by some of the tribe, but permit me to remark that I cannot conceive that any Maori can acquire a right to taboo a property not his own.

106 The government moved to Wellington following pressure from MPs in the South Island to move the capital to a more geographically central location, *New Zealand Herald*, 12 June 1865, p.4; *New Zealander*, 17 March 1865, p.3; *Daily Southern Cross*, 9 August, 1865, p.4; *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives* (AJHR), 1865, D-04, Correspondence Relative to the Construction of Public Buildings in the Province of Auckland.

107 Public Domains Minute Book, 17 October 1861, PDB 001, Auckland City Archives; Public Domains Minute Book, April 14th 1864, PDB 001, Auckland City Archives; Public Domains Minute Book, 28 May 1862, PDB 001, Auckland City Archives.


The 1860 letter from a European settler requesting that a ‘dilapidated’ cottage formerly occupied by Te Wherowhero be leased out to him. The response from the Colonial Secretary is written over the top of the original letter. Correspondence, W. Browne to Colonial Secretary, August 1860, IA1 211 [13] 1850/1572, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.

The letter was forwarded to several different government departments, but no one knew anything about the details of the cottage. Eventually it reached the Native Secretary, Donald McLean, who verified the story and explained that the cottage had been formally handed over to Te Wherowhero, rather than rented by him. ‘They might look upon it as a desecration’, he wrote, ‘if occupied as a dwelling house now.’ The letter finally went to the Colonial Secretary, who decided that ‘it would certainly be unwise to offend prejudices at the present time. When possible (without doing so) it would be desirable to throw down the House.’

By 1860, the cottage had been empty and deteriorating for almost ten years, but it was still a place where Māori custom and law prevailed. Rather than break the tapu and re-occupy it, the government appears to have left it to deteriorate so that it could eventually be pulled down.

The material traces of Te Wherowhero’s cottage in the Domain have now been erased, but its narratives are woven through the landscape and still unfold over time. Te Wherowhero’s house is not well-documented by historians, or well-known by Aucklanders, but Māori have continued to commemorate Te Wherowhero’s presence in the Domain through stories, place-names, and memorials, including the planting of the Totara tree on Pukekaroa in 1940 to
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commemorate Te Wherowhero’s cottage. Following the material life of the cottage, we can track its disappearance from the public record, but also its remembrance by tribal groups and the ways that iwi and hapū continue to find ways to reshape the terms of historical interpretation.

In every city, writes historian Simon Schama, there are places where the boundaries between the past and present, wild and domestic, nature and culture, belonging and not belonging, collapse together. In early colonial Auckland, the Domain was such a place. On the edge of town, just outside the town grid and in a place between civilization and wilderness, as Europeans understood it, the Auckland Domain was a site where complex social, cultural and scientific exchanges took place in the early years of the city. These longer, more complicated stories de-centre the Auckland Museum, making it part of a longer history with wider trajectories that challenge the idea that places are settled and distinct communities with stable, coherent social identities. Its setting in the Domain reminds us that things, even monuments, are not static, timeless objects, but rather part of unbounded and continually renegotiated narratives. The work of memory carries on, swirling beneath, through and around the museum, continuing to evolve, with no fixed beginning or end.

Te Wherowhero Memorial, on Pukekaroa in the Auckland Domain. The totara (the symbol of a chief) was planted by Princess Te Pua Herangi, the great granddaughter of Te Wherowhero, in 1940, to commemorate Te Wherowhero’s home in the Domain. Photograph by Lucy Mackintosh, 2016.
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CHAPTER THREE

‘The Crooked Place’: The Ihumātao Mission Station and the Ōtuataua Stonefields, c.1846-1866

Among the stone walls on the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve, there is one that is unlike the others. Its large foundation stones and façades with large rocks infilled with smaller ones indicate that the wall was built using European drystone techniques, but it is wider and lower than the other European walls on the Stonefields.\(^1\) Rather than following the straight survey lines that defined the new boundaries laid down after the Waikato War in 1863-4, like the rest of the European walls, this structure follows the edge of the lava field.\(^2\) Though the date and circumstances of the construction of the wall are unknown, its form, location, positioning in relation to the other walls and its relationship with the underlying geology indicate that it was built after Europeans arrived in the area, but before they began farming the Stonefields after the Waikato War.\(^3\) This means the wall is likely to have been built by Māori using European techniques, sometime between 1846 and 1863 when the Wesleyan Methodist mission station was operating alongside the Ōtuataua Stonefields. The wall is only partially intact, with one end tapering off until only the large foundation stones mark its presence. Its incomplete state indicates that the wall was either being constructed or deconstructed when it was left unfinished.\(^4\) This was at a time on the Stonefields when Māori and Europeans were exchanging new ideas and incorporating them into their own existing practices, and when relationships between people and their material worlds were unfolding in ways that produced unanticipated and inconclusive outcomes.

\(^1\) Ian Lawlor, pers. comm. 14 May 2015.
\(^2\) Ian Lawlor, ‘An assessment of heritage resources located within the proposed Otuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve Visitor Centre development ‘footprint’, and measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate effects’, report to Manukau City Council and the OSHR Visitor Centre Design Team’, 2009, p.134.
\(^3\) Ian Lawlor, pers. comm. 14 May 2015.
\(^4\) Ian Lawlor, pers. comm. 14 May 2015.
This partially built wall on the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve follows the drystone technique used by European settlers but is lower and wider than the other walls built by European farmers in the mid-late nineteenth century. Photograph by Lucy Mackintosh, 2016.

This chapter explores the relationships forged between Māori, missionaries, European settlers and the colonial government at the Ihumātao mission station and neighbouring Ōtuataua Stonefields between 1846 and 1866. While most of the land that makes up the city of Auckland today was alienated from Māori in the first few years of European settlement, Māori at Ihumātao continued to occupy and cultivate their ancestral lands. In about 1846 they invited the Wesleyan Methodist Church to establish a mission station at the end of the Ihumātao Peninsula, adjacent to the Stonefields. For over twenty years after the establishment of Auckland, Māori at Ihumātao provided essential agricultural produce to Auckland settlers from their stonefield gardens, helped to run the mission station and school, advised the governor and corresponded with the national and international press on issues of land and politics.

In a city where historical attention has focused heavily on British experiences after 1840, the Ihumātao mission station offers very different insights into early colonial Auckland. Unlike Auckland Domain, discussed in Chapter Two, a site that came under the control of the government, at Ihumātao Māori cultural practices and histories continued to evolve with the mission station on ancestral tribal lands up until the outbreak of war in 1863. The Ōtuataua Stonefields was a site of compromise and hybridisation, as both the ‘Anglo World’ and the indigenous world were transformed to create a mixed place, one forged by both imperial
structures and by existing tribal dynamics. If the community at Ihumātao experienced any sudden rupture, it took place not in 1840, but in 1863, when Māori were forcibly evicted from their villages of Ihumātao, Pūkaki and Māngere (now called Māngere Bridge). This moment, which for some Māori marked the beginning of the Waikato War, and which led to the confiscation of the Stonefields, has largely disappeared from our histories.

The relationships forged on the ground at Ihumātao reveal modes of operation and concepts of place-making that differ those more commonly associated with early colonial towns in New Zealand. According to geographer Eric Pawson, written and visual works have traditionally represented colonial towns in New Zealand as centres of progress and civilization. This ‘urban boosterism’, as Pawson describes it, portrays colonial towns as ‘neo-Europes’ where infrastructure, capital, civic achievements and population growth are the driving forces and where Māori and nature have been controlled and tamed. Contemporary commentators often promoted this perception of Auckland, acknowledging the importance of Māori agriculture and trade to early settlers in Auckland, but ignoring the presence and influence of Māori who actually lived and worked in the area. In 1852, for example, William Swainson mentioned the important role of ‘natives’ in Auckland in the town’s economy, but went on to describe Auckland as resembling ‘an English watering-place’. Frederick Peppercorne wrote the same year that ‘the country around Auckland presents the appearance of a ‘home-like English landscape’. Twentieth century historians of Auckland also tended to overlook Māori. In his 1955 history of Auckland, for example, A.W. Reed’s one reference to local Māori was that they ‘made themselves thoroughly at home in the white man’s town’. In recent years, local historians have begun to address these gaps, and Ben Schrader’s history of New Zealand
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cities, though not specifically about Auckland, marked a significant shift by highlighting the Māori presence throughout colonial towns in ways that had not been done previously.10 Archaeology in New Zealand has also tended to focus on European experiences after colonisation.11 In 1996, Stuart Bedford commented that archaeologists have largely ignored ‘post-contact’ Māori, approaching interactions between Māori and Europeans from a Eurocentric point of view ‘as if Maori had little impact on settlers and on the manner in which European society was established in New Zealand’.12 Matthew Campbell and Louise Furey found that Bedford’s observation was still true in 2007, when they undertook an archaeological investigation of an early European settler house in Māngere.13

The Ihumātao mission station and the adjacent stonefield gardens were places in which Māori were not outsiders in a European town, but rather continued to live on their ancestral lands and practice ahi kā, inviting the missionaries into their space on their own terms. Yet outside the field of religious history, the Ihumātao mission station has received very little attention. In the late nineteenth century Reverend William Morley interviewed a number of Methodist ministers, including those at Ihumātao, for his detailed A History of Methodism in New Zealand, published in 1900.14 Since then, church historians George Laurenson, Clarence Luxton and Donald Phillips have investigated aspects of Methodist Māori mission stations in the Manukau, and other studies have been published by the Wesleyan Historical Society.15


14 W. Morley, A History of Methodism in New Zealand, Wellington, 1900, p.103. Lawry’s recollections have unfortunately been misplaced, but they are listed in a document entitled ‘Early Church Records’, collected by Rev Morley and Rev Bull for the forthcoming book, in the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Church Minutes of Seventeenth Annual Conference, 1890, p.75. Thanks to Jo Smith of the Methodist Church of New Zealand Archives for her help locating this information.

Beyond the Methodist Church, the only published work that discusses the mission station in any detail is A.E. Tonson’s history of the Manukau area, published in 1966.16 Tonson’s work drew on Morley’s study as well as missionary records and descriptions by other contemporary European settlers in the area. ‘There is no doubt’, he concluded, ‘that the mission settlements were a great influence upon the Maori people and did much to pave the way for later understanding. They accustomed the Maoris to European ways of living and instructed them in the best methods of farming and agricultural pursuits’.17 Tonson, who viewed the missionaries as the main agents of change at Ihumātao, described the exchange of ideas as a one-way process, from missionaries to Māori.18 But a closer reading of the missionary records and press coverage at the time, along with more recent iwi and hapū tribal histories and historical and archaeological reports, indicates that published histories of the mission station have underplayed the role of Māori in the establishment, success and ultimate closure of the Ihumātao Mission station.19

In *Entanglements of Empire*, Tony Ballantyne argues that a close spatial reading of mission stations in the Bay of Islands reveals the limits of a historiography that portrays mission stations in early New Zealand as ‘fundamentally European, English or “white” spaces and as centres for a project of Europeanization’.20 Ballantyne’s work presents mission stations as places of translation, compromise, and conflict that defy the neat dichotomies that underscore much historical writing on this topic.21 This chapter examines the material changes and continuities on the Ihumātao mission station and its surroundings, as well as the cultural transformations that accompanied them. Given its particular location and the period in which it operated, however, the Ihumātao mission station is in many ways very different from earlier mission stations outside of Auckland, which have tended to be the focus of historical attention.22 While historians have found that by 1840, Māori were pushed to the margins of
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17 Tonson, *Old Manukau*, p.49.
18 Tonson, *Old Manukau*, pp.47-49.
21 Ballantyne, *Entanglements of Empire*, pp.18, 97.
colonial society in the Bay of Islands, for instance, at Ihumātao mutual accommodations between missionaries, Māori and local settlers continued well into the colonial period.  

The exact date that the Ihumātao mission station was established is not known, but missionary and tribal records indicate that it was driven by the prominent Ngāti Tamaoho chief, Te Rangitāhua Ngamuka (later known by his baptismal name Ēpiha Pūtini, or Jabez Bunting). Although Tonson described it as a European initiative, the beginnings of the mission station can be linked to the migration of Pūtini and his people from the Āwhitu Peninsula to Ihumātao in 1846, where they joined their Te Waiōhua relatives. Pūtini has disappeared from histories of Auckland, but he played a pivotal role in the establishment of the mission station, and was an influential figure in the early colonial town of Auckland.

Born around 1816, Te Rangitāhua Ngamuka was the son of a prominent Waikato chief called Te Tuhi. After the death of his parents when he was a child, Te Rangitāhua was fostered by his relative Wiremu Wetere Te Kaue, a Ngāti Tamaoho chief, and eventually became a powerful leader of the tribe himself. In the mid 1830s, Te Rangitāhua spent two years at the Wesleyan Methodist mission station at Mangungu, on the Hokianga Harbour, and in 1835 he adopted the baptismal name of Jabez Bunting (after a missionary society secretary in London), or Ēpiha Pūtini, as he was known in Māori.

When Te Wherowhero escorted the Tāmaki tribes back to their ancestral lands after the Musket Wars in 1836, Pūtini also moved back with his tribe to the Āwhitu Peninsula on the western shore of the Manukau Harbour. After the Wesleyan mission station at Ōrua closed down in 1836, following a dispute with the Anglican Church Missionary Society (CMS), Pūtini asked for a Wesleyan missionary to be sent to his village at nearby Pehiakura, although his request was declined when the two denominations agreed to stay out of each other’s areas.
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24 ‘The Maoris at Ihumatao’, wrote Tonson, ‘were very receptive to the establishment of a mission station for their chief Te Rangitahua’. Tonson, *Old Manukau*, p.47.
26 *Daily Southern Cross*, 11 April 1856, p.3.
28 Sullivan, ‘Maori Gardening in Tamaki Before 1840’, Appendix 7; Stone, *From Tamaki Makau-rua to Auckland*, p.162.
of jurisdiction. Historians have noted how this arrangement made it difficult for many chiefs to retain control of which religious denomination they chose to follow, but Pūtini refused to shift his allegiance from the Wesleyans. Instead, he built a substantial Methodist chapel made from raupo (a native New Zealand wetland plant) in 1838, where he began teaching the gospel and running a school. Shortly afterwards, Reverend John Whiteley and James Buller baptised 45 people and married 16 couples in the raupo chapel. In 1840, Governor Hobson visited Pūtini, and was so impressed with the church the rangatira had built that he gifted Pūtini a large folding door and two window sashes. The church also had American chairs ‘for the accommodation of the aristocratic portion of his hearers’. The Anglican Bishop, Augustus Selwyn, who also visited Pūtini in early 1843, commented that ‘[t]he chapel at Pehiakura had a very respectable appearance, having large glass windows, gifted by the Governor. The native teacher is a Wesleyan; but he was very attentive to us, and supplied us with goats’ milk and potatoes’.

30 Anderson et al, Tangata Whenua, p.196.
31 Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, pp.7-8
32 Buller, Forty Years in New Zealand, p.70.
33 Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, p.9.
35 Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, p.8; George Augustus Selwyn, New Zealand, 1844-51, Cambridge, 2010 (reissue), p.96.
Pūtini was not the ‘versatile Christian’ that James Belich described in *Making Peoples*, ‘swapping easily between denominations’. When Selwyn offered to provide Pūtini with an Anglican missionary, he refused, replying ‘No, I will adhere to my own people; I have waited a long time for a missionary, and shall wait until I get one’. On another occasion, when a visiting minister offered to baptise him in a different denomination, Pūtini asked the minister how many times Jesus Christ had been baptised. When he replied once, Pūtini responded ‘Then once will do for me, as I wish to imitate His example as closely as possible’.

In the wake of the Musket Wars, Te Taoū gifted land to Pūtini, Te Kaue and Te Wherowhero at Remuera, in gratitude for their assistance during the fighting. After Auckland was established in 1840, Pūtini often stayed on his land in Remuera, which was close to the new town. When the Wesleyan Minister, James Buller, visited Auckland for several weeks in 1841 to explore the prospects for establishing a Wesleyan Mission, he visited Pūtini at Remuera and held what is thought to have been the first Wesleyan service in Auckland on
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39 Stone, *From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland*, pp.292-93, 310.
Pūtini’s land. Buller commented that ‘Jabez Bunting and his people are, at present, within two miles of the town, preparing for planting their crops in the ensuing season, and I held service with them on Sunday morning last. On my last visit I baptised more than 30 natives, and on this occasion I have administered that sacrament to two more adult natives.’ After his visit to Auckland, Buller recommended establishing a mission station there, noting the large number of Māori living in the vicinity of Auckland and the considerable numbers of Māori visiting the new town, as well as the influx of European settlers.

Over the first few years of colonial government in Auckland, Pūtini met a number of times with the governor and influential European leaders, seeking assistance for establishing schools, hospitals and housing for Māori. Auckland resident, William Brown, noted that ‘one native, a most intelligent and promising youth, called Jabez Bunting, residing in the neighbourhood of Auckland, has already planned a township to be laid out on his lands at the portage of the Manukau and the Waikato. It is to have regular streets like Auckland, and the houses are to be built of wood.’


---

41 James Buller, quoted in Chappell, ‘Across a Hundred Years’, pp.10-11, 19.
42 Morley, A History of Methodism in New Zealand, p.92.
44 Brown, New Zealand and its Aborigines, p.165.
In 1844, Pūtini was one of the hosts of the Remuera Feast (paremata), a gathering of around 4000 Māori, which was intended to complete peace-making amongst the tribes. By now, he had married Tiaho Te Paea, the daughter of Potatau Te Whero who later became an influential Waikato leader and was considered as one of the possible successors to Te Whero after his death. Governor FitzRoy attended the feast, accompanied by Pūtini, who he described as ‘one of the most promising young Christian chiefs in the country’.45

Pūtini is identified as number 13 in the lithograph, along with the description ‘Epiha, a native chief on his own horse’. He is shown galloping across the centre of the scene with a sense of energy and purpose that stands out amongst the stiff, staged poses of carefully placed groups. ‘Maori Feast at Remuera’, 1844, by Joseph Merrett, published by Henry Brett, Auckland, 1890, Te Papa Tongarewa, Collections, 1992-0035-1868, Wellington.

In the days after the Remuera Feast, Pūtini took the opportunity to approach Reverend Walter Lawry, the new Superintendent of the Methodist Mission, asking him again to provide a missionary for his village at Pehiakura, where he now had a number of Māori preachers and a congregation of 150.47 Pūtini made a very favourable impression on Lawry, who described

46 Copy of a despatch from Governor Fitzroy to Lord Stanley, 25 May, 1844, Parliamentary Papers, volume 33, Accounts and Papers, Session 4 Feb to 9 August 1844.
47 Morley, A History of Methodism in New Zealand, p.96; Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, p.11.
him as ‘a fine chief, about thirty-five years of age, who for many years has been baptised into the Christian faith and has walked uprightly… He is a fine person, has agreeable features, is not tattooed, and generally appears in European clothes. His wife rides on her saddle and horse and he on his: probably they are the only example of this advance in civilization in New Zealand… He is currently the most intelligent man I have seen amongst the aborigines’.

Lawry agreed to send a missionary to Pehiakura. He suggested his son, Reverend H.H. (Henry) Lawry for the position, but Pūtini insisted on having someone who could speak Māori, so William Woon was sent instead. Woon was on his way to Pehiakura when war broke out between Pūtini’s Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata over land boundaries in late 1845. The war initiated major changes in the dynamics of the local Māori population, and its effects reverberated throughout the wider district, disrupting missionary activities in the Manukau and unsettling the European residents of Manukau and nearby Auckland.

Local European commentators interpreted the conflict as a possible threat to Auckland, and argued for further military protection in Auckland. In Tonson’s account, ‘only the intervention of Rev. Maunsell of the C.M.S. [Church Missionary Society] and Rev. Thomas Buddle of the Wesleyan Mission prevented greater bloodshed’. While the missionaries did intervene during the conflict and attempt to prevent warfare, newspaper accounts document that peace was eventually brokered by Māori, using their own systems of dispute resolution. Te Wherowhero, who was now living in Māngere, arranged with the Te Ākitai chiefs Mohi Te Ahi ā Te Ngū and Ihaka Takanini, and the Ngāti Whātua chief Apihai Te Kawau, for Pūtini and his Ngāti Tamaoho hapū to settle at Ihumātao alongside their Te Waiōhua relatives. As one press report noted: ‘Te Werowero [sic] arrived at the pa of Wetere, and expostulated both with him and Katepa, telling them that he was related to both, and would not suffer the continuance of the strife. … Te Werowero left for the Waikato; and Wetere,
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49 Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, p.13.
50 *New Zealand Spectator and Cook’s Strait Guardian*, 27 September 1845, p.3; *New Zealander*, 8 November 1845, p.2; *Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle*, 14 February 1846, p.197; Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, p.13.
51 Luxton, Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau, p.13.
52 *Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle*, 14 February 1846, p.197.
53 Tonson, Old Manukau, p.47.
54 *Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle*, 14 February 1846, p.197; Graeme Murdoch, ‘Māori Ancestral Relationships with Māngere-Ōtahuhu’, p.43. The hapū subsequently became known as Te Ahiwaru and was formally gifted the land at Ihumātao at a meeting in 1858. *The Maori Messenger (Ko Te Karere Māori)*, 30 April 1858, p.1.
with Jabez Bunting and their tribe, are coming over to Hihu Matou [Ihumātao] at the head of the waters of Manakau, near Pukake [Pūkaki].

Between 1846 and 1849 Pūtini moved between Pehiakura, his tribal territory on the Āwhitu Peninsula, and Ihumātao, the land of his Te Waiōhua relatives in Māngere. The Wesleyan missionaries followed their movements, preaching in both places. ‘Intercourse between these two places’, wrote Morley, ‘both of which were under the Missionary’s care, was by canoe only.’

A tabular return of the ‘native population of the district of Auckland’ in 1848–1849, lists the numbers of Māori living in pā throughout Auckland, along with the denomination and chief of each pā. The table lists ‘Ihumātao and Pehiakura’ as a single ‘pā’ under the leadership of Ēpiha Pūtini. The pā was recorded as having a population of 200, all of whom were Wesleyan. Though the table may have attempted to portray Māori settlements as fixed, contained and stable locations that fitted within Western Cartesian conventions, it unwittingly conveyed the more fluid situation on the ground.


At the time the information for the table was compiled, Ēpiha Pūtini was living between Pehiakura and Ihumātao. Ngāti Tamaoho cultivated land at both places, seeking the assistance of the missionaries when required. In March 1846 Māori at Pehiakura commissioned Henry Lawry to look into the erection of a wheat mill. At this stage they already had extensive wheat cultivations, and planned to build a road from their pā and...
cultivations to the water in order to trade with Auckland.\textsuperscript{59} As soon as Pūtini and his tribe moved to Ihumātao in early 1846, they also began to prepare the gardens on the volcanic soils. The press reported in July 1847 that, ‘[t]he natives of Ihumatao will, this year, cultivate a large piece of ground of this nature. They made during last summer some deep drains, down the sides of which you look in vain for any change in the rich black vegetable mould, of which the whole mass is composed’.\textsuperscript{60}

In 1849 problems arose again between Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho, when Ngāti Te Ata reportedly occupied and began to cultivate land at Pehiakura.\textsuperscript{61} Rather than go to war again, Pūtini decided to permanently ‘sit down’ at Ihumātao and take the matter to the Resident Magistrate to resolve.\textsuperscript{62} The press interpreted this as ‘additional and gratifying evidence of the genuineness and strength of those principles of Christian civilization which, mainly through missionary efforts, have been extensively inculcated on the native population’.\textsuperscript{63} Pūtini, according to the press, had now learned to have confidence ‘that British law, as administered by British authorities, will be available for his protection, and sufficient to secure for him that justice’.\textsuperscript{64}

Though Pūtini was working closely with the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries and Governor Grey over this period, he also took steps to keep control of the narratives being constructed around him. When one settler commented that the war between Ngāti Tamaoho and Ngāti Te Ata had only been resolved after Grey had threatened to hang the chiefs if they did not stop fighting, Pūtini responded by writing a letter to the editor of The Times in London, telling the editor ‘not to listen to lying letters that are sent from New Zealand, lest he be deceived by a crooked and perverse generation’.\textsuperscript{65} Pūtini explained that he had sought Governor Grey’s advice and that Grey had replied that any disputes must be settled in the court of law. ‘We were pleased with this talk, and considered it straight’, he wrote. Pūtini then explained that the tribes had resolved the issue themselves: ‘[a]ll the tribes in the vicinity of Auckland are now sitting in peace, all of us … We love the white man and we say let us sit together, and talk together in peace’.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{59} New Zealander, 21 March 1846, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{60} New Zealander, 28 July 1847, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{61} New Zealander, 3 October 1849, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{62} New Zealander, 3 October 1849, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{63} New Zealander, 3 October 1849, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{64} New Zealander, 3 October 1849, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{65} New Zealander, 22 May 1847, p.2.  
\textsuperscript{66} New Zealander, 22 May 1847, p.2.
Historians have suggested a number of reasons why Māori supported the establishment of mission stations in early colonial New Zealand. Recent works have argued that Māori used Christianity as a tool for gaining material and competitive benefits, such as literacy, trade, or superior mana (authority, status). While Pūtini may have expected material benefits and an increase in status to come with the mission station, these reasons do not adequately explain his motivations for encouraging the Methodist missionaries to join his people. In an 1847 letter to Waikato chief Te Awaitaia (also known by his baptismal name William Naylor or Wiremu Nera), Pūtini asked Nera to join the Europeans in resisting Māori dissent from British rule, writing: ‘Let the work of God grow – let us quench the fires of the world this year. Let us two go as slaves for the Queen – that is, as men to assist her. … But the thought for must proceed from the Governor. If he should say arise, I’ll arise – Don’t leave our Kingdom for the Europeans to put in order, but let us two.’

The letter provides some insight into Pūtini’s perspective on Christianity, indicating that he hoped it would bring law and justice to the area, and help bring about peace. Pūtini’s view of Christianity aligns more closely with the argument put forward by Lyndsey Head, that after colonisation some Māori ‘found personal dignity, social discipline and political empowerment in the faith of the nineteenth century superpower’. In Head’s interpretation, Māori viewed God as the highest authority in the affairs of men, and the source of the structures of ‘civilization’ such as law and justice, which could be used to bring about peace. Pūtini actively sought the involvement of the missionaries, not solely so that his tribe could be become more powerful, but so that he could help actively shape the events unfolding around him in a way that he considered tika (straight), or ethical, fitting and correct.

The Ihumātao mission station was located on the tip of Ihumātao Peninsula, alongside what is now the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. It stood at the base of the terraced slopes of Maungataketake volcanic cone, facing the cold prevailing southwest wind that blew across the Manukau Harbour. The mission station was situated next to the Ihumātao kainga (home,
settlement) with its extensive gardens on the lava fields between Ihumātao and Oruarangi (discussed in Chapter 1), part of which now form the ʻŌtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. Church records describe the mission station property as a ‘Native Conveyance’, which indicates that the mission station had been established on ancestral Māori land with the permission of the tribe.\(^{71}\)

There is no record of the date of the erection of the Ihumātao mission station, but the buildings had been erected by 1849, when it is recorded that one minister turned down a position at Ihumātao because of the exposed position of the mission buildings, which he feared would affect his wife’s health.\(^{72}\) Henry Lawry, Walter Lawry’s son (who had presumably learnt to speak Māori by now), moved to Ihumātao instead, and in 1850, Lawry’s daughter was born and baptised there.\(^{73}\) An 1859 map of Auckland by Ferdinand von Hochstetter shows the small, faint cluster of mission buildings perched on the south western edge of the extensive lava fields that covered the Ihumātao Peninsula.\(^{74}\)

![Map of Ihumātao Peninsula](image)

In this detail of Hochstetter’s map, the mission buildings (marked by black rectangles on the south west tip of the peninsula, here labelled Tumatao Pt) are almost absorbed into the pink pillowy lava streams that flow out from the deep, red volcanic craters that dominate the landscape. ‘The Isthmus of Auckland with its Extinct Volcanoes’, Ferdinand von Hochstetter, 1859, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 5694b, Auckland Libraries.

Lawry initially lived with Māori in their kāinga, but eventually they helped him build a European-style house, and erect a church. ‘During the visits of the earlier years’, wrote Morley, Lawry ‘usually shared with the Native teacher a one-roomed hut, and frequently ate

\(^{71}\) *Minutes of the first conference of the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Church*, Sydney, 1855, p.92, John Kinder Theological Library, Auckland.


\(^{73}\) *The Maitland Mercury and Hunter River General Advertiser*, 15 May 1850, p.3.

\(^{74}\) Ferdinand von Hochstetter, ‘The Isthmus of Auckland with its extinct volcanoes 1859’, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 2654, Auckland Libraries.
out of the same kit. After some time a weather-board cottage of three rooms was built, and substantial fences of sods or stones were put around the garden and paddocks by free labour. A canoe was also supplied free of charge’. Morley described the mission station as having a weatherboard house and two acres of pasture on eight acres of land.

Morley recorded that while the Wesleyan missionaries initially gave their addresses outside in the Māori settlements of Māngere, eventually ‘[c]hurches were put up in all the villages, all the expense being borne by the Natives themselves.’ ‘Most of these early sanctuaries were of raupo’, wrote Morley, ‘and were comparatively inexpensive. Gradually, weather-boards took the place of reeds, and considerable labour was expended in sawing timber for this purpose’. A chapel which could hold up to 150 people was erected at Ihumātao sometime before 1855. It was regularly attended by around 120 people.

Māori preachers held daily services in te reo Māori (the Māori language) at Ihumātao and also taught at daily and Sabbath (Sunday) schools. In his 1848 Pehiakura Circuit report, Lawry reported that the church was thriving, with 114 members led by the Māori preacher, Hone Piha. From 1849 to 1856 there were between five and twelve Māori baptisms every year at
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Ihumātao and an increasing number of European baptisms as more settlers began arriving in the area. Henry Lawry described the daily routine of the schools in the Auckland Māori mission stations. ‘The day commences’, he wrote, ‘with Divine worship. The native teacher in charge announces sunrise by ringing his bell, which summons the entire population to the house of God. The worship consists of singing a hymn, reading a portion of Scripture, and prayer. Then follows the school exercises, in which the old and young of every grade are found side by side.’ Lawry stated that often the students would return to class in the evening and teach the adults, and as a result, three-quarters could read and two-thirds could write in their own language.

---

**Return of the Number of Churches, Livings, &c.**

While in theory a strict routine was followed in the mission stations, the reality appears to have been somewhat different. Though the church and Sunday school were well attended, Lawry reported that attendance was ‘exceedingly irregular’ at the day schools at Pehiakura and Ihumātao. More fluid patterns of existence continued to operate at Ihumātao, and these in turn continued to shape the mission station and its wider networks. The preaching places on the Wesleyan missionary circuit had been established at existing Māori settlements around the Manukau Harbour, and missionaries visited these places using Māori canoes, following

---


84 *Minutes of the D.M.*, 14 July 1848, John Kinder Theological Library, Auckland.
the routes taken by Māori for hundreds of years. The missionaries documented how Manukau Māori continued to move between their tribal lands, following their seasonal patterns and maintaining ahi kā in their territories.\(^{85}\) According to Reverend Walter Lawry, the arrival of Europeans in the area had the opposite effect to what the missionaries expected. ‘Instead of following the example of the pakeha, by centralizing themselves, and settling down in towns and villages, they have spread themselves abroad, over a much greater surface of country’.\(^{86}\) Lawry later complained that the missionaries had considerable difficulties finding and following Māori, who were constantly moving among their dispersed tribal lands. ‘[T]he Missionary’, he wrote in 1853 ‘is sometimes puzzled to know where to find his people, and can only meet with them as by accident, and in small detached parties’.\(^{87}\) Pūtini also regularly moved between his territories to maintain relationships with missionaries and colonial officials, oversee land sales and make sure that his tribe benefitted from the opportunities presented by the arrival of Europeans in the area.

As well as the existing Māori networks, the missionaries also forged new networks throughout Auckland and beyond, which Māori also began to use. When the Wesleyan Native Institute opened in central Auckland in 1845, and moved to Three Kings in 1849, Māori from Pehiakura and Ihumātao went to live there for extended periods of schooling, before returning to their kainga.\(^{88}\) Similarly, Māori from various parts of the country preached and lived at Ihumātao and Pehiakura once their training had been completed. Hone Piha, for instance trained at the Wesleyan Institute and was the resident pastor at Pehiakura for some time.\(^{89}\) Hohepa Otene was a chief from the Oruru Valley in Northland, where he established a Christian community, before moving to Ihumātao in 1857 and preaching at several Māori churches in Manukau until 1863.\(^{90}\) Though he was not from the area, Otene played an important role in both the church and tribal issues at Ihumātao, considering the place his ‘real home’.\(^{91}\)

\(^{87}\) Young, *The Southern World*, p.156.
\(^{88}\) *New Zealander*, 28 June 1848, p.1.
\(^{89}\) Luxton, *Methodist Beginnings in the Manukau*, p.17.
Initially, Ihumātao was part of the Pehiakura circuit, which operated between Pehiakura and Ihumātao. However, from 1848 it became part of the Auckland circuit, which incorporated a larger number of settlements and included the newly erected Wesleyan Native Church, the first church built for Māori in Auckland, which was situated just above the Māori hostel in Mechanics Bay.\(^92\) Books, missionaries and goods arrived at the Wesleyan stone store on the beach at Official Bay, passed through Walter Lawry’s cottage situated above the bay just across the road from Government House, and then circulated out to the various stations in the Auckland district.\(^93\) Māori and missionaries also regularly travelled from the various mission stations into town, attending the native chapel in Mechanics Bay or visiting the Native Institute.\(^94\)

\[\text{‘Manukau Heads from the back of pa at Pukaki’, by John Johnson, 1853. The painting looks from the vicinity of Pūkaki Lagoon towards Maungataketake (now quarried away), Ōtuataua (now partly quarried) and Puketapapa towards the Manukau Heads in the background. The buildings in the foreground may belong to Colonel Marmaduke Nixon. Colonel PD-1963-8-40, 63/47, Auckland War Memorial Museum.}\]

The weather and the physical environment also had a significant impact on the success of missionary activities. In 1858, Buddle reported that the poor state of the roads prevented many European settlers getting to church during the winter months, and that the failure of the previous year’s crops, ‘together with their habitual improvidence’ was reducing the native

\(^{92}\) H.H. Lawry, Minutes of the D.M. (District Meeting), Auckland, 14 July 1848, MET004/1, John Kinder Theological Library, Auckland; Morley, A History of Methodism in New Zealand, p.96.
\(^{93}\) The cottage was on the site of the Courtville Apartments on Eden Terrace, a site still marked by a magnificent Norfolk Pine in 1900, according to Morley. Morley, A History of Methodism in New Zealand, p.93.
\(^{94}\) Morley, A History of Methodism in New Zealand, p.92.
population in the circuit. In 1862, William Rowse, who was now running the Manukau Circuit, reported that ‘The winter set upon us just after our entering upon the circuit with almost incessant rains, the roads both in the bush and out of it, were in such a state as they had never been before, preventing us in some instances from paying regular visits to distant places for some weeks’. Though the missionaries attempted to organise the mission station and the surrounding area of Ihumātao around Christian routines, in reality life revolved equally around Māori practices and movements, the weather and the rhythms of the Manukau Harbour.

∆∆∆∆∆

On the lava fields adjacent to the mission station and pā, Māori continued to cultivate their gardens, providing food for the mission station and their European neighbours as well as for the nearby township of Auckland. Their field systems are shown clearly on an 1853 survey map of the Manukau Harbour, overseen by Captain Drury. The map shows the cluster of buildings on the mission station and the adjacent kainga, and also the extensive cultivation areas, organised into rectangular enclosures, on the lower slopes on either side of Ōtuataua (mislabelled Moerangi), including the area now known at the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve.

95 Manukau Circuit Report, 1858, Methodist Church of NZ Conference, Box 162, Con-220, Methodist Church of New Zealand Archives, Christchurch.
96 Manukau Circuit Report, 1862, Methodist Church of NZ Conference, Box 162, Con-220, Methodist Church of New Zealand Archives, Christchurch.
The field systems on each side of Ōtuataua (mislabelled Moerangi) are shown on this 1854 survey map. The kainga and mission station are also on the west side of Ihumātao/Maungataketake (misnamed Thumatoa). Detail of ‘Manukau Harbour’, surveyed by Commander B. Drury, Messrs H. Kerr, and P. Oke, second masters, A. Farmer and C. Stanley, Masters Assistants, and W. Blackney, R.N., 1853, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZ Map 890, Auckland Libraries.

The extensive gardens at Ihumātao contained both Māori and European crops. Aihepene Kaihau, the Ngāti Te Ata chief, described the gardens and village on the Ihumātao Peninsula in 1863 as containing eight cornfields, potato fields, kūmara, 200 pigs, three cows, six horses, a plough and cart, and a canoe capable of carrying twelve tons. European crops and animals were already in the area before the first European settlers arrived in the mid 1840s. When Henry Weekes arrived to live on Pukekutu Island just off shore from Ihumātao in February 1846, a number of Māori from Ihumātao greeted him on his first night with gifts of potatoes and fish.

The introduction of pigs, sheep and chickens into the area required immediate changes to the garden systems, according to archaeologist Ian Lawlor. Walls had to be constructed to contain animals and keep them out of garden and orchard areas and to protect lambs from dogs and pigs. Animals needed to be kept near to sources of fresh water. Potato fields had to

be ploughed. European crops and fruit trees also required different cultivation techniques. The missionaries and the colonial government encouraged Māori to move away from seasonally mobile systems of land and sea use towards crops such as wheat, which required a more settled existence in one location. Thomas Buddle, writing from Auckland to Governor Grey in 1851, reported that ‘All the tribes in this district are peaceable, I believe generally directing their attributes to a wheat crop. We have endeavoured to urge them to this as far as far as we have had opportunity’.

The Stonefields evolved as European crops and animals were introduced, but Māori also continued to grow their traditional crops and follow more fluid patterns of existence. In rockier parts of the Stonefields that were inaccessible to the horse and plough, kūmara gardens may have continued to operate on the dry and warm soils. The introduced European crops such as potato, wheat and oats are likely to have been grown on the stone-free, ash-derived loam soils.

The fruit, vegetables and grains were taken by canoe to Onehunga to sell to European settlers. Historians have noted that Māori commerce continued to operate under its own laws throughout the 1840s and 1850s and was mainly motivated by wealth and mana. Māori wishing to sell produce outside of their own tribal area were required to negotiate a reciprocal agreement with those tribes whose lands or waters they were accessing. This gave places such as Ihumātao, which occupied a coastal environment close to a major European settlement, a distinct advantage.

At around the time the Ihumātao mission station was established, European settlers were beginning to arrive in the Māngere area in increasing numbers. In 1844 Governor FitzRoy lifted the crown pre-emption clause of the Treaty of Waitangi, allowing Māori to sell land directly to individual settlers rather than solely to the Crown. Māori in the Auckland area,
according to historian Alan Ward, anticipated ongoing relationships with Europeans settling in their area, including assistance with their agricultural enterprises.\textsuperscript{109}

Existing tribal dynamics significantly influenced Māori decisions around land sales in the Māngere area.\textsuperscript{110} By the mid 1840s, Ngāti Whātua had moved their base from Māngere to their lands on the Waitematā Harbour and their tribal leaders began to sell land at Māngere.\textsuperscript{111} Te Waiōhua hapū retained their kainga at Ihumātao, Pūkaki, Papahinu and Waimihia, but sold land surrounding these areas in 1845-46.\textsuperscript{112} Payment often included horses and agricultural equipment (including a mill in one instance), as well as money, indicating that the motivation for selling land was driven by desire to expand their agricultural practices to take advantage of Auckland’s emerging economy.\textsuperscript{113}

Governor Grey restored the practice of pre-emption in 1846 and investigated the sales that had taken place directly between Māori and settlers over the previous two years. The ‘Old Land Claim’ investigations found that many of the transactions had not met the requirements of the Crown that Māori interests must be provided for, and many of the transactions were disallowed or heavily reduced. Rather than returning the ‘surplus lands’ removed from settlers to Māori, however, the Crown retained these lands for itself.\textsuperscript{114} Problems between hapū and iwi escalated as tribal lands near Auckland continued to be sold. Māori rights to land had traditionally been gained through ancestral connections or intermarriage with previous occupants, which meant that land boundaries had a degree of fluidity.\textsuperscript{115} Commercial transactions, however, required fixed and final land boundaries. Disputes inevitably arose when the delicate balance of occupation rights was lost as individuals of various tribes sold land to Europeans without consulting or including those from other tribes who also had interests in that site.

When Ngāti Whātua rangatira sold land in Māngere that bounded the Oruarangi Creek (on the eastern boundary of the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve), for instance, the Ngāti

\textsuperscript{109} Under the terms of the sale, the Crown was required to ensure that tribes had enough land remaining for themselves, that the chief selling had the authority to do so, and that ten percent of the sale would be set aside for the Crown to develop schools, hospitals and other amenities for the tribes’ benefit. Alan Ward, \textit{An Unsettled History: Treaty Claims in New Zealand Today}, Wellington, 1999, pp.97-98.

\textsuperscript{110} Ward, \textit{An Unsettled History}, p.97.
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\textsuperscript{115} Anderson et al, \textit{Tangata Whenua}, p.214.
Tamaoho chief Wetere Te Kaue argued that the land was not for sale, and Ėpiha Pūtini and Ihaka Takanini also claimed an interest in the land.\(^{116}\) The Crown disallowed much of the purchase, but retained the ‘surplus’ land, including Oruarangi, which was described as ‘contiguous’ and forming a part of Ihumātao, and allowed the remaining natives to occupy it as ‘an act of grace’.\(^{117}\) A year later, however, the dispute had still not been resolved and Donald McLean (during this period Inspector of Armed Police) visited Oruarangi. McLean concluded that Te Kaue and his people had had cultivations at Oruarangi ‘for years… He always objected to the sale of it by Te Tawa, a chief of the Ngatiwhatua tribe. He has been offered payment, and I believe he has accepted some remuneration for a portion of Major Greenwood’s property, but this particular spot and other portions of land, comprising altogether his conjoint interest with Te Tawa, to about one thousand two hundred acres … has never been alienated by him’.\(^ {118}\) The dispute highlighted the long ancestral occupation of Ihumātao and the neighbouring area of Oruarangi, and the reluctance of mana whenua to sell land in these areas.

While maps, plans and paintings may have indicated a firm European foothold in the Māngere area, the records of missionaries and early settlers reveal a more tenuous position. At Ihumātao and neighbouring areas still occupied by Māori, the negotiations and accommodations between missionaries, Māori and local European settlers continued well after the establishment of the colonial capital. Missionaries and settlers engaged with Māori on a daily basis, visiting their settlements, negotiating with them about labour and supplies and working alongside them on their lands. In 1848, Māori still made up around ten per cent of the population of Auckland, and considerably more in the wider vicinity of the town.\(^ {119}\) In Māngere, where the Ōtuataua Stonefields are located, over 50% of the local population was Māori in the late 1840s.\(^ {120}\) Unlike the Bay of Islands, where Ballantyne concludes that colonists did not need to engage with Māori on a daily basis after 1840, Europeans in
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\(^ {120}\) Thomson, ‘A Statistical Account of Auckland, New Zealand’, p.231. In 1848, the Māori population of Ihumātao and Pūkaki was 290, compared with the European population of 297 for the whole of Otahuhu in 1851, which encompassed a much larger area than Māngere. ‘Tabular Return of the Native Population of the District of Auckland’, New Ulster Gazette, 1849, p.81.
Māngere had to work closely with Māori and built sustained relationships with them throughout the 1840s and 1850s. For all their efforts to control their circumstances and ‘pin down’ their place, Europeans in the area were still required to operate within a fluid, dynamic Māori world.

In an account entitled ‘My Island’, for instance, Dr Henry Weekes wrote about his experience living on nearby Puketutu Island. Weekes had been inspired by the adventures of Robinson Crusoe in the novel by Daniel Defoe, in which Crusoe mastered both the indigenous population and the natural environment of the island on which he had been marooned. Though Weekes’s intention was ‘to be monarch of all I surveyed’, his experience turned out to be quite the opposite. When Weekes arrived in 1846, local Māori built him a whare and then a European-style house. They also built a traditional Māori fence to protect his vegetable garden and taught him how to fish for flounder in the harbour. But not long after his arrival, Weekes ran into trouble. His cattle regularly got stuck in the mud while crossing the harbour in the low tide, and then drowned as the tide rose. His horse broke into his vegetable garden and destroyed the entire garden in one night. When his boat, with his wife on board capsized, Weekes decided to move back to the mainland and run the farm from there rather than drown in ‘that dangerous harbour’. His problems continued, however, and his pigs began to eat his lambs. Weekes arranged for local Māori to bring their native dogs across to destroy the pigs, but then the dogs learnt to cross the harbour during low tide and returned to attack the lambs. Some time later, Weekes’s helper, Edward, burned down all the buildings on the island while trying to control the native fern. Weekes finally admitted defeat, and sold the island.

Similarly, Lieutenant Colonel Marmaduke Nixon, a retired officer in the Imperial Army in India, purchased land in Māngere in 1852. His diary documents the extent to which he relied on assistance from nearby Pūkaki and Ihumātao Māori to establish his farm. Pūkaki Māori built a raupo hut and a ‘food house’ for him, helped with the construction of his house, assisted with the preparation and maintenance of crops, provided him with firewood and sold him pigs. At times it was difficult to get their assistance, as they were busy ‘getting in their crops’. Though Nixon provided plans, Māori built the house with a lower roof and without
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a door, in the manner of a traditional whare (house) and Nixon grudgingly lived in it until he eventually erected his own house.\textsuperscript{127}

For Māori, the establishment of the mission station and the arrival of Europeans into the area brought new opportunities to engage with the growing town of Auckland. However, it became increasingly difficult to maintain control of their world amidst the wider colonial policies that encouraged the expansion of European settlers in Auckland. In the end the law, which Pūtini had counted on to make ‘crooked’ things ‘straight’, did not protect him or deliver the justice he sought. In 1850, Pūtini tried to take the Surveyor General to court for not paying him for land he had sold in 1848.\textsuperscript{128} When this was unsuccessful, he turned to the press again to express his dissatisfaction with the colonial government: ‘Now, my thoughts during these many years have been that there was one Law for both Natives and Europeans. Now, however, I fully understand that it is all deception, and that the Natives must still grovel in the mud. Now listen, friends, do not in future talk about the oneness (impartiality) of the Law for the European and the Native. It will not be correct in future to talk this oneness, because its falsity has now been publicly seen. Fathers, this is a great evil. Is there no Doctor that can give medicine for this disease’.\textsuperscript{129}

Pūtini also sought help from Thomas Buddle, who was now in charge of the Ihumātao mission station and the wider Auckland circuit. Although Buddle was generally supportive of Māori retaining their lands, he was reluctant to help Pūtini on the issue of land sales in Māngere, because he was worried it might affect his relations with Grey.\textsuperscript{130} Grey had recently given the Wesleyan Mission Society a considerable amount of money and land for the church to establish itself in Auckland, and Buddle did not want to risk falling out with Grey, as had happened recently with the Anglican Church Missionary Society. Buddle’s lack of support for Pūtini on this issue put considerable strain on their relationship. ‘Jabez Bunting [Ēpiha Pūtini] was at one time regarded as the leading native chief amongst the Wesleyan converts’, an 1852 newspaper article reported. ‘I have heard that he is not now on the best of
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\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, 27 January 1852, p.3. When the Waste Lands Act was proposed by the British Government in 1847, which claimed that Māori land not being actively cultivated was ‘Waste Land’ and owned by the Crown, Buddle had called it a bad breach of national faith and a violation of the Treaty of Waitangi. He met with the Governor and Te Wherowhero expressing his concerns and had organised for a letter to be written by the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Mission Society to Lord Grey outlining their opposition to the Act. Correspondence from Rev. Thomas Buddle to the General Secretaries, 5 July 1847, MET004/1, John Kinder Theological Library, Auckland; Correspondence from the Secretaries to Lord Grey, 23 February 1848, MET004/1, John Kinder Theological Library, Auckland.
terms with that body; occasioned it is further rumoured, because the chief expected more assistance from his friends than they found it their interest to give him in obtaining his land rights from the government’.  

Pūtini had used all the European methods available to him to try to bring about unity and peace in his area under British rule. He had invited the missionaries to live with him at Pehiakura and Ihumātao, outlined his territories in a pukapuka (written document) for the governor, sought re-dress through the British justice system and outlined his grievances in the national and international press. When these measures failed, Pūtini continued his work, but his support for the Ihumātao mission station began to wane. In the 1852 Manukau Circuit Report, Lawry reported that the two principal chiefs of the district had defected, which had ‘greatly increased the otherwise great obstacles to the progress of the truth’. 

In an interview with Robert Young, a missionary who visited New Zealand in 1853, Pūtini elaborated on why his attitude towards Europeans had changed. Although he still believed in the authority of God, and of the tools of law and justice, he no longer had faith that the colonial government could deliver the unity (or oneness) between Māori and Pākehā that it had promised through law and justice. ‘The Gospel’, he said, ‘has taught us to live in peace. It gave us love, and love is the fulfilling of the law’. When asked if he was satisfied with the arrangements of the British government in relation to land, Pūtini replied ‘I think one place is straight, and another place is crooked… We like the law, which says, the Queen shall buy our lands first. This is quite straight… The crooked place is here. The Governor sometimes buys lands from Chiefs that have no right to sell them…. I gave the Governor a pukapuka with all my lands written in it and told him, when anybody came from my district to sell land, to look into the pukapuka. But some of those lands have been sold.’ Pūtini still believed the British monarch was capable of upholding the law, but he was no longer convinced that the Europeans living in New Zealand would do so: ‘When the Queen has her children [the Europeans], in England in front of her, she can keep them right; but when they get as far away as New Zealand, what can she do to keep them right? Like children out of their parents’ sight, they sometimes get into mischief.’ Playing it straight, in Pūtini’s view, meant upholding the promises that had been made by the Crown that Māori would be protected by the same laws and justice system that applied to British citizens. When it
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became clear to him that he could not achieve this on his lands, Pūtini did not blame the monarch, who he saw as the representative of God, but her ‘children’, the New Zealand administration, the missionaries and the settlers, who had created a ‘crooked place’.

In 1856, Pūtini died unexpectedly, having just returned from delivering five Māori who had assaulted a European settler to the Governor. Te Wherowhero organised for Pūtini to be taken to Māngere, before he was buried at Ihumātao. His tangi (funeral) was attended by around 800 people, and his loss mourned by both Māori and Pākehā. The press, describing the funeral, reported: ‘How much Jabez’s loss is deplored may be gathered from the fact that so great a multitude gathered assembled to weep over his remains. In the death of this chieftain, the tribes have indeed, as they assert, lost a sage counsellor, and the Europeans a warm-hearted friend’.

Pūtini was described in the press as a ‘consistent and exemplary man’ who had recently lost the ‘power of Godliness’. Thomas Buddle, similarly, recorded that Pūtini had died ‘while in a “backsliding state”’. ‘We had no opportunity of ascertaining his views in his last moments’, Buddle wrote, ‘for death made quick work and after a few hours’ illness sent him to his final account.’ Buddle may have been unclear about Pūtini’s views at the time of his death, but tribal leaders were not. Just before his death, he is reported to have ‘exhorted the people to lay aside their petty differences, and dwell together in unity, as brethren’. At his tangi, one chief commented ‘Behold, O our son, thy dying request is realized! For, even before thou art removed from our sight, the tribes are cemented in a bond of union. … Jabez still lives’.

Pūtini’s work continued after his death, in ways that neither the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries nor the colonial government anticipated. In May 1857, the Auckland newspaper the Southern Cross, announced that ‘[a] great meeting is to be held at Ihumatao, in the neighbourhood of Māngere, on the occasion of the exhumation of the bones of the late Jabez Bunting, chief of the Ngatitamaoho tribe. It is said that two or three thousand persons will be
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present.’ 143 Tribal chiefs from around the North Island gathered at Ihumātao to continue the Māori burial practices that had taken place in the area for hundreds of years (discussed in Chapter 1), but also to talk about the election of a Māori King. 144 The meeting was one of a number of hui (gatherings) in different locations held to consider methods for securing the protection of Māori autonomy and power-sharing. 145 After lengthy discussion, rangatira asked Te Wherowhero to become the Māori King, and he was formally appointed to this position at a subsequent meeting at Rangiaowhia (near Te Awamutu) in 1858. 146 The election of a Māori King, though perhaps not anticipated by Pūtini, was consistent with his belief in unity and justice under the authority of God, towards which he had worked since his conversion to Christianity in 1835.

The Ihumātao mission station had continued throughout the 1850s, despite increasing tensions in the area. In 1855 it had became part of the Manukau circuit, which included the Māori settlements of Pūkaki, Papahinu and Pehiakura. In 1856, Buddle reported that there were still regular congregations of about 50 and classes of 25 at Ihumātao, led by the Māori preacher, Samuel Ngārapi. 147 ‘There are Sabbath schools at all the native villages’, wrote Buddle, ‘but the difficulties connected with schooling natives do not decrease.’ 148 From 1857, the year that the meeting was held at Ihumātao to discuss the appointment of the Māori King, Māori baptisms at Ihumātao began to drop dramatically from the six to twelve every year which had occurred since 1849, to no more than two per year. 149 Buddle still hoped, however, that relations between Māori and Europeans would improve. In 1857, he reported on a ‘union meeting of Pakeha and Māori’ at Taotaoroa (a few miles from Ihumātao), which he felt ‘increases good feeling between the two races in that locality’. 150 Two years later, the Māori preacher Hohepa Ōtene was still regularly visiting the Māori villages in the circuit, which at
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that time had a total Māori population of 353, although Buddle noted ‘there is reason to fear it is gradually decreasing’.  

In the early 1860s, relationships between the colonial government and the Waikato tribes continued to deteriorate. Following the formation of the Kīngitanga, or Māori King movement, tensions increased with the involvement of Waikato men in the Taranaki War, and the construction of the Great South Road, which opened the frontier between the Waikato region and Auckland.

The mission station was still operational when, on Saturday 10 July 1863, Henry Halse, a government agent, set out from Auckland on the 20 kilometre journey to the Māori villages of Māngere, Ihumātao and Pūkaki on the coast of the Manukau Harbour. In each of the villages, he read out a proclamation from Governor Grey:

To the Natives of Māngere, Pukaki, Ihumatao, Te Ririki [Kirikiri], Patumahoe, Pokeno, and Tuakkau [sic]. All persons of the native race living in the Manukau district, and the Waikato frontier, are hereby required immediately to take the Oath of Allegiance to her Majesty the Queen, and to give up their arms to an officer appointed by the Government for that purpose. Natives who comply with this order will be protected. Natives refusing to do so are hereby warned forthwith to leave the district aforesaid, and retire to Waikato, beyond Mangatawhiri. In case of their not complying with this order, they will be ejected.

Local Māori were forced to decide between swearing allegiance to the Queen or leaving the lands their people had lived on and gardened since the earliest days of human settlement in the Auckland area. Most decided to leave and support the Kīngitanga, believing that relationships between Māori and the Crown had already deteriorated to the extent that even if they chose to take the oath and stay, they would be branded as enemies. ‘They travelled south with all the belongings they could carry towards the Mangatāwhiri River, which marked the frontier separating Auckland from the Waikato lands of the Kīngitanga.

The eviction of Māori from their villages in the Māngere area in 1863 was hugely distressing, a polarising moment that was felt deeply in the local community and beyond. In a despatch to the Duke of Newcastle, Governor Grey claimed the evictions had been necessary, as ‘[i]t was impossible to leave a strong disaffected population, well armed … in the rear of the General
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and of the Troops, when they occupied the frontier for the purpose of preventing armed bands from falling upon the out-settlements’. ‘I hoped’, he continued, ‘that from so many of the Waikato Natives who resided in our vicinity having for years lived amongst the European population, and having received so many acts of kindness from them and from the Government, that at least a large number of them would be well disposed towards us, and might be won over to abstain from taking part against us’. Others, however, such as the Aborigines’ Protection Society, saw the situation differently, describing the evictions as the ‘cruel and unprovoked deportation of the natives who inhabited the Maori villages in the neighbourhood of Auckland’. In an 1864 pamphlet, the Society quoted a correspondent who had witnessed the event: ‘old and young, the widow and orphan, were driven from their peaceful homes, and had to fly to the woods. There they were followed by armed men and troops. Their houses and settlements were soon pillaged of everything. Their neat little church at Ihumata [sic], within a few days, had its sashes, door-bells, communion-table, &c. stolen, and even the floor was torn up for the sake of the timber. Soon their beautiful settlement became a wreck, everything moveable being taken’.

Historians continue to debate the extent to which the threat to Auckland was rhetorical or real. James Cowan asserted that Waikato Māori had elaborate plans to attack Auckland, but other historians claim that while some leaders such as Rewi Maniapoto advocated for an attack, others including Wiremu Tamihana, also known as the Kingmaker (for his critical role in the King movement), argued vehemently against it. In his recent book on the Waikato War, Vincent O’Malley concluded that ‘Grey’s supposed dossier of incriminating evidence against the Kīngitanga hardly provided sufficient justification for the subsequent invasion of Waikato. Nor were his retrospective justifications any more convincing’.

The Waikato War, the largest campaign of the New Zealand Wars, officially began on 12 July 1863, when the British troops crossed the Mangatāwhiri Stream and invaded Waikato. However, for some Māori at least, including Tamihana, the evictions in the vicinity of
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Auckland marked the beginning of the Waikato War. Tamihana argued that the war had begun when ‘the Governor drove off from their own lands, without cause, the Maoris who resided at Pakaki [sic], at Ihumatoa [sic], at Mangare [sic], at Kirikiri, at Patumahoe, at Tuakau, and at Pokeno. The Governor also captured without cause Ihaka, the owner of his tribe [at Pukaki], and the children, and sent his soldiers to roam about among the Maori villages … This is the proof the Maoris give in relation to the war … having been commenced by the Governor’.  

Eye-witnesses and early historians recognised the importance of this moment to the war. John Gorst, a resident magistrate for Waikato and a civil commissioner prior to the war, described the evictions in his 1864 book as an act that was undertaken in haste, and one ‘which will exercise immense influence on the future relation of the Maori and European races’. One local resident who witnessed the departure, later recalled ‘All our Maoris, except about fifteen at Māngere … took the road to the Waikato. Their going was very pathetic, as they had, with very few exceptions, good relations with their Pākehā neighbours. Nearly all their belongings had to be left – canoes, fishing gear, hundreds of pigs and poultry, and worst of all their land was later confiscated. It was a case of blood being thicker than water’. Another resident commented in a letter to a newspaper editor, ‘The Ihumata natives, notwithstanding their alleged disloyalty, were good neighbours and very much respected by the settlers around; nearly all their houses and fences have been destroyed, their church gutted, the bell, sashes, door, and communion-table stolen, and the floor even torn up and taken away; and now, their land is to be occupied by Mr Russell’s brother-in-law! The history of this war will be a dark page in the history of New Zealand’.  

The forced evictions were largely overlooked in twentieth century histories of the Waikato War, though Vincent O’Malley’s recent detailed history of the war described them as part of the lead up to the invasion. Historians of Auckland have also ignored the evictions and
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confiscations at Ihumātao and the surrounding Māori villages in their discussions of the Waikato campaign. The hostilities, wrote Barr in 1922, never reached Auckland, ‘nor even lapped its shores’, wrote Reed in 1955. While these authors did discuss the impact of the war on Europeans in Auckland, including conscription of Auckland residents, the building of blockhouses and the onset of the depression following the war, neither mentioned the forced evictions and subsequent confiscations in Māngere.

The evictions from the Māori villages in the Māngere area are important for both understanding Māori perspectives on the outbreak of the Waikato War and recovering the experiences and perspectives of Māori north of the Mangatāwhiri River in the Auckland district during the war. After the war ended in April 1864, the government confiscated the land of those found to be ‘in rebellion’. At Ihumātao, most of the Māori land was confiscated, including the land today known as the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve. The Waikato War and its consequences have continued to resonate throughout the local community in Māngere, shaping both the physical landscape and the identities of Māori and Pākehā in the area. The local people returned to Ihumātao after the Waikato Campaign to live on a small reserve adjacent to the Stonefields, now known as Ihumātao papakāinga, where their descendants continue to live today. In 1983, the Waitangi Tribunal held the investigations into the Manukau Claim on the marae at Ihumātao, concluding that the Waikato tribes had never been in rebellion and had been attacked by British troops, in direct violation of the Treaty of Waitangi. The subsequent confiscations, the Tribunal found, had left an enduring mark on the Māori people of the Manukau: ‘For them’, the report stated, ‘it is as if the confiscations and dealings occurred yesterday’.

In his 1867 report of the Manukau Circuit, Reverend John Warren commented that ‘the history of this Circuit has been somewhat peculiar and discouraging’.
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destructive battles which took place between the natives and settlers were fought either in or
on the immediate borders of this circuit’. Though the missionaries felt they had done all they
could to prevent the outbreak of war, once the fighting had started, they had felt obliged to
visit the redoubts and preach to the troops even though it was ‘unproductive to’
Methodism’. After the war, the Methodist church sold the eight-acre property on which the
mission house still stood, to a European farmer.

Following the confiscation of the Stonefields area, the land was subdivided and sold to British
immigrants, who began to dismantle and rearrange the rock walls to fit their ideas of order,
space and belonging. Using the dry stone walling method they brought from home, they
fitted the stones together like a jigsaw puzzle, shaping them into rectangular forms across the
landscape and establishing some of the first dairy farms in Auckland. A fourth generation
descendant of these first European farmers, remembered ‘Dad always said there was only one
stone that fitted a position in the wall. He’d turn it round and round and up side

The Stonefields were ultimately not hospitable to European methods of farming. The rocky
terrain could not be ploughed mechanically and the fresh water spring that came from the
rivers running underneath the layers of rock dried up during a drought in the 1930s.
According to one of the farmers ‘it was hard land to farm, but it always had resource
underneath and one day we thought, it would actually be worth something’. The volcanic
cone Ōtuataua had been renamed Quarry Hill in 1863 and over the next 100 years much of the
cone was quarried away and distributed to Auckland airport, to local roads, to container
wharfs. Nearby Maungataketake was completely quarried away. ‘We’ve been spread around
far and wide’ commented one of the local farmers. For these families, the rock was ‘excellent
quality solid blue metal’ and if keeping the rock on the land made the farm economically
unviable, removing it was the key to being able to remain on the land.
In 1999, after archaeologists and historians highlighted the significance of the remaining stonefield garden systems on the Ōtuataua Stonefields, Manukau City Council, together with the Department of Conservation, the Lotteries Commission and the Auckland Regional Council, purchased the Ōtuataua Stonefields from the four families who had farmed there for over 100 years and created the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve, which opened in 2001. Development pressures have continued in the area, however, with the expansion of the airport and its precinct and a recent zoning change in the area which has allowed for more intensive development. The flattening of the landscape may be ‘straight’ in one sense of the word but it is also destroying the ancestral home of one of Auckland’s most long-standing communities. Today, the descendants of Epiha Pūtini and other tribal leaders of the area continue to seek ways to make what they consider to be the crooked straight, working with their local community and through the court systems to prevent further destruction of the landscape at Ihumātao, where their ancestors have lived since the earliest days human settlement in Tāmaki.

The relationships forged on the ground at Ihumātao in early colonial Auckland reveal very different but equally important notions of place-making and identity as those being forged in the centre of town. The complex relationships between Māori and Europeans, and humans
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and the environment at Ihumātao from 1846 to 1866 provide insight into a place that was not a ‘neo-Europe’, as New Zealand’s towns have often been described, but rather a place that was heavily influenced by the existing and evolving tribal dynamics, as well as the physical environment. The Ihumātao mission station and the adjacent gardens reveal complicated, enmeshed and reciprocal relationships between Māori, missionaries, settlers and the Crown that challenge the prevailing narrative that Europeans were the only active shapers of Auckland after 1840. Ihumātao provides insight into a place where Māori were central and persistent protagonists well after the establishment of Auckland and where early European settlers and missionaries were regularly overtaken and defeated by their physical environment.

Between 1846 and 1866, the rocks on the Ōtuataua Stonefields were arranged and rearranged to fit evolving ideas of property, religion, law and justice as relationships shifted quickly between mana whenua, missionaries, European settlers and the Crown. Different concepts of ‘crooked’ and ‘straight’, right and wrong, were crafted in the spatial arrangements across the Stonefields, the mission station and the wider area. These concepts are still present in the rock walls, boundary lines, burial sites and soils of this area, as well as in the histories and memories of the people who live here. The forced evictions from their ancestral lands and the subsequent confiscations were a major turning point for this community, which continue to have local, city-wide and national consequences. Sites such as the Stonefields are not remote outposts of local importance, but places that are important for all New Zealanders, if we are to understand different perspectives on our colonial history; even those that don’t fit comfortably or easily into the meta narratives that have been crafted about our past.
CHAPTER FOUR
‘Matters of Moment’: The Olive Grove at Cornwall Park, 1878–1901

The remnant of an old olive grove in Cornwall Park surprises many visitors. Planted on the slopes of Maungakiekie, with its impressive Māori earthworks, and surrounded by a pastoral landscape reminiscent of the English countryside, these mature, gnarled trees disrupt the dual narratives of Māori and British identity that dominate this iconic landscape. Though their thick twisted trunks largely follow the fence lines and roadways of this orderly landscape, clusters of trees in the middle of the paddocks do not fit with existing patterns across the land, hinting at the former spread of the grove. Underneath the olive trees, the work of the countryside carries on, with sheep and cattle grazing at their feet, rabbits burrowing into their trunks, and cricket games underway on the fields alongside them. Moreton Bay figs, a favourite tree of the early English settler, literally engulf some of the olive trees, having arrived as seeds on the olive branches and taken root.

![The olive grove in 1977, in a photograph commissioned by Professor Russell Stone, Department of History, PID408010, University of Auckland Library.](image)

John Logan Campbell, a prominent merchant and public figure who was known as the ‘Father of Auckland’, planted the olive grove in 1878.¹ For over twenty years, Campbell oversaw the cultivation of around 2500 trees, harvested the olives, produced olive oil and sought local and international markets for his produce. The operation of the olive grove throughout this period

¹ John Logan Campbell Papers, MS 51-262-2, Auckland War Memorial Museum (AWMM); New Zealand Herald, 31 August 1878, p.3; New Zealand Herald, 20 October 1881, p.5.
complicates the story about colonial settlers in late nineteenth century New Zealand, which often focuses on the strengthening connections between New Zealand and Britain, and to a lesser extent on the links between British colonies. From the 1880s, according to historians James Belich and Felicity Barnes, the amount of land converted to grasslands, small-scale dairy and sheep farming increased exponentially in New Zealand, as frozen meat and dairy products were exported en masse to Britain. This was part of a process, argues Belich, by which Britain ‘recolonised’ New Zealand, tightening the links between New Zealand and London. ‘In some respects’, concludes Belich, ‘New Zealand and the relevant bits of Britain made up a single entity. Essentially, New Zealand became a town-supply district of London. London became the cultural capital of New Zealand’.4

In many ways, Cornwall Park fits neatly into this story of mass conversion into grasslands and tightening links with Britain. When Thomas Henry purchased a large block of land stretching from Maungakiekie to the Manukau Harbour from Te Taoū (by this time commonly known as Ngāti Whātau) in 1843, he began clearing the fern, mānuka and flax that covered the mountain and converting it into pasture and land for agricultural produce.5 John Logan Campbell and his business partner William Brown, continued Henry’s conventional British-style stock farming on the land when they purchased part of the property in 1853 and re-named it One Tree Hill Estate.6 Campbell later wrote: ‘[t]he estate was advantageously worked after its immediate purchase in sheep and cattle raising and agricultural produce, and down to almost present day’.7
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3 Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.29.
4 Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.30.
6 R.C.J. Stone, The Father and his Gift: John Logan Campbell’s Later Years, Auckland, 1987, pp.31-33
7 John Logan Campbell, ‘The History of the Purchase of One Tree Hill by Thomas Henry 1844-5’, John Logan Campbell Papers, 1903, MS51-243-1, AWMM.
Barnes has pointed to the ‘disproportionate British influence’ in New Zealand’s cultural landscape, forged by settlers throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century through the constant reiteration of terms such as ‘Greater Britain’, ‘Britain under the Southern Cross’ and ‘The Britain of the South’. These close ties between Britain and New Zealand were demonstrated when Campbell gifted his estate to the public in 1901 during the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall to New Zealand, in what one historian has called an ‘Imperial Moment’. In another ‘moment’ he renamed the estate in their honour. Today, Cornwall Park is best known for its ‘picturesque semi-rural pastoral setting, with sheep and cattle grazing, natural features, stone walls, and expanses of green open space that provide a “country” experience in the city’.

---

8 Barnes, *New Zealand’s London*, pp.5-6, 13.
Historians have paid little attention to Cornwall Park’s olive grove, considering it aberrant and an embarrassing lapse in Campbell’s catalogue of successes. Campbell’s biographer, Russell Stone, called it ‘disappointing’, and concluded that Campbell had given up on the grove by 1892, when ‘what was sadly labelled the “the olive paddock” was leased to a Chinese, Ming Quong, to be converted into a market garden’. The olive grove, however, operated for longer than historians have realized. More importantly though, its presence and history reveal important aspects of Auckland’s past that are often obscure.

Tom Brooking and Eric Pawson have argued that although conventional histories often portray the transformation of the New Zealand landscape into grasslands as inevitable, ‘as if New Zealand was somehow inherently suited to this outcome’, there were in fact a number of competing visions for the remaking of New Zealand in the late nineteenth century, before these ideas gave way to a ‘more narrowly focused British-style stock farming, based on

---

12 Stone, The Father and His Gift, pp.117-19.
These alternative visions have received very little attention from historians, and are absent from more general histories of New Zealand. As Tony Ballantyne has commented, it is also important to acknowledge the existence of connections that operated outside of the imperial web in the nineteenth century, even if they were not ultimately successful. Exploring these connections, explains Ballantyne, helps to address the silences that exist within key historical works on national identity in New Zealand, which often emphasize the dominant bi-cultural histories that revolve around British and Māori perspectives.

The olive grove at Cornwall Park, the only commercial olive grove in New Zealand for more than a century, points to a ‘Mediterranean moment’ on Campbell’s estate that has been almost entirely forgotten but is important for understanding Auckland’s history and one of its most celebrated citizens. Paying attention to the olive grove allows us to understand other visions of place in late nineteenth century amongst various settlers, both prominent and forgotten, which may not have continued into the twentieth century, but are nevertheless important for understanding the history of Auckland. The grove, one of the few physical reminders of Campbell’s plans for his estate before he gifted it to the public in 1901, suggests that some of the most prominent British settlers in late nineteenth-century Auckland were not as closely bound by the cultural and geographical ties of Britain as some historians have asserted. Campbell’s visions for the property had both British and Mediterranean elements, indicating he was crafting a broader sense of place than a replica British landscape, or a ‘suitably familiar’ home. Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, the olive grove also generated connections with Italian, American, and Chinese immigrants in Auckland, as well as international connections beyond the British Empire. These connections suggest that late nineteenth-century Auckland is better understood as a site of intersecting colonial spheres, rather than a remote satellite of metropolitan Britain.
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15 Ballantyne, Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand’s Colonial Past, pp.54-55.
17 Barnes, New Zealand’s London: A Colony and its Metropolis, p.5.
In August 1878, John Logan Campbell planted 5000 olive seedlings on a plateau on his property, One Tree Hill Estate.\textsuperscript{18} The seedlings were planted on a site of particular personal significance to Campbell, who had created the plateau only a few years earlier as the site for his proposed family home. Stone has described Campbell’s olive and grape ventures as projects ‘from the heart rather than the head’.\textsuperscript{19} They were part of his wider plans for this part of his property that were closely connected to ideas of home, family and self-identity, revealing a deeply personal side of this ‘intense, reticent man’, which, as Stone notes, is hard to access through his extensive written records.\textsuperscript{20}

When he established the olive grove, John Logan Campbell was already one of Auckland’s most successful and celebrated citizens. He had arrived in New Zealand in 1840, and although he had trained as a doctor in Edinburgh, decided to go into business as a trader, in partnership with William Brown, in the new town of Auckland.\textsuperscript{21} Campbell and Brown became one of the most successful firms in Auckland, carrying out international shipping and auctioneering, running commissioning agents and engaging in land speculation. As well as playing a dominant role in Auckland’s business affairs, Campbell was heavily involved in

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{18} Huia Lodge and Acacia Cottage are now located on the plateau. \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 31 August 1878, p.3; \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 20 October 1881, p.5; Stone, \textit{The Father and His Gift}, p.118.
\textsuperscript{19} Stone, \textit{The Father and His Gift}, p.119.
\textsuperscript{21} Stone, \textit{The Father and His Gift}, p.14.
\end{flushleft}
public and cultural affairs, serving as Mayor of Auckland, establishing the city’s first school of art in 1878 and supporting many educational initiatives.22

As part of their business, Campbell and Brown purchased Thomas Henry’s 1000-acre estate in 1853.23 Considered the most desirable suburban farm in Auckland at the time, the sale of Mount Prospect included 250 cattle, 500-600 sheep, 40-50 pigs, and chickens, as well as dairy and agricultural equipment.24 Over the next twenty years Campbell and Brown continued to develop the pasture, importing English clover seed, bulls and Cheviot rams, as well as cultivating potatoes and other crops.25

The success of their merchant business allowed Campbell and Brown to spend most of this period in Europe with their families, leaving the management of the farm to two brothers, James and Robert Farmer. Campbell’s travels in the Mediterranean and the friendships he formed there had a powerful influence on the way he later managed his farm in Auckland. During an earlier trip in 1848 Campbell spent a year travelling through Egypt, Switzerland, Italy and Greece, which he later described in his autobiography: ‘What a glorious journey it had been. I had lain stores of travel upon which I was to feast for the remainder of life’.26 It was during this trip that Campbell first saw olive groves in Greece and obelisks in Egypt, both of which were later incorporated into his plans for Maungakiekie.

From 1856 to 1871, with only a brief return to Auckland for business, Campbell toured through Italy, Switzerland, France and Britain with his new wife, Emma, and his children. He spent most of this period in Florence, which he described as ‘the city of my heart’.27 Campbell had some of his most turbulent emotional experiences in Florence. It was the place where his infant son died and was buried, and where he met the American sculptor Frank
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23 R.C.J. Stone, Young Logan Campbell: Tales from the Early Years, Auckland, 1982, p.189. Most of the land that Henry purchased from Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei in 1843 was removed from him when the government investigated land purchases made directly from Māori in 1847, and he was left with the parcel of land that later became Cornwall Park. The summit of One Tree Hill, which was part of Henry’s original purchase was kept by the government as a reserve. ‘Claims 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084 Thomas Henry. One Tree Hill, Auckland’, OLC Plan 178 – Series 2, BAIZ A1708 23642 Box 73, Archives New Zealand, Auckland.
24 Deed of Sale, 1853, MS51-244-4, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM.
25 Stone, Young Logan Campbell, p.194.
26 John Logan Campbell, quote in Stone, Young Logan Campbell, p.157.
Connelly, whom he considered a ‘true genius’. 28 Campbell formed an intense friendship with Connelly and became his patron. 29

In 1874, after he returned to New Zealand and took sole ownership of the One Tree Hill Estate, Campbell began making plans to build an Italianate house on a plateau on the north-east lower slopes of Maungakiekie so that his family could live permanently on the property. The site that Campbell chose was sheltered from Auckland’s south-west prevailing winds and had a panoramic view towards the town and the Waitematā Harbour. Campbell described it in his letters as the ‘loveliest landscape of land & sea I have ever seen’, with a ‘view seaward which matches the Bay of Naples’. 30 In preparation for ‘our beautiful forever Castle Campbell’, as he described it to his wife, the land was cleared and a carriage-way built. Flanked with Macrocarpas, Moreton Bay figs and pines, the drive-way lead up from the main road to the house site. 31

This photograph appears to have been taken from the plateau, where Campbell planned to build his family home, then subsequently planted his olive seedlings in 1878. In 1883, Campbell transferred the trees to their current location, to the left of the photograph. Mt Hobson is visible in the top left corner of the photograph. ‘Looking north east from One Tree Hill’, photo by William Richardson, 1873, Sir George Grey Special Collections, 4-798, Auckland Libraries.
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28 Connelly had grown up in Italy and England, but lived in Florence, where he had trained under the distinguished American sculptor Hiram Powers. Stone, ‘John Logan Campbell, Frank Connelly and “Trespiano”’, p.25.
31 Correspondence John Logan Campbell to Emma Campbell, 8 August, 1875, quoted in Stone, The Father and His Gift, p.138; ‘The History of the Purchase of One Tree Hill by Thomas Henry’, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS-51-243-1, AWMM. The plateau is now the site of Huia Lodge and Acacia Cottage, and most of the trees planted for the carriageway still exist along one of the pathways up to the plateau.
Campbell also had plans for the summit of One Tree Hill. The summit was owned by the government, but had recently been leased to Campbell for depasturing. In 1875 Campbell planted a small group of pine trees on the summit to replace the previous pohutukawa tree, which had been a landmark in early Auckland and gave the mountain its European name.\textsuperscript{32} The pohutukawa had been cut down over 20 years earlier by an unknown European settler in 1852, and Campbell was determined to restore the landmark so that, as he explained to his wife, he could take ‘No Tree Hill to try and make it One tree Hill’.\textsuperscript{33} As one of the few surviving early settlers in Auckland, Campbell was one of the only residents to have seen the previous tree. ‘Save the oldest of our settlers’ reported the press at the time, ‘few others know why One-Tree Hill is so called, for … there is not any tree on the hill itself that arrests the eye’.\textsuperscript{34} [In the olden days’, according to the article, as you travelled facing north, One-Tree Hill was the landmark which enabled you to individualise all the other volcanic hills’\textsuperscript{35}

By replanting trees on the summit, and replacing the native pohutukawa with exotic pines, Campbell was deliberately crafting a settler identity in Auckland. ‘An attempt is now being made’ reported the press at the time, ‘to restore the ancient landmark – a legacy, as it were, from this generation to be enjoyed by the next. And the task has fallen to appropriate hands – for who more fitting than the oldest resident on these shores’.\textsuperscript{36} The crafting of similar narratives in different ways has been explored by New Zealand historians, including Peter Gibbons, who discusses how Europeans inserted themselves into the land through non-fiction literature, and Giselle Byrnes, who shows how surveying practices inscribed new meanings on to the land.\textsuperscript{37} American historian Jean O’Brien has demonstrated how European settlers in New England crafted origin stories that cast Indians as preludes to their own arrival, and subsequently constructed their own monuments and adopted place-names which erased Indians from New England’s histories and landscapes.\textsuperscript{38} Campbell’s tree-planting can be viewed as another instance of ‘firsting and lasting’, as O’Brien described the practice.

\textsuperscript{32} Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p.3.
\textsuperscript{33} Correspondence John Logan Campbell to Emma Campbell, 2 July 1875, MS-51-18b, AWMM; Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p.3; Stone, John Logan Campbell’s Auckland, p.58. The history of the summit of Maungakiekie is explored more fully in Chapter Six.
\textsuperscript{34} Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p.3.
\textsuperscript{35} Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p.3.
\textsuperscript{36} Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p.3.
As we have seen, when Campbell planted the pine trees, the mountain was known by most Aucklanders as One-Tree Hill, rather than its early Māori name of Maungakiekie. ‘Maungakiekie was altogether too large and long and difficult a mouthful to pronounce when the then significant name of One-Tree Hill could be given’, wrote the press.\(^{39}\) By the 1870s most Aucklanders had little knowledge of or interest in the Māori names or histories of Auckland. During the Ōrakei Land Court hearings in the 1860s, for example, when Māori gave testimony about their rights to occupation, one correspondent to the press commented that he had learnt the Māori names for places in Auckland for the first time. ‘It is a curious fact’, he wrote, ‘that even in the most thinly peopled districts in the North Island, every little inlet or hillock has its native name, well known to at least every Maori living within a large circuit. The taste is very questionable which insists upon changing these, which are generally appropriate to the places, and substituting some unmeaning word’.\(^{40}\)

Though these Māori histories were not well-known amongst European settlers, rangatira occasionally mentioned the significance of places such as Maungakiekie in the press. In 1863, during a dispute with Ngāti Pāoa over land ownership in the Auckland area, a group of rangatira with affiliations to Te Taoū, Te Waiōhua and other Auckland tribes wrote in a letter to the editor of an Auckland newspaper: ‘Now do you hearken O Pakehas, our ancestors are like unto a spring bubbling up at Tamaki’.\(^{41}\) The rangatira named Maungakiekie as one of several tohu, or place-markers, that proved their claim to Auckland, describing the mountain as ‘Maungakiekie Te Raketonga … where the lightning of our ancestors flashed forth in former times, even till now, to us who are living on the pieces of land left to us’.\(^{42}\)

The extensive terraces on Maungakiekie, the largest in New Zealand, had been built in the seventeenth century by Titahi, an Ngāti Awa chief, and were known as ‘Nga whaka iro a Titahi’, or ‘the carvings of Titahi’.\(^{43}\) Early in the eighteenth century, the sprig of a totara tree had been planted on the summit of the mountain, along with the umbilical cord of the son of a Ngāti Awa chief.\(^{44}\) The tree grew into an important landmark that signified a long line of chiefs, and was known as ‘Te Totara i āhua’ (‘the totara which stands alone’).\(^{45}\) By around the mid-eighteenth century, the paramount chief of Te Waiōhua, Kiwi Tamaki, was living at

\(^{39}\) Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p.3.
\(^{40}\) Daily Southern Cross, 17 December 1866, p.4.
\(^{41}\) New Zealander, 6 April, 1863, p.3.
\(^{42}\) New Zealander, 28 April 1863, p.3.
\(^{44}\) Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.16.
\(^{45}\) David Simmons, Greater Maori Auckland, Auckland, 2013, p.37.
Maungakiekie. During this period, the summit (toi) was apparently palisaded and had a large gong which was struck at times of war and could be heard throughout the isthmus. Around the base of the hill there were extensive kūmara gardens known as Ngā-māra-o-Tahuri (the gardens of Tahuri) renowned for their productivity.

When Te Taoū and related tribes defeated Te Waiōhua in the mid to late eighteenth century, Tuperiri, the principal chief of Te Taoū fortified Maungakiekie and occupied it as his main residence. After Tuperiri’s death in the late eighteenth century, the main base of Te Taoū moved to Māngere and then later to Ōrakei (as discussed in Chapter 3). Although Maungakiekie was no longer a focal point for the tribe, it remained within Te Taoū’s territory. In 1843, a number of tribal chiefs sold Maungakiekie and the slopes surrounding it to Thomas Henry. When the government later declared the original transaction between Ngāti Whātua and Thomas Henry illegal, it retained the summit of Maungakiekie as a reserve, rather than returning it to its Māori owners.

In addition to replanting the lone tree on the summit of One-Tree Hill, Campbell also planned to build a campanile (Italian bell-tower) alongside it. On top of the campanile, he explained to his wife, he hoped to attach a Royal Standard (flag), in time for the impending visit of the Prince of Wales. The ‘only thing not commenced’, he wrote to Emma in 1875, ‘is the Campanile you wanted not to be commenced, but once I begin to amuse myself by drawing a plan of it … as sure as fate when you drive up the avenue you will see the Royal Standard waving from above the top of the highest pine tree. It would be quite a picture in the landscape.’ Campbell continued in the same letter: ‘we must have a Royal Standard waving somewhere and we could not stick it on the top of a tree far less on a pole stuck in the ground’.

The importance of Campbell’s Maungakiekie plans are evident in his letters to Emma, to whom he explained in 1875: ‘to suppose I am going to give up what I have been looking
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46 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.32; Simmons, Greater Maori Auckland, p.54; Hayward et al, Volcanoes of Auckland, p.62.
47 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.37.
48 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.33.
49 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.48.
50 Stone, From Tamaki Makau-rau to Auckland, p.48.
51 Claims 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, ‘Thomas Henry, One Tree Hill, Auckland’, OLC Plan 178, Series 2, BAJZ A1708 23642 Box 73, Archives New Zealand, Auckland.
52 Correspondence John Logan Campbell to Emma Campbell, 14 June 1875, MS51-18b, AWMM.
53 Daily Southern Cross, 14 August 1875, p. 3; Correspondence John Logan Campbell to Emma Campbell, 14 June 1875, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS51-8B, AWMM.
54 Correspondence John Logan Campbell to Emma Campbell, 14 June 1875, John Logan Campbell Papers MS51-18B, AWMM.
forward to for the last twenty years, beautifying the plateau, is to suppose I am going to deny myself the only ideal pleasure that remains. No I can’t give up that …. The “firm” to me is wholesome mental occupation, but I have no positive and downright pleasure in the mere making of money, as so many have, it is in the spending of it that I derive pleasure." The term ‘ideal pleasure’ was used in contemporary philosophy texts, including a text written only a few years earlier, by Campbell’s compatriot Scottish Alexander Bain. Bain defined ‘ideal pleasure’ as an experience maintained by memory and association as opposed to immediate enjoyment. Campbell’s use of the term indicates that he associated this project with the deepest aspects of his personal identity, rather than as a fleeting whim.

Emma, however, did not approve of the plans Campbell sent her for the house and campanile. Writing from England in 1876, where she and the children had been sent by Campbell to further the girls’ education, Emma wrote: ‘Yr [sic] new site seems to me a cold situation. Sun goes off & would blow & sweep along that little plateau. Just now I am very sensitive to wind’. When Emma refused to live on the property, Campbell was forced to change his plans. The decision not to build a home on the plateau must have been a poignant moment for him. These careful preparations for the site had expressed his most personal efforts at place-making, incorporating a combination of Pākehā, British and Mediterranean elements. Yet the grand carriage-way, planted with its avenue of trees, now wound its way up to an empty site.

Campbell’s friend from Florence, Frank Connelly, was staying with him when he abandoned his plan. Connelly helped Campbell choose a new site for the house in Parnell (on the site of the Parnell Rose Gardens). ‘Kilbryde’, built in 1879 in an Italianate style, featured an elaborate ball room with Italian frescoes and a cantilevered gallery for musicians. Connelly was also living with Campbell while he researched and planned the planting of an olive grove and a vineyard. Less than a month after Connelly left, Campbell ordered the olive seedlings and when they arrived, he planted them on the plateau.

Campbell’s plans for an Italianate home on a site with a view he compared to Naples, together with the campanile, olive grove, and vineyard on One Tree Hill Estate, suggest strong Mediterranean influences, even if these were combined with archetypal British signifiers such

55 Correspondence John Logan Campbell to Emma Campbell, 2 July 1875, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS51-18B, AWMM.
57 Correspondence Emma Campbell to John Logan Campbell, 13 March 1877, MS51-19A, AWMM; Stone, The Father and His Gift, p.130
58 Terence Hodgson, The Big House: Grand & Opulent Houses in Colonial New Zealand, Auckland, 1991, p.80. The house was built in 1879 and was demolished in 1924 when the headland was destroyed.
as the Royal Standard of the United Kingdom and fields of British clover. Campbell’s plans disrupt the conventional narrative that British settlers invariably sought to recreate Britain in their gardens and landscapes, and more generally, that ‘early Pakeha consistently saw themselves as the Britons of the South’. As James Beattie has argued in his work on European settlers with Asian connections, some settlers had ‘multiple allegiances’ and actively sought to recreate their connections with places outside of Britain in their landscapes. The ‘father of Auckland’ was such a man.

Although his house was never built on One Tree Hill, Campbell’s plans for an olive plantation did proceed. On 5 July 1878, Campbell ordered 5000 olive seedlings from JM Stewart in Adelaide. It was the first commercial grove of olive trees in New Zealand, as the *New Zealand Herald* reported in 1881: ‘On a beautiful sheltered plateau at the eastern base of One-tree Hill … Dr. Campbell has commenced the experiment of olive cultivation. Some 5000 grafted plants are at present in the nursery, preparatory to being planted out, over an area of about 40 acres’. The article praised Campbell for his initiative in experimenting with this new crop in New Zealand: ‘Dr. Campbell deserves the highest credit for his public spirit and liberality in going to the trouble and expense which he has done to solve the question— can the olive be profitably grown as an article of commerce in the province of Auckland?’ The variety of olive plants Campbell purchased is unknown, except that they were of the ‘olive oil producing variety’.

Though Campbell was the only person to plant a commercial grove of olive trees in New Zealand for more than a century, he was one of a number of people in late nineteenth century New Zealand who explored the development of agricultural products outside of those developed in Britain. A few early European settlers had grown single olive trees and small groves since at least the 1830s, and as early as 1840 the British Resident, James Busby, floated the idea of developing an olive industry in New Zealand, after touring vineyards and olive groves throughout Spain and France and noting the similar climate and latitude between
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61 ‘Olive Culture Expedition’, MS51-262-2, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM.
62 *New Zealand Herald*, 20 October 1881, p.5.
63 *New Zealand Herald*, 20 October 1881, p.5.
64 *New Zealand Herald*, 20 October 1881, p.5.
these countries and New Zealand. The press had also occasionally commented on the potential of the industry, noting in 1865 for example that olives trees thrived in northern New Zealand, yet the industry was currently ‘neglected and … dormant’ mainly because its cultivation ‘cannot be much understood in this country’.

In 1869, the New Zealand government investigated the possibility of offering incentives to encourage the olive industry and other Mediterranean crops, after such initiatives were introduced in the Colony of Victoria. No incentives were introduced at the time, but in 1873, acclimatisation societies and botanical gardens began importing small numbers of olive trees around the country, following a recommendation from the committee on Colonial Industries. By the mid 1870s there was a small but prominent group of people arguing for the introduction of olive trees and other sub-tropical crops. In 1876, Josiah Firth, Chairman of the Auckland Acclimatisation Society declared that the introduction and propagation of fruit trees were ‘matters of moment’. The olive tree, in particular, he believed, was ‘the best speculation or investment that any person could make’.

The first official report on the potential of an olive industry was produced in 1877. Its author, who had visited Tuscany, was highly optimistic about the prospects of the industry in New Zealand. ‘I am convinced’, he wrote, ‘that no country is in point of climate better adapted for it than the greater part of the Northern Island, and can recommend it as being one of the most profitable sources of wealth that Providence can confer on a country’. This was one of a number of reports that Campbell collected and read in preparation for his olive venture. A copy of another report produced by Sheriff Boothby, who oversaw the olive grove in the Adelaide gaol, is signed by John Logan Campbell and dated June 1878, one month after the first official report.
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66 New Zealander, 3 January 1865, p.5. See also New Zealander, 3 December 1851, p.4.

67 ‘Correspondence Relative to Premiums of New Industries and Manufactures in the Colony of Victoria’, Correspondence Relative to Premiums of New Industries and Manufactures in the Colony of Victoria, Appendix to the House of Representatives (AJHR), Session 1 D-23, 1869.

68 ‘Colonial Industries, Reports of the Select Committee’, AJHR, Session 1 I-04, 1873. The Auckland Acclimisation Society was presented with 22 Italian olive trees by Mr McLeod of Tokatea in 1873. Daily Southern Cross, 8 July 1873, p.3. In 1875, the Botanic Garden ordered one olive seedling amongst twelve boxes of plants from Kew Gardens in London. Annual Report of the Botanic Garden Board’, AJHR, Session 1 H-24, 1875.

69 New Zealand Herald, 4 April 1876, p.3.

70 New Zealand Herald, 4 April 1876, p.3.


before he ordered the olives. His files also contain an Australian newspaper article reporting on the success of the olive industry in South Australia which stated that ‘an industry which is such a source of wealth in Southern Europe could be profitably established in these colonies’. Following the planting of Campbell’s olive grove on his estate in 1878, the local press made a particularly strong case for the development of the olive industry in New Zealand. The article argued that the colony must begin growing crops suitable to its climate rather than continuing to grow those introduced from the northern country, as Britain was referred to, which had such a different climate from New Zealand’s. The author was most probably Campbell himself, since the article notes that he first came across olives on the island of Corfu in 1849, the same year that Campbell travelled through Greece. The author continued: ‘[H]aving stuck to the old groove in which all our ideas ran, we have never looked abroad or had the sense to ask ourselves what is grown elsewhere in the world in climates similar to our own’. Several further reports were commissioned by the government after the planting of Campbell’s olive grove, all of which recommended incentives to encourage the introduction of sub-tropical crops such as olives, grapes and mulberries. Campbell continued to collect these reports throughout the 1870s and 1880s, as well as other printed material on the developing olive industry in California and Australia which contained information on current practices in France, Italy and Spain.

The main obstacle to developing the olive industry in New Zealand was the lack of knowledge about how to cultivate Southern European crops. The vast majority of settlers arriving in the country in the nineteenth century came from Great Britain. While immigrants
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73 ‘The Olive: Its Culture and Products, the South of France and Italy, by William R. Boothby Esq, Sheriff of South Australia’, Adelaide, 1878, MS51-264-5, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM.
74 The Australasian, June 11 1887, MS51-262-1, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM.
75 New Zealand Herald, 31 August 1878, p.3.
76 New Zealand Herald, 31 August 1878, p.3.
77 In 1849, Campbell travelled through Egypt, Austria, Italy, Greece and Turkey. In May 1849, he travelled by boat from Trieste in Italy to Athens, which was broken by a trip to Corinth, and may well have included a stop at Corfu which was on the way. Stone, The Father and His Gift, p.153.
78 New Zealand Herald, 24 August 1878, p.6.
80 For example, ‘Fruit Culture in the Several Countries, United States, Bureau of Foreign Commerce (1851-1903)’, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS51-264-2 and MS51-264-3, AWMM; ‘A Treatise on Olive Culture by Ellwood Cooper of Santa Barbara, Cal.’, 1882, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS51-262-2, AWMM; ‘The Cultivation of the Olive: Notes Collected by J. Harris Browne’, 1883, MS 51 264-3, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM; The Australasian, June 11 1887, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS 51 262-1, AWMM.
from northern Europe were considered acceptable, Southern Europeans were not as welcome.\textsuperscript{81} This meant that settlers lacked knowledge about Southern European crops, and there was little local taste for Mediterranean cuisine. ‘Old Colonist’, for instance, lamented in 1875 that the individual olive trees he had observed throughout the Auckland province were ‘sadly neglected’ and ‘in many instances the very name of the tree is unknown to settlers’.\textsuperscript{82} The Auckland Provincial Council offered extra acres of land to farmers willing to try planting mulberry trees, vineyards and olives in 1874, but there was very little uptake, which the local press put down to ‘the want of necessary skilled labour to cultivate these articles, which are the products of a warmer climate than that possessed by Britain, whence the majority of New Zealand colonists have come’.\textsuperscript{83}

To a certain extent, those promoting the olive industry approached it from within British imperial networks. Governor Grey, who had a small olive grove himself on Kawau Island, suggested sourcing trees through British consuls in various parts of the world.\textsuperscript{84} Industry experts promoted olive oil not as a culinary product, but as soap for cleaning and lubricating wool destined for the British market.\textsuperscript{85} Campbell, though, planned to produce olive oil for local consumption, as he made clear in an 1878 letter to his lawyer. He wrote that one day he might walk up Queen Street and find ‘the grocers’ windows decked out with “Best One Tree Hill Salad Oil”’.\textsuperscript{86} He later restated his intention to produce olive oil ‘of a quality equal, if not superior to the best imported. Indeed, the intention of Dr. Campbell is to adopt from the first the standard of quality, style of label, trade mark &c. by which the article will be known in the markets for the colony for the future’.\textsuperscript{87}

Rhetoric from Campbell and others about the potential of the olive industry at the time indicates that there was a small, but prominent and vocal group of individuals who were trying to develop products beyond those destined for the British market. Men such as Busby, Firth and Campbell demonstrate that some settlers imagined New Zealand as part of a wider world than that of the British Empire, one that was tied together by latitude as well as

\textsuperscript{81} Belich, \textit{Paradise Reforged}, pp.223-5.
\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, 10 July 1875, p.5. See also \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 4 April 1876, p.3.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, 30 July 1874, p.2.
\textsuperscript{84} ‘Final Report of Colonial Industries and Tariff Committee’, AJHR, Session I-I-10, 1881.
\textsuperscript{86} Correspondence Sir John Logan Campbell to Thomas Russell, 1878, quoted in Stone, \textit{The Father and His Gift}, p.118.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 9 May 1887, p.6.
connections to the metropole of London. This geography encompassed links with other Anglo places, such as Australia and North America, but also included places beyond the Empire such as Spain, Italy and France.

In 1880, shortly after Campbell had planted the olive seedlings in the nursery, he was told that his daughter, Ida, was seriously ill in Europe. He left Auckland immediately, hoping to see her before she died, but was informed of her death before he reached London. Campbell described the journey as one of the most painful moments in his life, receiving ‘the heart-breaking telegrams that awaited me at the different calling places en route’. It was during his journey back to London that he decided to gift One Tree Hill Estate to the public, ‘to give practical effect to what had long been in possession of my mind, the bestowal of a great Park to Auckland’.

Campbell’s decision to gift the One Tree Hill Estate to the public, made at one of the most traumatic moments in his life, was bound closely with his most intimate connections with his family and friends and his links with Italy. After Ida’s funeral, Campbell spent the winter in Rome with Emma and his only remaining child, Winifred. It was there that he outlined the bequest of the park in his will, and decided to name it Corinth Park, after the city on the Greek peninsula. At the same time, Campbell decided to ‘adorn it, but not crowd it, with works of art in bronze and marble from the great ancients and modern masters’. While in Rome, he asked his friend Frank Connelly to produce an Italianate fountain as a centrepiece of the new park.

Though he made extensive plans for incorporating Mediterranean elements into his estate, the olive grove is the only aspect of Campbell’s Mediterranean plans that materialized. It is one of the few traces of Campbell’s interior life at this pivotal moment, giving insight into the more complex and fluid side of this ‘quintessential Aucklander’, as Stone described him.
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93 Correspondence Frank Connelly to John Logan Campbell, 30 August 1882, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS51-258B, AWMM; Memo of Agreement, 22 September 1881, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS51-258A-7-3, AWMM.
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Campbell may have been the epitome of an emotionally reticent and self-contained Victorian male in his business relationships and public life, but his Mediterranean plans for the One Tree Hill Estate in the 1870s suggest an identity that was more intricate and multidimensional.95

Although Campbell decided to gift his estate to the people of New Zealand in 1880, it was not until 1901 that he formally handed it over to the public. In the meantime, he continued to run the property as a private estate, and the public remained unaware of his future plans to make it a park. Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, Campbell continued to work on the olive grove, with the help of several other individuals who influenced its development. In 1879, for example, he imported olive scions from Adelaide to graft onto the seedlings in his nursery, but they dried out on the journey across the Tasman and only 250 of the 5000 grafts survived.96 Campbell kept the seedlings in the nursery for another year and then tried again, using the 250 grafted seedlings to graft with his remaining stock.97

Campbell’s accounts show that for this second attempt at grafting, he paid a Captain James to do the work.98 Robert James does not appear in any published works on Auckland, but newspaper reports indicate he had one of the largest orchards in the district at the time, and was one of the only European settlers experimenting on a large scale with sub-tropical fruits such as grapes.99 In around 1881, at the time he was employed by Campbell to graft the olive trees, James established a 20 acre nursery in Waterview, filled with various fruit varieties, which the New Zealand Herald described as the best example in the district of ‘what industry, practical skill, and capital can accomplish’.100 His success was largely attributed to the fact that he was American rather than British. As one newspaper article reported: ‘Captain James

96 New Zealand Herald, 9 May 1887, p.6; ‘Olive Culture Expenditure’, MS51-262-2, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM.
97 New Zealand Herald, 9 May 1887, p.6.
98 ‘Olive Culture Expenditure’, MS51-262-2, John Logan Campbell Papers, AWMM.
100 New Zealand Herald, 24 June 1882, p.6.
is an American, and like many of his countrymen, has quick and cheap ways of doing some things which Britons do not think of".  
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In this satellite image of part of Cornwall Park, the extent of the original olive grove is shown in the shaded area. The remaining olive trees can be seen dotted across the shaded area. The plateau is situated in the middle of the image, where the cluster of buildings is now located. Google images, 2017.

James’ grafting work was successful, and in 1883, 2500 plants were transferred from the nursery to the north-west slopes of the One Tree Hill Estate, covering an area of around 22 acres.102 The new site for the olive trees was described in the press as ‘all that could be desired for this important work. The paddock contains about 30 acres of the richest volcanic soil, it lies on a northern aspect, and is well sheltered by the mountain, and a belt of trees on the south-west side.’103 The site of the olive grove had been part of the extensive garden area

101 Southern Cross, 9 August 1875, p.3. Campbell must have regarded his work highly, because in 1887 he asked Thomas Hardy, the Australian vintner, if he could find work for James on his vineyard. John Logan Campbell papers, MS51-262-8, AWMM.
102 Auckland Star, 6 September 1883, p.2.
103 Auckland Star, 6 September 1883, p.2.
mentioned previously, known as Ngā-māra-o-Tahuri. When archaeologists recently inspected a portion of the site, they found the topsoil mixed through with finely fragmented shellfish middens, which had probably washed down from the terraces above the grove over time. The sheltered site, with its fertile soils mixed through with shellfish created a perfect free-draining site for the olive grove.

When a reporter from the *New Zealand Herald* visited the grove in 1887, the trees were about six feet high, and the reporter described the plants as presenting ‘a rather unusual appearance in this part of the world’. The grove stood out in the suburb of Epsom, which at the time was filled with ‘comfortable cottages …. succeeded by neat and thriving farms, with fields of rich grass well fenced and subdivided, where troops of healthy stock are busy converting the grass and clover into milk’. From the middle of the grove, according to the reporter, the rows of trees planted 20 feet apart appeared to ‘radiate from the visitor’s point of observation from whatever portion of the plantation he looks around him’. Campbell had planted his orchard in a quincunx pattern – like the five on a dice. It was a pattern that Europeans had long used to create order in nature, but Campbell was probably unaware that the quincunx also echoed the planting pattern used by Māori for hundreds of years at gardens such as Maungakiekie for kūmara and taro cultivations.

---

This archaeological map of Maungakiekie shows the renowned gardens of Tahuri during the Te Waiōhua occupation of the site, around the lower slopes of the volcanic cone (labelled Nga Maratahuri). ‘Defences of Maungakiekie Pa’, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS 51, Auckland War Memorial Museum Library.

By 1887 the olive trees were already producing fruit and attracting a great deal of interest locally and around the country, including in Dunedin, where the *Otago Daily Times* reported that ‘the result of his operations will be watched with interest’.\(^{111}\) The reporter observed that ‘[t]wo varieties of olives are grown, but the names, unfortunately, have not been kept. One is

\(^{111}\) *Otago Daily Times*, 13 July 1887, p.4. See also *Evening Star*, 13 June 1887, p.3 and *New Zealand Herald*, 9 May 1887, p.6.
much smaller than the other, though both appear to be remarkably fertile—many of the trees carrying as much fruit as will fill several buckets when the olives are ripe.'

When Campbell organized the pressing of the first olives that year, he sought the advice of Signor Giovanni Federli. Federli, an Italian immigrant, had arrived in New Zealand in the 1870s along with a small group of Italians who were offered free passage and employment by the New Zealand government during Vogel’s public works era. At first, Federli and other Italian immigrants tried to establish a vineyard at Jackson’s Bay on the west coast of the South Island, where they had been sent by the government. Unsurprisingly, given the local climate, the venture failed. Many of the immigrants subsequently struggled to survive in New Zealand, with no work or capital and an increasingly hostile environment for non-British immigrants as the depression began to bite.

Federli, however, managed to find another job with the government, and set about trying to persuade local and central government to provide incentives for the development of subtropical crops in New Zealand. In 1884 he embarked on a nationwide tour of New Zealand to investigate sub-tropical crops currently being grown in the country, and the suitability of each region for the development of these industries. He was optimistic about the prospects for the industries: ‘if the people – farmers and settlers particularly, would rouse themselves, and get out of the old groove which they had worked in for years, the colony had a glorious future before it’.

At first Federli received considerable support for his ideas, with Auckland leaders agreeing to finance him if the government provided land and Italian immigrants to oversee the operations. Māori were also keen to support the venture, with one tribal chief in the Hokianga saying he would donate the land if the government would provide an Italian family to teach them how to grow the crops.

---
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Campbell’s first attempt at pressing his olives coincided with Federli’s opening lecture at the Industrial Association Exhibition in Auckland in 1887. Campbell’s olive grove provided Federli with the opportunity to expound the potential success of the industry and promote it to the rest of New Zealand. He spent a week overseeing the first pressing of the olive oil and preparing samples for display at the exhibition.  

Federli brought branches of Campbell’s olive trees, laden with fruit, with him to the lecture, and praised Campbell’s ‘pluck’ in planting the olive grove without government support. He declared the grove ‘a great success, and the oil … was equal to the best produced in Lucca’. Federli also assisted with promoting Campbell’s oil around the country, sending news of the first pressing to the chief scientist, James Hector, who in turn forwarded it to the Prime Minister, Julius Vogel.  

To further complicate the story, for almost the entire time that Campbell maintained the olive grove at Maungakiekie, from at least 1887 to 1908, there was also a Chinese-run market garden operating beneath the olive trees. According to historian Russell Stone, Campbell had given up on the olive grove when he leased the land to Ming Quong in 1892, but in fact, it seems that Campbell operated the market garden alongside the olive grove as a way of maximizing income from the land. Furthermore, it appears that the market garden may have actually improved the condition of the olive grove. One Herald reporter who visited the site in 1887 attributed the healthy and vigorous growth of the olive trees to the constant ploughing and weeding by the market gardener and the application of manure to the soil:  

‘One cause of the vigour with which they are growing may be found in the circumstance that the ground in which they are planted is used as a market garden’. In fact’, he continued, ‘it would seem that one of the leading principles of modern culture of fruit trees has been applied quite unexpectedly to this olive plantation’. Ming Quong ran the market garden at the olive grove until he left New Zealand in 1900, but the land continued to be used as a
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120 Correspondence Union Oil, Soap and Candle Co. to John Logan Cambpell, 24 August 1887, MS51-262-2, John Logan Campbell papers, AWMM; Evening Star, 13 June 1887, p.3; New Zealand Herald, 2 July 1887, Supplement, p.1.  
121 New Zealand Herald, 9 July 1887, p.5.  
123 New Zealand Herald, 9 May 1887, p.6; Correspondence S. Chiles to John Logan Campbell, 18 August 1908, John Logan Campbell papers, MS51-265-1, AWMM.  
124 See, for example, Stone, The Father and His Gift, p.119.  
125 New Zealand Herald, 9 May 1887, p.6.  
126 New Zealand Herald, 9 May 1887, p.6.
market garden until 1908, when it was suggested to Campbell that he remove the market
garden because it was destroying the trees’ fibrous roots.127

In 1892, the Auckland Star reported that the olive grove was thriving and its future prospects
were looking good:

> Dr. Campbell's oliveyard at One Tree Hill is an evidence of [the olive’s] great
> adaptation to the climate of this country. Italians who have seen this oliveyard say
> that for vigorous and healthy growth, and for early and abundant bearing, they
> have rarely seen it surpassed in Italy. The olive requires to be made into oil before
> its advantages can be fully realised. But for pure olive oil there is always a good
> market, more especially because in this adulterating age olive oil, so called, is
> largely composed of cotton seed oil and other inferior products.128

The reporter predicted that Campbell would become renowned for his role in the
establishment of the olive industry, but it was the rich soils, worked by Māori for hundreds of
years, the grafting skills of the American, the knowledge of the Italian immigrant, and the
practices of the Chinese market gardener, that came together in the production of the first
batch of olive oil and pickled olives in New Zealand. These connections highlight the
different knowledge systems and practices that helped to shape ‘scientific’ agricultural
projects in the late nineteenth century.129 While these wider trajectories are not easily
traceable in the historic records, their traces can be detected in the evolving practices and
networks of particular places. These ‘vectors of assemblage’, as historians David Chambers
and Richard Gillespie have called them, allow practices outside of western science to become
more visible, along with the multiple understandings of the physical world that often operated
alongside one another in a single place.130 Much like the process of grafting, Māori, Italian,
American, Chinese and British ideas and practices became inextricably linked with the olive
grove as it evolved.

↑↑↑↑↑

Campbell continued to press and preserve olives from the grove throughout the 1890s. He
initially used the press belonging to the Union Oil, Soap and Candle Factory, a company
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mainly dealing with mutton fat for soap and candles. The olives were first crushed, then the pulp was put into canvas bags, which were put in the press. After good returns initially, the yields began to drop and he invested in a screw press from McCroskin & Son, which specialized in wine and olive oil production. The yields improved with the new press, but continued to be variable over the following years.

During this period, Campbell corresponded with producers and distributors in Australia, California, and Portugal, seeking advice about olive cultivars, pressing techniques and potential markets. He sent samples of his olive oil and pickled olives to Portugal, where experts gave it very favourable reviews, calling it ‘fine and bright’. J.W. Burmester, the port-maker, reported that the oil was ‘very much liked by connoisseurs [sic] who saw them’, and that ‘the pickled olives are very good and much liked. They look & taste indeed like South
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French’.  

Things did not go so well in California, however, when Campbell tried to break into the market. In 1894 he sent four jars of olives to San Francisco, hoping to sell them in a grocery store, but they all leaked during the journey. Campbell’s agent in California wrote with the following verdict: ‘I saw the four jars opened, and with the cellarman, [and] half a dozen …. salesmen, I sampled the contents. I have not yet succeeded in getting the disagreeable bitter taste of the Auckland olives out of my palate …. I regret to say your olives are quite unsalable, because of their excessive bitterness, and nothing could be done with such an article in this market’.  

Alongside the olive grove, Campbell continued to farm cattle and sheep, selling meat, dairy and wool to the local markets and eventually in London, and to grow mixed crops, including potatoes, marigold wurzels (a type of turnip), oats and carrots for the local market. He still had not managed to find a market for his olives by the mid 1890s, and by this time, mutton, beef, dairy products and wool were becoming the mainstay of the New Zealand economy. Campbell’s business records trace this transformation. In the 1890s, the number of cattle and sheep on his property increased, and he began exporting wool to London and selling milk to a dairy factory that exported its goods to London. Historians have had many theories about why the grove ‘failed’, blaming the humidity, blight, sterile grafting plants, and poor varietal selection, but it appears that it was a lack of specialist equipment and knowledge about pressing processes that led to Campbell’s difficulties with yields and bottling.  

The ‘Mediterranean moment’ on One Tree Hill Estate was over, and the olive grove was neglected, gradually diminishing in size as trees died from storm damage or disease, or were removed to make way for roads, livestock or cricket grounds. By 1906, when a reporter visited the newly established Cornwall Park, the olive grove was considered charming but out of place in the park: ‘there on the western slope’, he wrote, ‘the grey green of the olive gardens, rich in innumerable trees, mingle softly with the whole [of the park]. Wind-torn and
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twisted, a forest in themselves, they lend a charm that is unspeakable – the witchery of strange and foreign things.\(^{139}\)

![View along olive grove in Cornwall Park, 1913. Sir George Grey Special Collections, 4-2490, Auckland Libraries.](image)

It was not until the 1980s that the next commercial olive grove was planted in New Zealand, and since then the olive industry has thrived. As it turns out, New Zealand is ideally suited to growing olives. Since 2014, staff at the Cornwall Park Trust have harvested the olives from Campbell’s olive grove several times and produced a small amount of olive oil with the help of olive-growers Margaret and John Edwards. Margaret, who is an international olive oil judge, said the oil from Cornwall Park had excellent flavours and was one of the most interesting olive oils she has ever tasted.\(^{140}\) These processes of harvesting, pressing and consuming the oil, have reinvigorated the histories of the olive grove, creating performative links with the lived experiences of forgotten communities as well as a new, embodied archive that reminds us of the entanglements between the human and material world both in the past
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\(^{139}\) *New Zealand Herald*, 8 December 1906, Supplement, p.1.

\(^{140}\) Margaret and John Edwards, pers. comm., 24 August, 2016.
The connections of taste with the past are amongst the most faint and delicate, much like our historical connections with those that worked on the olive grove. Campbell’s Mediterranean plans for his estate were not a rejection of English grasses and pasture plants. Rather, the olive grove demonstrates that a number of influences converged on One Tree Hill Estate in the late nineteenth century. As historian Joseph M. Hodge has argued, by following networks the historian can recognize that ‘multiple colonial projects and discourses existed in tandem’ which sometimes competed with or contradicted each other. While it is important to acknowledge the dominance of the British Empire in shaping New Zealand, as well as the unevenness of power between various individuals and communities connected with these places, following the connections generated from particular places also reveals complexities, contradictions and nuances in colonial place-making that often get overlooked by historians.

Campbell’s olive trees reveal that even on the estate of the one of the most prominent, successful British settlers in Auckland, there were alternative articulations of empire at work. The olive grove had no singular lineage, but was a hybrid system that incorporated Māori, North American, Italian, and Chinese ideas and practices, as well as the British practices that have been well documented by historians of the nineteenth century. Interrogating the forgotten corners of one of the city’s iconic landscapes shows the finer, more variegated workings of a local community over time, as well as the wider international networks that were generated from this particular place.

---


The olive oil produced by the Cornwall Park Trust Board in 2014. Photo by Lucy Mackintosh, 2016.
CHAPTER FIVE
‘The Ideal Home’: The Ah Chee Market Gardens and Auckland Domain 1880–1920

At the Auckland War Memorial Museum there is a collection of objects that belonged to the Ah Chee family, who lived and worked on a market garden adjoining the Auckland Domain for almost forty years from 1882. The artefacts were discovered in 2007, following the demolition of the Carlaw Park sports stadium, which had replaced the market gardens in 1920.1 During the excavations, archaeologists uncovered traces of the Ah Chee family house, the surrounding garden field systems, and hundreds of gardening, cooking, and recreational items used by the Ah Chee family when they lived on the property. The discovery opened up a world that has been largely left out of histories of Auckland and erased from the land. Places have a way of disrupting the carefully crafted narratives on their surfaces. The remnants of the Ah Chee market garden offer glimpses of a Chinese immigrant community that was closely connected with the European settler communities in Auckland at the turn of the twentieth century, but that also operated with different assumptions, processes and networks that have not been as readily acknowledged or understood as those of the mainstream English-speaking European settlers in New Zealand at the time.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some of Auckland’s earliest Chinese market gardens were established in the Domain and on its borders.2 As well as Ah Chee’s gardens adjoining the Domain, Ah Hung had market gardens in the Domain from 1879 until 1882, and Yet Lee operated a market garden on the site of the former government gardens in the Domain (discussed in Chapter Two) from 1883 until at least 1906.3 Today, there is no sign of these Chinese communities or their market gardens in the Auckland Domain. Much like the Māori histories of the Domain, discussed in Chapter Two, the Chinese presence in the Domain has been erased from the landscape and largely forgotten by Aucklanders. Instead, what remains from this period are the tea-house and bandstand that were built for the 1913-14 Auckland Industrial, Agricultural and Mining Exhibition in the Domain. The tea-house, in particular, is well known and much loved by Aucklanders, who have stopped there for tea,
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scones and ice-creams for over 100 years. It was designed in the ‘English domestic style’ and sits comfortably within the wider picturesque and Victorian garden setting of the Domain.4

The tea-house, built for the Auckland Exhibition in 1913-14, with the duck ponds in front. Sir George Grey Special Collections, 1-W1757, Auckland Libraries, 1921.

The rustic design of the tea-house, also known as a kiosk, reinforces the prevailing view amongst many historians and the wider public that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, New Zealand renewed its tight links with Britain.5 As discussed in the previous chapter, James Belich has argued that from the 1880s, ‘New Zealand identity fit[ted] neatly within a British one’.6 The tea-house’s status as a symbol of its time has been further reinforced by the notion that it was designed as an ‘Ideal Home’. In its 1993 guide to the Domain, Auckland Council stated that the tea-house was intended to represent an ‘ideal New Zealand house, to show visitors to the Exhibition how they might live in the future’.7 In fact, the tea-house was never a domestic building. It was designed for commercial purposes, and was meant to serve as a tribute to the merchants who paid for its construction. But its retrospective misnomer has further reinforced the idea of a very English sense of home being crafted in the Auckland Domain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

6 Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.30.
Renovations on the tea-house in 1992, for example, sought to recreate the ‘Ideal Home’ of the early twentieth century by creating a ‘romantic, relaxed Colonial Raj ambience that befitted such a fine old building’.  

Although imperial links between Britain and New Zealand were evident in the 1913-14 Auckland Exhibition in the Domain, the Chinese market gardens operating nearby indicate that civic identities in Auckland at this time were not as homogenous as the ‘Ideal Home’ might suggest. While the exhibition helped foster the construction of a collective civic identity in Auckland, one centred upon Anglo-Saxon settlers, connections with empire and scenic beauty, at the same time the Ah Chee family lived and worked on their Mechanics Bay gardens at the bottom of the same hill. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Ah Chee’s established one of the most successful fruit and vegetable businesses in Auckland, built extensive commercial networks throughout New Zealand and the world, and successfully negotiated their way through life in Auckland. Unlike the olive grove at Cornwall Park, discussed in Chapter Four, in which individuals from diverse communities were involved in a project conceived and led by a prominent European settler, the house and market gardens of the Ah Chee family operated independently from the projects of their European neighbours. At their home and market garden, the Ah Chees created their own world. They were closely connected with Auckland’s European settlers, but their lives also evolved in different and lasting ways.


---

8 Home and Building, April/May 1992, p.107.
Though the stories of the Ah Chee family and other Chinese market gardeners in and around the Domain are no longer be visible on the ground, their traces were temporarily reinscribed back on the landscape in 2007 before being dismantled and covered over again under concrete. The erasure of the Ah Chee market garden from the landscape and its subsequent re-discovery, reflect the historiographical record in New Zealand. Throughout much of the twentieth century there was little historical research on Chinese life in New Zealand, apart from the work produced by a few historians such as Manying Ip and James Ng. Tony Ballantyne has argued that New Zealand historians have consistently ‘written out’ Asian histories in an effort to create a coherent narrative about New Zealand as a bi-cultural nation of British immigrants and Māori. From the late nineteenth century, Ballantyne argues, concepts of a national identity began to develop around ideas of cultural nationalism based on social progress and political enlightenment. This resulted in increasingly restrictive immigration regimes for Chinese in New Zealand from the 1880s and the exclusion of Chinese communities from national histories. Even at the turn of the twenty-first century, when the New Zealand government formally apologized for implementing an entry tax for Chinese immigrants (known as the poll tax), a member of the Wellington Chinese community was still able to comment that ‘[l]ittle has been written of the Chinese in the general histories of this country’.

Since the early 2000s, historians have shifted towards transnational, subaltern and environmental histories, and have begun to examine different aspects of Chinese communities in the Western world. The archaeological investigations of the Ah Chee market gardens in 2007 opened up aspects of New Zealand’s history that until then had received very little attention from scholars. More recently, works by Lily Lee and Ruth Lam, and Joanna Boileau have also made significant contributions on the history of Chinese market gardening.

in New Zealand. In addition, local historians and descendants of the Ah Chee family have conducted historical research into the Ah Chee family and have recorded family histories. These works have begun to provide a fuller picture of the experiences of Chinese immigrant communities, but there are still significant gaps in the historical record. As Ballantyne commented in 2012, ‘the history of these mobile groups … remains largely unwritten’.

The Chinese market gardens operating on and around the Domain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries highlight the complexities of Auckland communities at that time. In places that were potent locations for crafting European settler civic identities, non-European communities were also engaging deeply with those same places, generating different ideas of localness, identity and belonging. These other communities were closely entwined with European settler cultural, social and economic networks, but were also separate from mainstream processes. By recovering the wider histories of this landscape at this time, it is possible to track different processes of community formation in this part of Auckland as well as exploring the ways that these processes interacted with or diverged from the more mainstream ideas of civic identity which were being developed simultaneously. The rakes, meat cleavers, storage containers, fan tan counters, tea sets, and cooking utensils from the Ah Chee family that were uncovered during the 2007 excavations further complicate the narratives of collective memory constructed in our landscapes.

ÓÓÓÓÓ

In 1882, Chan Ah Chee (also known as Chan Dar-Chee) took over the lease of 7 ¼ acres (3 hectares) at the foot of the Domain and began to build a home and market garden on the property, which he named Kong Foong Yuen (Garden of Prosperity). Ah Chee had arrived in New Zealand from Guangdong (then known as Canton) in 1867 at the age of 16. He was
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17 The lease was formalized in 1882. The document was also signed by Ah Sec (or Ah Sea), but nothing more is known about him: *Auckland Star*, 7 January 1929, p.11. According to Lily Lee and Ruth Lam, family history records show that Ah Chee was working on the site prior to formally leasing the land in 1882. Lily Lee and Ruth Lam, ‘Chan Dah Chee’, n.p.; https://timespanner.blogspot.co.nz/2009/08/domains-three-chinese-gardens.html, accessed 15 November 2017.
one of many who migrated to New Zealand from Guangdong at the time. His home province had a long history of emigration (including those who had followed the gold rush to California and Australia) and had recently experienced significant environmental, political and social upheaval.\textsuperscript{19} According to his descendants, Ah Chee originally intended to go to the Otago gold mines along with most other Chinese immigrants to New Zealand, but he decided to disembark in Auckland after suffering from sea sickness on the journey from China.\textsuperscript{20}

At the time he arrived, Ah Chee was one of only a handful of Chinese immigrants in Auckland.\textsuperscript{21} The Domain and surrounding streets were some of the earliest sites gardened by Chinese immigrants, who had begun to establish market gardens in the area by the mid-1870s.\textsuperscript{22} As early as 1879, Ah Hung leased land on Stanley Street from the Domain Board on behalf of ‘the Chinese gardeners’.\textsuperscript{23} Most, like Ah Chee, came from farming backgrounds and were attracted to sites with volcanic soils, access to fresh water, proximity to town and leasable land.\textsuperscript{24} By 1881, there were sufficient Chinese living in Auckland to prompt the \textit{New Zealand Herald} to report on ‘a few facts concerning those resident in the city’.\textsuperscript{25} Most Chinese in Auckland, according to the article, were working in market gardens and selling fresh produce door to door, although some had established shops for ‘fancy goods’ and opened restaurants and hotels.\textsuperscript{26} Ah Chee apparently worked at first as an itinerant hawker in town before securing the lease for the land adjoining the Domain in 1882, the same year he became a naturalized New Zealander.\textsuperscript{27}
Ah Chee’s garden was on Crown land, apparently inside the early northern boundaries of the Domain.\textsuperscript{28} It was formerly swampy land that had been filled over the years, and was intersected by the Waipapa River, which flowed from the Domain ponds out to Mechanics Bay (also known as Waipapa). The site had been much modified in the first 40 years of European settlement, as industries established themselves in the Bay and reclamation works began. In 1843, James Robertson established a rope works on the level ground between the swamp and the rising land, and shortly afterwards Joseph Low and William Motion set up a flour mill and mill race on the site, diverting the stream as a source of power.\textsuperscript{29} In 1851, the Crown granted the land as a hospital endowment but continued to lease it to various

\textsuperscript{28} See Roll Plan 61, Archives New Zealand, Auckland, created sometime before 1847 when the hospital was built (the hospital and the Māori hostel are drawn onto the plan in pencil sometime after the plan was completed), which shows the northern boundary of the Domain coming up to the confluence of the rivers draining into Mechanics Bay. See also Brian Rudman, \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 5 February 2006, p.2 for further discussion of this issue.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 25 August 1903, p.7.
businesses, including a bakery and a tannery. During the 1870s the site was also used as a nursery by several European nurserymen and seedsmen.

As discussed in Chapter Two, Waipapa was a major gathering point for Māori in the 1840s and 1850s. It was the main arrival point for Māori visiting Auckland, with a Māori hostel for accommodating visitors, several Māori churches and a fresh produce market. Māori and Europeans regularly swam in the mill dam, and an annual ‘Native Feast’ was held at Robertson’s Ropeworks to celebrate the Queen’s birthday. After the Waikato War of 1863, however, and the subsequent confiscations of Māori land, Māori trade with Auckland was interrupted and the area was no longer well-used by Māori, although the Māori hostel remained there until 1967. Reclamations began in the 1870s to accommodate the new railway line connecting Auckland with the lower North Island, a line that crossed land recently confiscated from Māori in the Waikato and the King Country. By 1884, commented one newspaper reporter, the hostel was run down and empty, ‘the children of Nature having faded away before the hardier colonist’. With Māori now engaging less with the city than they had done in early colonial Auckland, Chinese immigrants began to provide fresh produce for its residents.

ÓÓÓÓÓ

By the time Ah Chee took over the lease of the Mechanics Bay property, the area had become a busy manufacturing district, and several of the springs running into Mechanics Bay were already affected by pollution. The ‘hospital’ spring and the ‘graveyard spring’ (presumably the water draining from the Symonds Street Cemetery) were marked as polluted on an early
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33 Daily Southern Cross, 27 May 1851, p.2.
35 Fill for the reclaimed land at Mechanics Bay was provided by destroying the nearby Government Reserve on which the Māori Church, St Barnabas, was situated. New Zealand Herald, 9 February 1872, p.3.
plan of the site of Ah Chee’s gardens, while the springs in the Domain were still considered ‘pure’. 37 With the rapid expansion of industry in central Auckland, residents began moving out to the suburbs, but Ah Chee and many other Chinese residents chose to stay in the inner city on properties where they could establish their gardens on leased land, close to the expanding industrial and transport networks connected with their businesses. 38

Even though the site had been under environmental pressure for many years, Ah Chee’s lease contained a condition stating that he had to cultivate the soil in a ‘proper and husbandman-like manner and so as not to unduly impoverish the soil’. 39 Ah Chee used, repurposed and built upon the existing structures and features on the site to create his home and gardens. Over time, he filled the tannery pits with rubble and covered with them with topsoil to use as gardens, raised the level of the ground using bottles and other rubbish to prevent flooding on the site, as earlier residents had done, and imported rich, fertile soil for his crops. 40 By 1886, he had built a house on the property, repurposing bricks and wood from a nearby site to build a surrounding courtyard. 41

As well as adopting the resources and methods used by earlier occupants of the site, Ah Chee also integrated them into his own framework, converting this European industrial site into a place that reflected his own practices and beliefs. The orientation of the Ah Chee house, for instance, was not aligned with the existing European structures on the property nor with the cadastral boundaries. Archaeologists have argued that the Ah Chees used the principles of feng shui to decide on a suitable position and orientation for their home. 42 In their excavations, archaeologists also uncovered a path leading from the courtyard to a mature beech tree beside the stream, which may have been planted by the previous nurserymen occupying the site. 43 The lack of a bridge, or other indications of a working area, has led them to conclude that Ah Chee and his family may have used this space as a shrine, or place of rest. 44 Unlike most European spaces in the city, there was also no physical separation

37 IA1.1860/266, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
41 Archaeology Solutions Ltd, ‘Kong Foong Luen, Gardens of Prosperity’, p.203
43 In 1878, Robert Baird advertised beech trees from his Mechanics Bay nursery, along with many other species. New Zealand Herald, 27 August, 1878, p.4.
between the commercial and domestic spaces on the Ah Chee property, other than drains around the house. The house and courtyard led straight into the gardens and the packing and processing areas, reflecting a close integration of home and work practiced by many Chinese immigrants, in contrast with the approach of European settlers at the time, who tended to keep their private domestic spaces separate from other aspects of their lives.

In her recent study of Chinese market gardeners in New Zealand and Australia, Joanna Boileau has described the long history of intensive cereal and vegetable cultivation in Southern China, and identified a number of key horticultural techniques that Chinese migrants brought with them to New Zealand. These included crop rotation, intercropping and inlaid cropping, soil preparation using animal and human manure and vegetable compost, the individual handling of each plant using hand tools, and the creation of irrigation channels and drains. Signs of these intensive gardening practices were found throughout the site by archaeologists, who discovered a thick layer of enriched soil on the surface, gardening implements such as hoes and shovels scattered across the site and the jagged edge of spade marks still etched into the dirt.

---

47 Boileau, Chinese Market Gardening in Australia and New Zealand, pp.27-35.
Amongst the rakes, knives, ginger jars, rice bowls and Chinese brownware containers found on the site, archaeologists also unearthed an English tea pot and tea cups decorated in the English willow pattern made by Doulton & Co. (later Royal Doulton) sometime between 1891 and 1902.\textsuperscript{49} They noted that the lack of Chinese teaware in the Ah Chee market garden was unusual, commenting that the family probably used this European teaware for entertaining. One such occasion was recorded in a newspaper article in 1894, when Lady Glasgow (wife of the Governor of New Zealand) and her daughters visited Chan Ah Chee and his wife Rain Ah Chee at their home in the Domain:

On a recent Monday afternoon Lady Glasgow sent a note to her greengrocer (Ah Chee) that she and her daughters would pay him a visit at his home at Mechanics’ Bay Gardens on the following day. At the time appointed the ladies duly arrived, and were entertained by Mrs Ah Chee. The Ladies Boyle played and sang, partook of afternoon tea, fruit, etc. and the whole party (yellow and white) had a good time. Lady Glasgow requested a photo of the Chee family group for her album, and the delighted Chee immediately ordered a splendid enlarged photo. Ah Chee forwarded Lord Glasgow a present of half-a-dozen silk handkerchiefs from the Flowery Land. Aren’t the opposition greengrocers just mad!\textsuperscript{50}


Ah Chee had married Rain See (Joong Chew Lee) in 1886, at the Auckland Registry Office.\textsuperscript{51} Rain See had arrived in the country only a month before her wedding and was one of only a few Chinese women in New Zealand at the time. The event attracted considerable attention as it appears to have been the first Chinese wedding in Auckland.\textsuperscript{52} ‘Yesterday morning a

\textsuperscript{49} Archaeology Solutions Ltd, ‘Kong Foong Luen, ‘Gardens of Prosperity’, p.141.
\textsuperscript{50} Observer, 31 March 1894, p.6.
\textsuperscript{51} New Zealand Herald, 23 January 1886, p.2.
\textsuperscript{52} New Zealand Herald, 22 January 1886, p.2; Tuapeka Times, 17 February 1886, p.6; Ip, Dragons on the Long White Cloud, p.42.
most unusual incident took place, namely the marriage of two parties hailing from the Flowery Land’, reported the *New Zealand Herald*.\(^{53}\) Rain See wore colourful traditional dress and according to the press ‘manifested considerable shyness during the ordeal’.\(^{54}\) According to her descendants, she was highly educated and spoke English, which was unusual for Chinese immigrants at the time.\(^{55}\)

The newspaper report of the tea party hints at the complex relationships navigated between the Governor’s wife and children and the Ah Chee family in 1894. While the British teaware found on the site suggests that the Ah Chee family was conforming to the protocols of a predominantly British colonial settler society in Auckland, the willow-pattern tea cups were also a reminder of mutual borrowing and exchanges between Asia and Britain over many centuries. The tea cups were decorated with a blue and white willow pattern, the standard pattern of almost all British pottery manufacturers in the nineteenth century. Although the willow pattern may have been considered archetypally British by the end of the nineteenth century, the design was derived from eighteenth century Chinese porcelain designs imported into Britain. British manufacturers copied the Chinese designs, incorporating scenes from a fabricated Chinese love story set in a Chinese landscape with a willow tree, pergolas, a bridge and Chinese figures. As Lady Glasgow and Rain See brought their tea-cups to their lips on that brief social occasion in Auckland in 1894, the willow patterns hovered between them, telling their own story of the long history of Chinese influence on British culture and practices.

During the visit of the Glasgow family, the Ah Chee family followed the British norms of drinking tea and playing the piano, there are also indications that the family may have been using the English social practices for the traditional Chinese practice of guanxi.\(^{56}\) According to historian Jane Lydon, Chinese immigrants in nineteenth century Australia developed strong connections based on clan and places of origin, which extended to neighbours and business associates, maintaining these connections through gifts and hospitality.\(^{57}\) Lydon has shown the ongoing centrality of the practice of guanxi, a system of relationships and mutual dependencies developed through systems of obligation and indebtedness, in the everyday lives of Chinese merchants in Sydney. The merchants she explained, ‘were nodes in a wide-

\(^{53}\) *New Zealand Herald*, 22 January 1886, p.2.

\(^{54}\) *Taranaki Herald*, 27 January 1886, p.4.


\(^{56}\) Adamson and Bader, ‘Gardening to Prosperity’, p.144.

\(^{57}\) Lydon, *Many Inventions*, p.87.
cast net of business and trade, kinship, native-place and neighbourhood ties, patterned on Chinese family structure’. If we view the visit of Lady Glasgow in this context, then the tea ceremony, photographs and gifts such as the silk handkerchiefs were designed to create and nurture bonds between the Ah Chee family and the Governor’s family. These expensive, rare gifts were important devices for carrying out the practice of guanxi, and brought key European members of the community into existing Chinese systems and practices, even if those individuals were unaware of it themselves.

Ah Chee’s efforts to nurture strong relationships with his European colleagues helped him gain their support in 1892, when he faced prosecution for receiving stolen goods. Though Ah Chee denied knowing the goods were stolen, the facts of the case proved hard to establish, and the defence rested largely on testaments to Ah Chee’s good character. Ten of the ‘leading citizens of Auckland’ testified to Ah Chee’s character, including prominent Auckland businessmen such as L.D. Nathan, J.M. Geddes, and Henry Hesketh. The men all testified to ‘his general reputation for honesty and honourable conduct’, with Nathan stating that ‘the heathen Chinese in this instance was a model to half the commercial community’. The case was subsequently dismissed.

Like other Chinese residents in Auckland, Ah Chee used his market garden at Mechanics Bay as a base for expanding his business. By 1883 he had established his first greengrocer shop in Queen Street, and over the next few years he opened several more stores in central Auckland as well as a number of dining rooms that offered meals and board. By investing profits in New Zealand businesses, as historian James Beattie has pointed out, merchants such as Ah Chee developed new industries and opened new networks across the Pacific. As well as selling the produce from his own gardens, Ah Chee engaged in the lucrative business of exporting native New Zealand tree fungus (Auricularia polytricha) to China, possibly in conjunction with other Chinese merchants in the North Island. Muk yee, or ‘wood ear’ was highly prized by the Chinese and by 1890, 46% of New Zealand’s total value of exports to
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58 Lydon, Many Inventions, p.87.
59 New Zealand Herald, 3 December 1892, p.3.
60 New Zealand Herald, 5 December 1892, p.3.
62 New Zealand Herald, 10 May 1883, p.6; Auckland Star, 4 October 1886, p.3; Auckland Star, 23 March 1887, p.5; Hawke’s Bay Herald, 30 June 1887, p.3; Auckland Star, 26 January 1888, p.1; Auckland Star, 24 May 1889, p.1; Observer, 1 June 1889, p.18.
64 In 1887, Ah Chee was advertising to buy fungus, either at Mechanics Bay, Wakefield Street, or at the Wharf Dining Rooms at 27 Queen Street. Auckland Star, 13 August 1887, p.2; Auckland Star, 26 September 1887, p.3; James Beattie, ‘Hungry Dragons’, p.137.
China and Hong Kong was provided by fungus; gold, by comparison, made up 32%. Ah Chee advertised for the fungus in Auckland newspapers, as well as advertising for tea, copper and other metals, fish fins and horse-shoes amongst other items.

As well as developing his own networks, Ah Chee also collaborated with European settlers to open up new markets. ‘A somewhat novel industry is to be started here shortly’, reported the New Zealand Herald: ‘It seems that a Chinese merchant in this town has arranged a contract with certain Europeans, in which he undertakes to accept delivery from them for twelve months, of whatever quantity of dried mussels and koheroa [sic] they can supply’. Ah Chee constructed a long box for drying the mussels in Mechanics Bay, presumably on his market garden, as well as a drying shed. The mussels were gathered from the Firth of Thames and the Hauraki Gulf, while Toheroa, ‘a delicacy much prized by the Maoris’, was collected from the west coast of the upper North Island. By 1889, Ah Chee was exporting dried Toheroa to China and San Francisco, where, the paper reported, ‘they appear to be much appreciated by the Celestials’. In 1891, he also began growing tobacco in collaboration with a Mr Macrae who farmed at Māngere. Alongside his export business, Ah Chee imported fresh produce from other countries to sell in his stores. He established his own banana and ginger plantations in Fiji and sent his nephew there as an overseer, so that he could ensure a continuous supply of the produce for his Auckland shops.

By the turn of the twentieth century, Chan Ah Chee had established substantial food trading networks throughout Auckland and internationally. From his market gardens at Mechanics Bay, and later in other parts of Auckland, Ah Chee’s fresh produce was distributed directly to households throughout the rapidly expanding suburbs of Auckland and to the growing number of shops and dining establishments in the city. His networks also extended beyond New Zealand, to the shipping lines that connected New Zealand with the rest of the world, especially to South East Asia and North America.

To provide for his expanding business and networks, Ah Chee leased additional land in Arch Hill and Epsom in the 1890s, and in 1905 he purchased around 26 acres (10 hectares) of land
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66 Auckland Star, 17 January 1889, p.3.
67 New Zealand Herald, 11 June 1889, p.4.
68 New Zealand Herald, 11 June 1889, p.4; Auckland Star, 10 February 1890, p.3.
69 New Zealand Herald, 11 June 1889, p.4; Auckland Star, 10 February 1890, p.3.
70 New Zealand Herald, 26 February 1889, p.4; Auckland Star, 16 July 1891, p.9.
72 Bush Advocate, 5 November 1907, p.5.
at Avondale. In order to meet the demands of the growing town, Ah Chee and his employees worked long hours, sometimes breaking local by-laws to make their deadlines. He was fined on numerous occasions for opening his shop outside the legal opening hours, and for working in the gardens on a Sunday. In 1907 several of Ah Chee’s gardeners were charged with working on a Sunday, the day of rest in predominantly Christian Auckland: ‘Fourteen Chinese were charged at the Police Court to-day with gardening on Sunday. Mr Napier, for the defence, contended that ‘the men were engaged in a work of necessity. They were not digging new ground or engaged in the various ways of the market gardener, but were taking up vegetables. They were engaged by Ah Chee, who had something like 50 contracts to fill early every Monday morning for the supply of vegetables to various steamers and clubs, and it was impossible to carry out the work except by raising the vegetables on Sunday. Decision was reserved’.75

Like many Chinese immigrants in Western countries in the nineteenth century, the Ah Chee family developed strong connections with their local community. Chan Ah Chee was one of several Chinese residents who contributed to fundraising efforts for South African War troops in 1900 (who had been carrying out military exercises in the neighbouring Auckland
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73 Lee and Lam, Sons of the Soil: Chinese Market Gardeners in New Zealand, p.321.
74 Poverty Bay Herald, 7 November 1907, p.5.
75 Bush Advocate, 5 November 1907, p.5.
Domain), as well as for the nearby Auckland hospital in 1903, and the War Fund in 1914.\(^{76}\) At the Jubilee Sports Day in the Domain in 1890, which celebrated 50 years of the colony of New Zealand, Ah Chee helped organize a race between Chinese residents.\(^{77}\) The event, which was attended by the Governor and other officials, included gymnastics demonstrations and obstacle courses, but the Chinese contribution was considered the highlight: ‘One of the most novel features of the proceeding’, reported the *New Zealand Herald*,

was the Mongolian Race, the competitors being 25 Chinamen. They appeared in new costume, purchased for the occasion… When they trooped on to the ground they were received with great applause. The details of the race arranged by Messrs. Ah Kew and Ah Chee, who presented a large consignment of Chinese crackers…, and these were placed in the centre of the field and fired at the moment of starting the race. The sound of the exploding crackers was almost deafening and as packet after packet was thrown onto the heap, a great volume of smoke arose, accompanied with a noise like the discharge of artillery, which continued whilst the Chinamen were running, and for some time afterward.\(^{78}\)

At the Jubilee Sports Day, as with other aspects of his life, Ah Chee was closely connected with the Auckland community but his race also set him apart from the European settlers with whom he lived.

Chan and Rain See’s sons William, Clement and Arthur, all attended Auckland Grammar School and William and Clement were keen motor-car racers at Muriwai Beach.\(^{79}\) The Ah Chee children were also involved in organising local community events, with one of them organizing a curtain-raiser football match between Chinese teams before the National Football Association finals in 1927.\(^{80}\)

\(^{76}\) Images of the military exercises in the Domain were published in the *Auckland Weekly News*. See, for instance: Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, AWNS-19000302-7-7; *New Zealand Herald*, 22 February 1900, p.6; *Auckland Star*, 9 March 1903, p.5; *Auckland Star*, 15 August 1914, p.6.

\(^{77}\) *Auckland Star*, 28 January 1890, p.5.

\(^{78}\) *New Zealand Herald*, 24 January 1890, p.11.

\(^{79}\) The Ah Chees also apparently had twins who died at birth and a son named George, who died in 1894. Lily Lee and Ruth Lam, ‘Chan Dah Chee’, n.p.; Wong Hop, *The Journey of Two Families*, p.10.

\(^{80}\) *New Zealand Herald*, 21 September 1927, p.17.
In addition to developing relationships within the Auckland community and throughout New Zealand, Ah Chee also maintained close links with his networks in China, regularly returning there while he was living in Auckland. This cross-national, cross-cultural phenomenon has been identified by historians as a transnational migration network which operated amongst Chinese migrants throughout the Western world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\(^8^1\) Ah Chee imported Chinese products into New Zealand, distributing them through his Auckland stores, as well as exporting New Zealand goods to China.\(^8^2\) He also supported Chinese workers to immigrate to New Zealand to live and work on his market gardens.\(^8^3\) All the members of the Ah Chee family were actively involved in Chinese associations in Auckland and in the Chinese nationalist movement, headed by Sun Yat-Sen.\(^8^4\)

Chinese horticultural techniques shared much in common with British practices, and for this reason, according to Boileau, Chinese market gardening practices were reasonably well accepted in New Zealand.\(^8^5\) There was still considerable antagonism towards Chinese market gardeners by European settlers, however. Ah Chee and other Chinese in central Auckland had to deal with regular assaults and abuse, as well as stealing and vandalism in his gardens, much of it racially motivated. A poll tax was introduced for Chinese immigrants in 1881, and in the following years, immigration policies became increasingly punitive against
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\(^8^1\) Huping Ling, *Chinese Chicago: Race, Transnational Migration, and Community Since 1870*, Stanford, 2012, pp.5-6.

\(^8^2\) In 1887, Ah Chee was advertising Chinese goods for sale in his Wakefield store: *Auckland Star*, 23 March 1887, p.5.

\(^8^3\) Alexander Don’s Roll, in James Ng, *Round Hill; Alexander Don; Missions; Mixed Marriages; The Opium Evil*, vol. 3, Dunedin, 1999, p.235.

\(^8^4\) *New Zealand Herald*, 8 January 1929, p.12.

Chinese. \(^{86}\) While these measures reflected the ‘Pakeha identity crisis of the decades around 1900’, as James Belich suggests, Tony Ballantyne has pointed out that they were also central to the shaping of new visions of the nation as a social laboratory. \(^{87}\) The attacks on Chinese immigrants, he argues, were mobilized as part of the shoring up of New Zealand’s identity as a ‘working man’s paradise’, where citizens were guaranteed work at a reasonable wage. \(^{88}\) Ah Chee’s success, which was based on his own business systems that included working long hours for low pay, often outside hours considered acceptable by European standards, presented a threat to the evolving European settler culture at the time.

Ah Chee was attacked in his gardens in 1885 and throttled (but survived) under the railway bridge in Parnell in 1890. \(^{89}\) Another report details the assault of Ah Ching, a gardener, in the Domain, and several other Chinese men while they were watching the races in the Domain during the Queen’s Birthday celebrations in 1882. They were set upon by a group of young men who called them names such as ‘Ching Chong Chinaman’ and threw stones and cow-dung at them. A crowd of around 100 then followed the Chinese men home to their gardens in Stanley Street, attacking them, breaking the windows of Ah Ching’s house and pulling up his vegetables. In court, the bench said it was the first attack of this kind in Auckland and that it was ‘much regretted by the people of Auckland as Chinamen were a peaceful and industrious people’. \(^{90}\)

Racially motivated assaults continued throughout the 1880s and 1890s. In 1892 Ah Chee filed a complaint about his workers on the market garden being harassed by boys working at the adjacent ropeworks. ‘I rent and cultivate a large garden in your borough, and employ a number of workmen. These men are my own countrymen, and are being constantly annoyed by being pelted with stones by the boys employed at the ropeworks adjoining; and not only that, the boys also trespass on my gardens, and destroy the growing crops.’ \(^{91}\) Chinese residents in Auckland were also regularly arrested for playing the traditional Chinese


\(^{87}\) Belich, Paradise Reforged, p.229; Ballantyne, Webs of Empire, pp.56-8.

\(^{88}\) Ballantyne, Webs of Empire, pp.56-8.

\(^{89}\) Auckland Star, 7 February 1885, p.2; New Zealand Herald, 12 July 1890, p.4.

\(^{90}\) Auckland Star, 29 May 1882, p.2; New Zealand Herald, 30 May 1882, p.3. Other attacks on Chinese residents in Auckland are documented in New Zealand Herald, 7 June 1881, p.4; Auckland Star, 4 May 1887, p.5; Auckland Star, 27 July 1893, p.2; Auckland Star, 7 August 1902, p.2; Auckland Star, 7 September 1907, p.6.

\(^{91}\) New Zealand Herald, 5 July 1892, p.3.
gambling game fan-tan and smoking opium, which reinforced popular stereotypes of Chinese as opium, alcohol and gambling addicts.  

Only a couple of years after Ah Chee began operating his market garden at the foot of the Domain, another Chinese market gardener took over the lease of the government gardens in the Domain. In 1884, the Auckland Council, which had recently taken over the management of the Domain, leased the gardens to an unnamed ‘Chinaman’, ‘at a larger rental than ever has been obtained previously’. As with many early Chinese immigrants, very little is known about the Chinese occupants of the government gardens, but Ah Kong, Yet Lee and Chung Yong are all recorded as living on the site at various times. The gardens were known as ‘Chinaman’s Gardens’ until at least 1906, and they may have continued to operate up until the 1913-14 Auckland Exhibition.

Cropped image showing ‘Chinaman’s Gardens’ on the site of the former government gardens, denoted by the four square design. ‘Plan of the Auckland Domain’, by G.H.A. Purchas, surveyed for the Auckland City Council, 1890, Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, Map No. 4697.

As noted in Chapter Two, from 1840 to 1865 the Domain shifted from being a fluid space between ‘urban’ and ‘wild’, where Māori and European leaders explored notions of identity and co-existence in the nascent town of Auckland, to a European place with clearly defined
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92 See, for instance: Auckland Star, 29 June 1885, p.2. Ah Chee was also prosecuted for having ‘Chinese wine’ in his store, which he had imported from China, and which he claimed had been inspected and passed by customs officials. New Zealand Herald, 30 June 1887, p.2.

93 New Zealand Herald, 8 August 1884, p.4; New Zealand Herald, 23 November 1899, p.4.

94 Lee and Lam, Sons of the Soil, p.323; New Zealand Herald, 12 March 1888, p.6; Auckland Star, 10 March 1888, p.8.

boundaries and military blockhouses. By the early 1860s, Te Wherowhero’s cottage had been largely forgotten by European settlers and the colonial government. Throughout the 1860s and 1870s, the Board converted large areas of the Domain into sports and leisure grounds, but at the same time it began to lease large tracts of land for grazing and other purposes, to boost its annual revenue.96 The tensions Schrader has noted in public city spaces in New Zealand between collective social identities, through sports and public spectacles, and the forces of individual capitalism are clearly visible in the Domain at this time. The settler view of land as a commodity rather than a shared public landscape almost always prevailed.97

When an Auckland resident asked the Board in 1867 about leasing the government gardens, to operate a market garden, the Board approached Governor Grey, who had retained his exclusive rights to the gardens so that he could continue to use them during visits to Auckland. Grey agreed to hand over the gardens on the condition that ‘any time His Excellency the Governor may be visiting Auckland the vegetables should be supplied for his use free of charge’.98 The conversion of New Zealand’s first government gardens from a site of scientific experimentation into a market garden went largely unnoticed by the public. The Auckland Institute (now the Auckland War Memorial Museum), was the exception; the Institute noted the change, with regret, during its first meeting in 1869.99

William Brighton gardens took over the lease of the government gardens in 1870 and established an orchard and fruit garden on the site.100 Brighton tidied the neglected gardens and kept part of the former government gardens open to the public.101 He also sold flower bouquets and strawberries and cream in the gardens.102 Brighton sold his lease in 1876 to a Mr Hamilton, who began selling flowers from the garden in the markets.103
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96 Public Domain Minute Book 1861-1884, PDB 001, Auckland Council Archives; New Zealand Herald, 6 June 1893, p.4.
98 2 September 1867, Public Domain Minute Book 1861-1884, PDB 001, Auckland Council Archives; 11 March 1868, Public Domain Minute Book 1861-1884, PDB 001, Auckland Council Archives; Daily Southern Cross, 16 February 1869, p.3.
99 The Institute put forward a plan for continuing to use the gardens as a botanical garden, but did not receive a reply from the Board. 2 September 1867, Public Domain Minute Book 1861-1884, PDB 001, Auckland Council Archives.
101 Daily Southern Cross, 2 December 1867, p.7; Daily Southern Cross, 10 February 1868, p.3.
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The former government gardens in front of the Auckland Hospital, sometime in the late nineteenth century. ‘Auckland Hospital’ by George Valentine, 1850-1900, L1986/9/1/4, Auckland Art Gallery.

Though parts of the government gardens were still open to the public in the 1860s and 1870s, the botanical focus of the Domain shifted to another part of the park, where the newly formed Auckland Acclimatisation Society occupied four acres (1.5 hectares) of land in 1867 and established an aviary, ornamental gardens and a house for the curator. The Acclimatisation Society was a private organization that was part of a bigger Western movement concerned with ‘all the beautiful and useful productions of nature’. Over the next few years the Society planted many exotic trees and shrubs and imported hundreds of birds and other animals including hares, frogs, and fish, releasing them in the Auckland Domain and at different locations around the country. By the mid 1870s there were also monkeys, kangaroos and deer in the Domain.

By the time Chinese immigrants began leasing the former government gardens in the Domain in 1884, the gardens had been reduced to a quarter of their original size. Information about the activities and experiences of the Chinese living and working in the gardens comes mainly from reports of crime on the property. In 1888 a number of local boys were charged with stealing pears and tomatoes from the property of Yet Lee in the Auckland Domain. Lee had reported several incidents of stealing to the police, who had visited Lee in his house and caught the boys eating tomatoes and pears and ‘throwing missiles’ into the pear trees and
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106 New Zealand Herald, 2 December 1867, p.5; New Zealand Herald, 10 March 1870, p.3.
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magnolias. Yet Lee was still living in the Domain in 1896, where he was growing ‘carrots and lettuces’, according the press, when he was charged with killing a pheasant from the neighbouring Acclimatisation gardens. He claimed the pheasant was disturbing his crops.

Sir George Grey found the occupation of the government gardens in the Domain by Chinese market gardeners particularly irksome. In an 1888 interview with the *New Zealand Herald* about the ‘rival races’, he complained that he had taken ‘special pains to secure the ground in the Domain near the Hospital as a place of recreation, and as a garden for growing rare and valuable plants and trees …. Now the Chinese have got hold of it … they have cut down the trees, and it is being used to supply Auckland with cheap vegetables.’ Grey then went on to criticize Chinese more generally: ‘The Chinese seem to have a sort of cunning, so to speak, superior to the Europeans. They wait for such chances of obtaining valuable ground for cultivation, and they have a facility for edging themselves in’. Grey reasoned that the Chinese worked so hard that the Europeans could not compete with them, and that if they arrived in New Zealand in great numbers, ‘they would drag all the European labourers down to their own economical and semi-barbarous mode of life’. Somewhat contradicting himself, he finished by stating that New Zealand should use the most stringent measures to assess immigrants and ‘look for industry as being the great qualification of manhood’.

If he was looking for industry, then the Chinese were the ideal immigrants, as an anonymous writer testified only a few years earlier: ‘let me tell my English friends who tenant cottages that as the early bird catches the worm, so do the Chinese surpass others in rearing vegetables cheaply and successfully for the market; and, at the same time, set a good example to their neighbours by rising at 3 and 4 a.m.’ Grey, however, had fixed ideas about who the ideal immigrants to New Zealand were. He continued in the article: ‘I wish to see a great and purely European national with no cross but that of the Maori in it’.

Grey’s reaction to the Chinese market garden in the Domain was visceral. The Domain, and the government gardens in particular, evidently resonated with his concept of settler society in New Zealand. Since the 1840s the gardens had been stocked with all the British fauna and flora available, a place where European settlers strolled through the picturesque environment.
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It was a site where Grey, a keen naturalist, could pick his vegetables and admire the scenery. As anxieties around non-European immigration rose in the late nineteenth century and ideas of nationhood based on bi-culturalism consolidated, the presence of a Chinese market garden in the government gardens was seen by Grey as a threat to European identity and social progress in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{115}

In reality, however, the Chinese market gardeners were continuing the work that their Māori and European predecessors had begun, successfully meeting the demands of the growing colonial city. The government gardens and the wider Auckland Domain had been under considerable environmental pressure for many years, most of it instigated by its own governing body. The gardens had become neglected and overgrown in 1868, shortly after the Domain Board began renting them out as market gardens. The Board opted to continue leasing the cricket grounds for grazing rather than plant trees in that area, as Stafford and Grey had requested in 1868.\textsuperscript{116} Other parts of the Domain continued to be damaged by stock using the land for depasturing, even though councillors questioned the legality of leasing public land to private individuals.\textsuperscript{117}

The Acclimatisation Society had transformed the Domain into a site of conflict between exotic and native fauna, with kingfishers attacking the Californian quail, shags attacking the carp in the Domain ponds, and moreporks attacking the small birds in the aviary through the wire.\textsuperscript{118} The new species also caused problems for local residents, with starlings inhabiting residents’ pigeon nests and introduced birds eating the produce grown on neighbouring properties.\textsuperscript{119} In 1892 the Society moved from the Domain, following a fungus outbreak that killed almost all of the 11,000 fish in the hatchery; by then there were serious concerns about the impact of the Society on New Zealand’s native flora and fauna.\textsuperscript{120}

The governing body had drained areas of swampland in the Domain so it could rent them out. It had also sold or given parts of the park away, including the site of Ah Chee’s garden, land for the railways and the site of the lawn bowling green.\textsuperscript{121} Commercial and residential

\textsuperscript{115} Belich, \textit{Paradise Reforged}, p.224; Ballantyne, \textit{Webs of Empire}, pp.54-5.
\textsuperscript{116} 11 July 1868, Domain Board Letter Books, PDB 002 1862-1884, Auckland Council Archives.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Auckland Star}, 20 September 1901, p.4.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 10 March 1870, p.3. There were also kiwi living in the aviary. The Society did at one point discuss selling one to a man in London who had expressed interest in it. See \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 6 January 1868, p.3.
\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, 5 January 1869, p.4.
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{See, for instance, New Zealand Herald}, 22 August 1891, Supplment, p.1.
neighbours had also encroached upon the Domain land for years. Just like many other settlers in Auckland, Ah Chee, Yet Lee and the other Chinese market gardeners in the Domain were leasing and making a living from the land being made available to them in the Domain. They were the very models of industriousness that Grey was looking for in immigrants to New Zealand, but since they were not European nationals, they were seen as ‘edging themselves in’ to a place where they did not belong.

Various plans had been proposed for ‘improving’ the Domain over the years (including plans for a zoo and a Māori pā), but none of these eventuated. At the turn of the twentieth century large parts of the Domain continued to be leased out for rental return, including the government gardens. In 1900 the Scenery Preservation Society complained that the Board was shirking its duties, allowing the Domain ‘to fall into absolute decay and desolation, simply for want of a little interest’. ‘Thirty years ago’, the Society continued, ‘the Auckland Domain was one of the most charming reserves in the colony, covered with a beautiful growth of choice native trees and shrubs, and traversed by clean and well-kept walks … To-day the Auckland Domain is wretched and neglected in appearance, the native trees and shrubs have been largely choked and killed by pinus insignus and other unsightly foreign trees … the walks are in a shocking state of disrepair’. The Society considered the Domain ‘a hideous blot on the reputation of the Mayor and Councillors’, and ‘a rendezvous after dark for the very worst characters’.

Looking closely at the Domain at the end of the nineteenth century, we can track the production of a site of leisure and recreation, for which the Domain is best known, and the interplay among very different ideas of home, work, identity and space as these evolved for different individuals and communities. The Chinese market gardens in and around the Domain show how Chinese immigrants negotiated their way through mainstream European systems and processes, but also how they continued to incorporate their own ways of living, businesses and networks into their practices. The Chinese immigrants working in central Auckland were influential in the development of Auckland at the turn of the twentieth century, but their working practices, commercial success, social activities, continued contact
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with China and the colour of their skin, meant there was little space for them in the united
vision for the nation that was forming in New Zealand at the time.

In 1912, the Domain was selected as the site for the 1913-14 Auckland Industrial,
Agricultural and Mining Exhibition. Attracted by ‘the scenic possibilities of the elevated and
undulating slopes of the Outer Domain’, the organisers planned to create ‘a new park for the
city’.\textsuperscript{127} Like other exhibitions in New Zealand and around the world, the primary purpose of
the Auckland Exhibition was to display material economic progress, but as historians have
noted, exhibitions also provided ways of reading national moods.\textsuperscript{128} According to Jock
Phillips, for instance, the 1906–1907 New Zealand International Exhibition in Christchurch
was designed to prove New Zealand’s value as a country by presenting it as a ‘Britain of the
South’ through its agricultural progress, good colonial stock, the benevolence of the state and
the country’s loyalty to the Empire.\textsuperscript{129} Similarly, a reporter who attended the opening of the
Auckland Exhibition noted that it demonstrated the strengthened relationship between New
Zealand and the Empire since the last exhibition in Auckland in 1898. ‘[I]t was brought home
to one’, wrote the reporter, ‘that we have really embarked on the journey which leads “into
the broader day” of Imperialism, and that in these times, no country, however small, can stand
in the “splendid isolation” of the favourite phrase of a few years ago’.\textsuperscript{130}

Unlike the Christchurch Exhibition, however, the Auckland Exhibition was a ‘purely local
undertaking’, financed and organized by Auckland citizens rather than the government.\textsuperscript{131}
Alongside its imperialistic aims, the Exhibition also appears to have been a conscious attempt
to create civic unity in Auckland, after a long period of instability due to the movement of the
capital to Wellington, the New Zealand Wars, the South African War and the economic
downturn of the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{132} Auckland Council had been trying to convince the
various local boards in the suburbs to amalgamate since it was first established in 1871, but
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had little success due to the long-standing and fierce rivalry between the boroughs. At the
time of planning the Exhibition, Christopher James Parr, the Mayor of Auckland, was in the
midst of a campaign to convince local bodies to join the Auckland Council so that it could
expand its boundaries and increase funding for municipal developments. In 1912 Parr was
beginning to gain traction, with the press supporting his argument that ‘the centralization of a
municipal system is in the long run always to the good of a city’. The Auckland Exhibition
provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate what a stable and united city could achieve
and the first site to benefit from this vision was the Auckland Domain.

By the time the Exhibition opened, few tangible traces of the early colonial work carried out
by the government in the Domain remained. The ideas of scientific and social
experimentation that influenced that work had also faded from Auckland’s collective memory
over the years. George Elliot, the president of the Exhibition Committee, described the
Domain prior to the Exhibition as ‘beautiful but uncultivated’. It was, according to the
press, ‘an uneven and unkempt field, where a few horses were wont to graze’. Te
Wherohero’s cottage was forgotten, as were earlier Māori connections to the Domain. The
government gardens had largely been destroyed, and the Chinese market gardens that
replaced them were not considered worth keeping. The site of the gardens was described as
‘a rough volcanic hillside, sloping down to the old Domain ponds. On one side was a group
of pinus insignia trees, under which the ground was very rough, and scattered about were
many old, but richly foliaged oaks, poplars, weeping willows, and northern pines.’ The
Exhibition was intended to be modern, and the Domain was to be refashioned in line with the
latest social, economic and intellectual ideas. ‘The keynote of modern times is pleasure’,
reported the press at the opening of the Exhibition, ‘and the modern exhibition must, first and
foremost, be in tune with this dominant chord’.

Excavation work for the Exhibition began in November 1912, and less than a month later, the
press reported that ‘half a hill has been carried away’ to provide the level, raised terrace for
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the Palace of Industries.\textsuperscript{140} In June 1913, when construction workers were filling ‘a deep hole which has existed for many years on the top of the knoll overlooking the cricket ground’ (Pukekaroa), they discovered koiwi (human remains), which from the positioning of the body, they guessed were Māori. The workers re-buried the human remains, but Mr Pearce stated that ‘he is quite prepared to disinter it if any museum or scientific institution should express a desire to own it’.\textsuperscript{141} Rather than being seen as a living part of their ancestral homeland, European settlers now considered Māori relics of the past. It was thus fitting for their artefacts and remains to be taken to museums where they could be preserved and analysed by European experts.\textsuperscript{142} As a space of modernity, there was no room for a Māori presence in the Domain in the early twentieth century. Rather, there were other specific, bounded places in Auckland where Māori associations with the past were acknowledged by European settlers, such as the nearby prominent terraced volcanic cone of Maungakiekie (discussed in Chapter Six).

‘When [the] excavations were complete’, reported the \textit{New Zealand Herald}, ‘there were sloping terraces where before had been hollows and hillocks, flower-beds had replaced bare volcanic clay, and grass was springing healthily beneath the pinus insignus trees, where the rough ground had been covered by several hundred loads of earth’.\textsuperscript{143} The result, reported the press, was ‘conversion from a grazing paddock to beautifully verdant lawns, graceful terraces, convenient drives and pathways, unique rustic fences, with many smaller but none less effective touches’.\textsuperscript{144} With its emphasis on ‘progress’, the Council swept away the Māori, government and Chinese histories of the site to create a new place, one that reflected the collective identity of Aucklanders in the early twentieth century, as a ‘home for Anglo-Saxons’, ‘a nation of the future’, and part of a beautiful city with ‘the sparkling waters of the Waitemata, surrounded by fertile country, dotted with numerous hills’.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 6 December 1912, p.8.
\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Auckland Star}, 23 June 1913, p.4; \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 23 June 1913, p.6. Thanks to Coralie O’Hara for letting me know about these references.
\textsuperscript{142} Amiria Henare, \textit{Museums, Anthropology and Imperial Exchange}, Cambridge, 2005, p.247. Koiwi and museums in the early twentieth century are discussed in more depth in Chapter Six.
\textsuperscript{143} \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 1 December 1913, Supplement, p.1.
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The Exhibition opened on 1 December 1913 and ran until 18 April 1914. Its grounds covered 59 acres (23 hectares) of the Domain, extending across the northern slopes of the volcanic cones and the land around the duck ponds. The main Exhibition building was the Palace of Industries, which was built between Pukekawa and Pukekaroa, on a terrace formed for the building (now the eastern edge of the sports fields). A large fairy fountain stood at the bottom of the front entrance steps to the building, where a replacement fountain is positioned today. The Palace of Industries, together with the Machinery Court and the District and Government Courts, housed the exhibition stands of businesses and organisations from around Auckland and New Zealand. Scattered around the grounds were 16 other buildings, including an Aquarium, a Concert Hall, an Art Gallery, bandstands and the tea-house. On the northern slopes of Pukekawa there was an amusement park, which included a water chute, a firing range and a Katzenjammer Castle (fun house). The lower slopes of Pukekaroa were levelled with terraces and covered with ‘a miniature demonstration farm’ with varieties of grasses, clovers, root crops and native and exotic trees.\(^\text{146}\)
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\(^{146}\) ‘Auckland Exhibition: The Department’s Display’, *The Journal of Agriculture*, 20 November 1913, p.481.
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In common with exhibitions elsewhere, the main venues at the Exhibition were temporary buildings. Designed in the free classical style, they were built using materials made from the latest technology, including three-ply, asbestos, corrugated iron and cast plaster, all cost-effective, modern materials that could be removed easily after the Exhibition.\textsuperscript{147} The ‘tea-house’, however, as it was named for the Exhibition, was built as a permanent structure, sponsored by several business firms in Auckland who gifted all the materials for the building.\textsuperscript{148} In contrast to the other buildings in the Exhibition, the tea-house was designed and built in a more traditional English style. Designed by Bamford and Pierce in 1912, its brick and plaster walls and terracotta tiles reflected the craftsmanship and the use of ‘honest’, simple materials that were typical of the Arts and Crafts movement.\textsuperscript{149} Unlike the other buildings in the Exhibition, which were modern and industrial in style, the tea-house was built on a smaller scale, emphasizing natural materials and comfort. Like many Arts and Crafts buildings, it incorporated elements of the Tudoresque style, which was closely aligned with the picturesque concepts of rustic domesticity.\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{147} Auckland Star, 1 December 1913, p.1.
\textsuperscript{148} New Zealand Herald, 24 January 1913, p.8.
\textsuperscript{149} ‘N.Z. Historic Places Trust Buildings Record Form’, No. 2648, Tea Kiosk, BDG 368, Heritage New Zealand Files, Auckland. Bamford and Pierce also designed Neligan House in Parnell, Auckland (1910) and 1 St Georges Bay Rd (1910). New Zealand Historic Places Trust Glossary of Architects and Designers, 1990.
The tea-house. 'In the Domain', Aotearoa Series N360 (glass), E5156/11, Hocken Library.

In 1913, the press reported that the tea-house ‘is developing a novel old English design’. Its pergolas with pillars of Oamaru stone were built to provide ‘resting-places on warm days and moon-lit evenings’. Once visitors had exhausted themselves looking at displays and enjoying the amusement rides, they could return to the tea-house: ‘And so at last the visitor finds himself back at perhaps the central tea kiosk, looking down on the gardens and the shifting mass of people, or else back to the quiet of the ponds’.

Elliot stated that the tea-house would stand permanently ‘as a memorial to the Exhibition, but also as a memorial to the generosity of Auckland merchants’. After the Exhibition, he anticipated that the tea-house would be run by the Auckland Council and that “‘tea in the Domain” will be a pleasant and permanent result of the Exhibition’. Although it was designed in the ‘English domestic style’, the tea-house was not designed as an ‘ideal home’ for New Zealanders, as it is widely claimed today. This mistake may be related to the
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presence of a demonstration worker’s cottage at the 1906 International Exhibition in Christchurch, or the establishment of the Ideal Home Exhibition in Britain in 1908, which featured demonstration houses to celebrate ‘home life’, but there is nothing in the contemporary literature to suggest that the kiosk in the Domain was built as a demonstration home. If anything, it served as a civic ‘home’, offering a tribute to the unity of the city’s residents who had supported it, and an experience of Auckland for visitors that had a distinctly British character – tea and strawberries under the pavilion in a picturesque setting.

After the Exhibition, the modern, temporary buildings were dismantled, and only the tea-kiosk and bandstand remained. These two structures, together with their Victorian surroundings, left a sense of idyllic rural simplicity and settled civic identities in the Domain, which has since been reinforced with the notion of the ‘Ideal Home’. Yet in the creation of this tranquil place of leisure, almost one third of the Domain had been substantially modified. Volcanoes had been mined and the scoria redistributed, undulating surfaces had been levelled and concreted over, and histories had been swept away, to create the smooth, even, level terrain and the modern narratives that framed the collective identity of Auckland in the early twentieth century.

ÓÓÓÓÓ

Just as the government gardens and Te Wherowhero’s cottage had been forgotten by the end of the nineteenth century, the Chinese presence in the Domain was largely forgotten in the years after the Auckland Exhibition. In 1920, the Board terminated Ah Chee’s lease of the land, known only at the time as the ‘Chinamen’s Gardens’, and offered it to the Auckland Rugby League Association to establish a sports grounds and a stadium. Shortly afterwards, the buildings were removed, the gardens ploughed over, the grounds drained and levelled, and the site sown with grass for the playing areas. In the same year, the former Chinese market garden and government gardens near the duck ponds, which were now being used as cricket
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grounds, were converted into two tennis courts for the finals of the Davis Cup tennis competition.\textsuperscript{160}

Chan and Rain Ah Chee returned to China permanently in 1920, leaving their children to run the New Zealand businesses.\textsuperscript{161} In 1958, Chan Ah Chee’s grandson, Tom Ah Chee, opened the first American-style supermarket in New Zealand, naming it Foodtown. The Ōtahuhu store was enormously successful and Ah Chee and his business partners soon expanded throughout the country, becoming the Foodtown chain of supermarkets. In 1977 Ah Chee also established the iconic New Zealand pie business, Georgie Pie. His success, he told his daughter, was partly due to the knowledge and work ethic that had been passed down through the family from his grandfather, Chan Ah Chee.\textsuperscript{162}

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries various communities occupied parts of the Domain, forging very different senses of belonging in Auckland through their engagement with the landscape and its flora and fauna. Yet ultimately, it was the twentieth century civic narratives of European settler belonging that were remembered and celebrated by the governing bodies of the Domain, while the deeper, more diverse histories have been largely forgotten. In 2009, the Auckland Chinese community began planning a Chinese garden in Auckland, to show its appreciation for the opportunities available in Auckland and to commemorate the history of Chinese communities in the city.\textsuperscript{163} The Chinese committee initially asked the Council for permission to build the garden at the duck ponds in the
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\textsuperscript{162} Louise Chin (nee Ah Chee), talk at the Ōtahuhu Historical Society meeting, 25 June 2018.
Domain. Both parties were apparently unaware of the long Chinese history on that site; the Council refused the gardens on the grounds of the site’s archaeological and geological history.\textsuperscript{164}

In 2016 the annual Auckland Lantern Festival, which celebrates Chinese New Year, moved from nearby Albert Park to the Auckland Domain. For several weeks each year, the teakiosk, bandstand, duck ponds and picturesque Victorian gardens are transformed into a Chinese landscape with lanterns, colourful displays, food stalls and performances. Though Yet Lee, and other gardeners, have not been remembered in the landscape or in our histories, their late nineteenth century presence in this very place is unwittingly reinvigorated and celebrated every year by the thousands of visitors to the festival.
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\textit{Exhibit from the Annual Lantern Festival in front of the duck ponds in the Auckland Domain in February 2018. Photo by Lucy Mackintosh.}

The bucolic tea-house and the wider Domain landscape belie the complex historic experiences that lie beneath and around them. Getting underneath the layers of the Domain, into the deeper histories that reside there, allows us to assess the historical construction of civic identity in Auckland at the turn of the twentieth century, as well as engaging with more diverse communities that did not fit neatly into these collectivities. The structures and monuments that are built in our landscapes might be fixed, but the relics we discover and collect can tell us different stories and open up different worlds in the places we think we know. The remnants of the Ah Chee market gardens dug up in 2007 now reside in the iconic Auckland Museum building, located in the centre of the Domain and at the top of the hill.

These objects help tell the long, significant stories of the construction of Chinese narratives of belonging that are deeply embedded in the Domain yet no longer visible in the landscape or remembered in our histories. While the tea-house may reinforce the city’s British heritage with its tea and scones, Arts and Crafts architecture and popular history as an ‘ideal home’, the tea-ware in Ah Chee’s collection tells us a more complex history of this place, in which tea-drinking was part of building relationships through guanxi, Royal Doulton tea cups were stored in the kitchen cupboard alongside Chinese brownware, and negotiations between Chinese and English ways of living were worked through materially, at home, in the Auckland Domain.
CHAPTER SIX
‘If you need a monument, look around you’: The Obelisk and Maungakiekie 1907–1940

The obelisk on the summit of Maungakiekie, also known as One Tree Hill, is one of the most recognisable landmarks in New Zealand. Situated on one of the largest volcanic cones in Auckland, the monument is visible from many parts of the city and the surrounding countryside. In 1906 John Logan Campbell, by then known as the ‘Father of Auckland’, requested the erection of an obelisk on the mountain as a monument to Māori and left funds for it in his will. Eventually constructed in 1940, it stood alongside Campbell’s grave and the lone pine that Campbell had planted many years earlier. The obelisk and the wider summit complex is a significant and complex icon of collective identity for Aucklanders, at times the site of heated controversy. In the late 1990s, an activist irreparably damaged the pine tree when he attempted to cut it down in protest against the government’s policy on resolving Treaty of Waitangi grievances with Māori. The tree was replaced in 2016 with a grove of native trees, their planting marked with a dawn ceremony attended by a large crowd of Aucklanders. ‘There’s a lot of history and complexity to this place’ commented Paul Majurey, Chairman of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority at the replanting ceremony. ‘People love and cherish this place’, he continued, ‘so there’s a lot of passion been shown about it’.1

Discussions about Maungakiekie have tended to focus on the meta-narratives forged on the summit, and the coherent, if polarised stories that it tells about collective identity in Auckland. Some have viewed the summit complex as a monument to Campbell and the European origins of Auckland, while others see it as a place of colonial domination and injustice.2 Historians have sought to draw out the complexities and contradictions of the monument’s history, arguing against a simplistic, fixed meaning and showing how it has
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2 During its construction, it was commonly believed that the obelisk was intended as a memorial to Campbell rather than to Māori. The District Engineer of the Public Works Department and Department of Internal Affairs, referred to the obelisk in a letter to the architect of the obelisk, Richard Atkinson Abbott, as ‘the Monument to the late Sir John Logan Campbell’ (to which Abbott promptly replied that it ‘is not in any sense a monument to Sir John Logan Campbell’). Correspondence F.S. Dyson to R. Atkinson Abbott, 9 February 1939; Correspondence R. Atkinson Abbott to District Engineer, 10 February 1939, John Logan Campbell Papers, MS 51 314-1, Auckland War Memorial Museum (AWMM). Thomas Clements, who tendered for the construction of the memorial, also called it ‘Sir John Logan Campbell’s memorial’. Correspondence Thomas Clements to R. Atkinson Abbott, 18 May 1939, Sir John Logan Campbell papers, MS 51 314-1, AWMM. See also Stuff.co.nz, 11 June 2016. https://www.stuff.co.nz/auckland/local-news/80961808/Hundreds-turn-out-for-One-Tree-Hill-planting, accessed 11 July 2018.
become an ‘unstable terrain of conflicting meanings and viewpoints’. Most of these discussions have treated the summit as a self-contained place that is separate from the slopes of the volcanic cone on which it sits. But if the site is broadened to include the mountain itself, different concepts of history, memorialisation and understandings of time emerge that provide important context for the summit. This chapter places the summit complex back into its physical environment, examining the construction of the obelisk within the wider landscape of the mountain. There are other less visible stories at Maungakiekie which displace the obelisk as the focal point for commemoration and the master narratives that have been constructed there, placing them in a deeper, richer historical context.

ΠΠΠΠΠ

On the afternoon of 30 January 1907, Sir John Logan Campbell climbed into a carriage and began the journey up the new coach road to the summit of One Tree Hill/Maungakiekie. It was Auckland Anniversary Day, the annual public holiday marking the founding of the province, and Campbell was the guest of honour at the official opening ceremony for the road. The press described the road as a mark of progress, an attractive addition to the ‘fine pleasure resort’ that was One Tree Hill Domain and the adjacent Cornwall Park. Aucklanders, wrote the Auckland Star, could now ‘enjoy the glorious view to be obtained from the summit without having to face the climb up the hill’. From the summit they could take in the ‘wonderful evidence of the rapid way in which Auckland is spreading’.

It took Campbell’s carriage 15 minutes to travel the one and a half miles up the spiralling road, which followed the existing Māori earthworks of this ‘old-time renowned City of Refuge’. In his earlier years, it would have taken Campbell less time to bound up the mountain by foot, which he had done regularly over the past 50 years. But by 1907, Campbell was 90 years old, almost completely blind and going deaf. From inside the carriage, he would have seen and heard little of the activities outside – the flags lining the new road, the double row of banners marking the summit, the noise of the crowds around him, and the unfolding panoramic views of Auckland. At the summit, a group of dignitaries waited
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4 Auckland Star, 29 January 1907, p.3.
5 New Zealand Herald, 30 January, 1907, p.8; Auckland Star, 30 January 1907, p.5.
6 Campbell stated that the first time he walked up to the summit of the mountain was in 1843: Auckland Star, 30 January 1907, p.5. He was still walking up to the top of the mountain in 1905: Correspondence John Logan Campbell to unknown (illegible), 9 June 1905, John Logan Campbell files, MS 51-96, AWMM.
7 Auckland Star, 30 January 1907, p.5.
for Campbell’s arrival. Behind the carriage, a procession of men, women and children followed him up the mountain. The slow, relentless journey onwards and upwards must have been hot and uncomfortable for the participants dressed in their formal suits and long dresses on this summer day.

The crowd cheered as Campbell stepped out of the carriage at the top of the mountain. He was introduced by Charles Bagley, the Chairman of the One Tree Hill Board, who remarked that Campbell’s name would always be associated with One Tree Hill, adding that ‘they were standing on a spot where mighty chiefs of the Maori race had stood, but their names were forgotten. He fully believed, however, that Sir John Campbell’s name would be remembered as long as the hill lasted, owing to his gift of Cornwall Park to the people (Applause)’. When Campbell stood up to speak, he acknowledged the ‘wonderful and magnificent panorama’ from the summit, but he also wanted to convey a very different perspective on this ‘spot’. Unlike those around him who were gazing out to the panoramic views and forward to the future of the city, Campbell was in the process of retreating from the physical world around him. He was turning inwards, to his own personal recollections. Campbell began his speech by recounting his first journey up the mountain in 1843, shortly after he arrived in Auckland.

8 *New Zealand Herald*, 30 January 1907, p.8.
9 *Auckland Star*, 30 January 1907, p.5.
‘Do you realize what that date of 1843 means?’ he asked. ‘It means that 64 years lies buried in the past’. This was a fitting moment, Campbell declared, to make his ‘final farewell bow’ from public life.\(^{10}\) The opening ceremony for the road to the summit was a closing ceremony for Campbell.

![Image of the opening ceremony](https://example.com/image)

The procession of carriages making their way up to the summit of Maungakiekie for the opening ceremony on 29 January 1907. *Auckland Weekly News*, 7 February 1907, p.11, Sir George Grey Special Collections, AWNS-19070207-11-1, Auckland Libraries.

In 1907 the summit was bare, except for the small group of pine trees which Campbell had planted in 1875 (discussed in Chapter Four). In the lead-up to the event, there had been some discussion about possible structures to adorn the summit. The Prime Minister, Sir Joseph Ward, had visited the summit the previous day and suggested that the ‘very ragged-looking pine trees’ be removed and replaced with a ‘modest tower … with a revolving turret furnished with a powerful telescope’, which visitors could pay to use to view the panorama that was Auckland.\(^{11}\) At the opening ceremony, Campbell intended to take control of the narratives on the mountain once again, but this time he wanted to commemorate past Māori achievements. ‘It has been suggested’, he said:

that I should plant a Totara here to replace the one that grew here and gave the name to this hill, and that a pillar be erected to record the events of to-day. No, not on this spot, for the event of to-day is but a small event compared to the greater one which must hereafter eventually take place. A more modest spot lower down the hill will suffice for to-day’s proceedings, but here where we now

\(^{10}\) *New Zealand Herald*, 30 January 1907, p.8.

\(^{11}\) *Auckland Star*, 29 January 1907, p.4.
stand on Maungakiekie’s highest summit must be held sacred and tabooed, for here there must arise, towering heavenward, the mighty obelisk, a landmark from either shore, a Maori memorial for all time. This, I have already said, is a debt the people of New Zealand owe to the great aboriginal race, whose country has passed into our hands, and is to us such a rich inheritance a lasting memorial to the Maori people, whose historical traditions can be traced for centuries into the dark ages. (Applause)¹²

Campbell chose an obelisk as the monument to place on top of Auckland’s summit. When he first saw these austere monoliths in Egypt during his travels in 1849, he was impressed by ‘[t]he clean, sharp, beautifully-proportioned outline, cutting its way through the clear atmosphere until it leaves the pale cloudless sky near the horizon and is thrown out in beautiful relief by the deep blue sky overhead towards which it towers’.¹³ In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, obelisks were being erected around the world, in a flurry of monument building.¹⁴ Though the obelisk was an imported aesthetic form, it was often used to mark a mystical relationship with the ground underneath.¹⁵ Many were erected on sacred ground, as place markers for the site of a battlefield or a cemetery.¹⁶ In Campbell’s biographer’s estimation, the obelisk ‘was a measure of his deep esteem (rather than of cultural appropriation)…. According to his lights, he could not have praised the Maori people more highly’.¹⁷

Campbell’s relationship with Māori, however, was complicated. Though he had often interacted with Māori when he first arrived in New Zealand, learned to speak the Māori language (though not fluently), and is said to have had a liaison with Te Opetaua, who bore him children, his relationship with Māori was not profound.¹⁸ As his biographer Russell Stone observed, Campbell empathised with Māori in his memoir, Poenamo, more than most of his contemporaries, but he had little understanding of the eroding impacts of colonialism on their economic and social base.¹⁹ Campbell described his early contacts with Māori with
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¹² Auckland Star, 30 January 1907, p.5.
¹³ Quoted in R.C.J. Stone, Young Logan Campbell, Christchurch, 1982, p.150.
¹⁶ Savage, Monument Wars, pp.108-11.
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affection and humour (if often at their expense), but like most of his contemporaries, he believed that Māori would eventually succumb to the more ‘civilized’ western cultures.  

Sir John Logan Campbell, speaking at the opening ceremony on the summit of Maungakiekie, 29 January 1907. Sir George Grey Special Collections, 4-855, Auckland Libraries.

Nevertheless, Campbell had been thinking about commemorating Māori for some time. In *Poenamo*, he had noted his desire to insert the Māori past into the collective memory of the city: ‘[t]here is now here so large a population who know not Tongata [sic] Maori … I would fain rescue from oblivion the chivalrous conduct of the Maori, when his power was supreme, towards the invading Pakeha’. By 1907, his connections with Māori were faint, distant, and nostalgic. At the opening ceremony on the mountain he was drawing on memories from over 60 years before. ‘It’s like a dream now looking back on those old days’, wrote John Webster to Campbell after the ceremony, remembering their early days in New Zealand in the 1840s.

In choosing the obelisk, Campbell may have wanted to pay tribute to Māori with the power, grandeur, ancient history and spirituality of this monumental structure, but it was a double-edged gesture. At the turn of the twentieth century this kind of icon was part of a tradition of empire, with cities around the world vying for Egyptian obelisks and settlers erecting monuments to commemorate their dead during colonial wars. It was an imported, generic aesthetic form which bore no relationship to the people Campbell was trying to commemorate.

22 Correspondence from John Webster to John Logan Campbell, 20 February 1907, MS 51-92, AWMM.
commemorate, their ongoing life in Auckland, or the place he considered sacred. The obelisk was a thing of memory, with potency and loftiness, but it was also devoid of detail and out of time and place, much like Campbell’s respectful, but distant and ultimately paternalistic memories of Māori that he was trying to articulate.

As Campbell spoke at the opening ceremony in 1907, his hand rested on a taonga known as a tuki, that had been placed on a table in the middle of the gathering. The stone tool, used for pounding fern root, had been found during the construction of the road. As he held the tuki, Campbell described the taonga in detail to the audience, and stated that he would find a ‘fitting resting place in a niche in the memorial obelisk’ for the tuki. Until then, he said, he planned to take the tuki ‘for safe keeping’. Amidst the cheers, the talk, the visions, and the panorama of the opening ceremony, it was the tuki that Campbell grasped. For Campbell, as he sought a tangible way to commemorate his memories of Māori, the tuki may have been the closest thing to the human experience he was trying to capture that day.

When the One Tree Hill Domain Board began constructing the road to the summit of Maungakiekie in 1907, it was anxious, according to the Auckland Star, that ‘the beauties of the hill and the ancient Maori works should neither be marred nor destroyed’. The New Zealand Herald wrote that ‘care had been taken to interfere as little as possible with the configuration of the hill over the grassy slopes of which are still plainly visible the forms of the terraces, fighting pits, and various other earthworks, which served the purposes of defence in the far-back day of Maori inter-tribal wars’.

This concern for preserving the volcanic cones can be partly explained by a developing interest in preserving ‘scenic’ and ‘historic’ landscapes throughout New Zealand in the late nineteenth century, which culminated in the Scenery Preservation Act of 1903. As historians have pointed out, this interest was related to an emerging nationalism that encompassed nostalgia for landscapes encountered by early European settlers, and also to the beginnings of
a nascent tourism industry in New Zealand. In the 1890s members of the social and political elite began holding scenery preservation meetings around the country; the Auckland society was formed in 1899.

One of the main preoccupations of the Auckland society was the ‘disfiguring’ of Auckland’s volcanic cones, which had been quarried for their scoria since the township of Auckland was established. As noted in Chapter Five, though, not all the volcanic cones were perceived as equally valuable. When the central cone in the Auckland Domain was quarried in 1913 to provide scoria for the Auckland Exhibition, there was no attempt to preserve the cone nor to remediate the damage. Maungakiekie, however, was identified as a site of particular importance at the Scenery Preservation meetings. At one of its meetings, presided over by John Logan Campbell, Montague Harrison Wynyard, a member of the One Tree Hill Board and an amateur historian, argued that Maungakiekie should be ‘restored back to its days when it was a pa’.

‘Auckland’s Splendid Heritage: Cornwall Park and One Tree Hill Domain’, New Zealand Graphic, 29 August 1903, p.609, Sir George Grey Special Collections, NZG-19030829-609-1, Auckland Libraries.

The particular interest in preserving the slopes of Maungakiekie was related to its evocation of the Māori past. Like much of the art and the literature at the turn of the twentieth century,
Auckland’s volcanic cones were deployed to invoke a Māori past in order to help forge a sense of history and local identity for its European settlers. Maungakiekie has the most extensive terraces of all of Auckland’s volcanic cones and is the one of the largest pre-European archaeological site complexes in New Zealand. Its prominent earthworks made this volcanic cone the most impressive visual representation of the way in which late nineteenth and early twentieth century Europeans conceptualised Māori in Auckland. As discussed in Chapter One, European settlers were heavily influenced by nineteenth century scholars, who portrayed Māori as living in extensive fortified citadels on Auckland’s volcanic cones and constantly fighting each other. Maungakiekie’s large defensive earthworks made it ‘a locality of historic interest dating back to the old Maori days of warfare on the Auckland isthmus’. Archaeologists have since challenged these interpretations, arguing that settlements on volcanic cones may have been small and largely unfortified, with large areas of open settlement used for gardening, living and storage, during the extended periods of peace. Although volcanic cones such as Maungakiekie provided only a partial picture of Māori settlement in Auckland prior to European arrival, they fitted with European notions of settlements as clearly defined, contained areas rather than places of fluid occupation and movement across a wider area, as the less appreciated Ōtuataua Stonefields still demonstrates.

Maungakiekie’s association with leading rangatira, including Kiwi Tamaki of Te Waiōhua and Tuperiri of Te Taoū, and with John Logan Campbell, by then known as the ‘Father of Auckland’, also fitted with the meta-narratives developed by nineteenth century European settlers that revolved around particular leaders. When the Governor visited Auckland in 1883, he was taken to the top of Maungakiekie, ‘having been the chief place of the Waiohua, the tribe which occupied the country about Auckland at the time when we have the first glimpses of authentic history of New Zealand’.

The fact that Maungakiekie was no longer permanently occupied by Māori by the time Europeans arrived in Auckland (although it was still part of Ngāti Whātua’s territory) also fitted with the European practice of representing a stark break between the Māori past and the...
European present. The ‘interesting historical associations’ on Maungakiekie (discussed in Chapter Four) were viewed by settlers as markers of the progress of the city from savagery to civilization since 1840.\textsuperscript{40} ‘From the summit where once stood the sacred totara’, wrote one reporter in the press ‘and where old time chiefs looked down on fighting pits and ovens where cooked human flesh, and later, on a scene of bloodshed when the conquering Ngatiwhatua advanced on the last stronghold, the visitor to-day will look on a sense of peace and surpassing beauty’.\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{golfers_on_south_west_slopes_of_maungakiekie.jpg}
\caption{Golfers on the south west slopes of Maungakiekie. Photograph by Henry Winkelmann, 1903. Sir George Grey Special Collections, I-W1077, Auckland Libraries.}
\end{figure}

The preservation of the mountain was part of wider plans by both the One Tree Hill Domain and the Cornwall Park Trust to turn the land into ‘a place of public recreation, one of the most attractive in the Auckland District’.\textsuperscript{42} The governing board of One Tree Hill Domain had leased the land on the summit for grazing for many years but in the late 1880s it had begun an extensive programme of planting and road formation in accordance with a plan developed by J.D. Louch, a New Zealand architect.\textsuperscript{43} In 1900, the Board leased some of the land to the Golf Club, which established golf links on the terraces of the mountain.\textsuperscript{44} The mountain was
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also deployed as a foil for the development of Auckland by Austin Strong in his plan for Cornwall Park, developed in 1902. Strong wanted Maungakiekie kept bare from foliage and plainly visible from the park, so that the visitor, ‘[a]scending the Drive … anon turning sharply to the right the plateau suddenly comes to view with its grand old pohutukawa tree and Huia Lodge nestling in a background of beautiful trees, proclaiming that the days of cannibal Maori Maungakiekie feasts have passed away and civilization reigns instead’.  

A depiction of Māori playing golf that portrayed them as ‘savage’ and ‘primitive’ compared with the ‘civilised’ Europeans playing golf in the previous image. ‘The First “Golf Week” at One Tree Hill’, Auckland Weekly News, 16 September 1908, Sir George Grey Special Collections, AWNS-19090916-3-1, Auckland Libraries.

Concern about the preservation of the landscape appears to have been reserved for the protection of the physical form of the mountain, particularly as experienced from a distance, rather than the human experiences that were enfolded within it. In the 1870s, the One Tree Hill Board had operated a quarry on the southern slopes of the mountain, and in 1900, the Board allowed the Manukau Water Board to build a reservoir on the western side of the mountain. The reservoir destroyed the crest of the hill, but, unlike other volcanic cones such as those in the Auckland Domain or on the Otuataua Stonefields, the Board rebuilt the crest and terraces.
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45 Austin Strong plan 1902, John Logan Campbell files, MS 51-271, AWMM.
46 Plan of One Tree Hill, n.d. (c.1874?), John Logan Campbell files, MS 51–247–18, AWMM; Minutes of the One Tree Hill Domain Board, 26 January 1895 and 31 March 1900, OTH Series 120, Box 1, Volume 1, Auckland Council Archives.
47 Hayward et al, Volcanoes of Auckland, Auckland, 2011, p.69.
At the opening of the road to the summit in 1907, the *Auckland Star* reported that the Board’s aim to preserve the hill ‘has happily been accomplished … as the drive cannot be seen from a distance and can only be traced when people or vehicles are passing upon it’.48 But despite the Board’s efforts to create minimal disruptions to the mountain, the construction of the road caused considerable damage. Not only did it cut through the outer wall of one of the entrenchments on the slopes of the mountain, it also damaged a burial site on the summit of the mountain. The *Auckland Star* reported that workers uncovered ‘the skeleton of what must have been a chief of considerable rank’, close to the trig station.49 The remains were found in a sitting position, with the knees placed upwards and bound to the body, a tradition practiced so that the tupapaku (corpse) could be addressed as a living person during the tangihanga (funeral) process.50

As works on the road continued, the Board also discovered several burial caves on the lower slopes of the mountain.51 Describing it as ‘a Maori sepulchre’, and a ‘veritable catacomb’, the One Tree Hill Board decided to enter the caves and collect some of the remains for scientific

48 *Auckland Star*, 30 January 1907, p.5.
49 *Auckland Star*, 4 June 1907, p.5.
51 *Auckland Star*, 5 June 1907, p.1.
examination.\textsuperscript{52} Charles Bagley, the chairman of the One Tree Hill Domain Board, organised an expedition to the caves in June 1907, accompanied by Thomas Cheeseman (curator at the Auckland Museum), Montague Harrison Wynyard (member of the Board and amateur historian), Charles Arnold (architect who was currently working on Cornwall Park), Charles Stewart (caretaker of the Domain) and Sir John Logan Campbell. The expedition received extensive coverage in the press, with articles and photographs of the caves published in newspapers around the country.\textsuperscript{53}

The caves were described as ‘hahunga caves’, indicating that the expedition members and the press were aware of their purpose and significance to Māori.\textsuperscript{54} According to ethnologist Elsdon Best, who had published a paper on Māori burial practices only two years earlier, Māori never entered the burial-caves of their own people: ‘A thing much dreaded by the Maori people is a burial-cave. No one trespasses there, no person desecrates the spot. It is a thing feared’.\textsuperscript{55} The bones of the dead, wrote Best, would turn upon the person and destroy them.\textsuperscript{56} Best described ‘hahunga’ as the process of exhuming the bones of the dead sometime after their burial, and placing them in burial caves or trees in secluded places that are difficult

\textsuperscript{52} Auckland Star, 4 June, 1907, p.5.
\textsuperscript{53} See New Zealand Graphic, 15 June 1907, p.10; Auckland Weekly News, 13 June 1907, p.6; Lyttleton Times, 5 June 1907, p.7; Wairarapa Age, 13 June 1907, p.4.
\textsuperscript{54} Manawatu Standard, 6 July 1907, p.7.
\textsuperscript{56} Burial caves belonging to enemies, however, were not necessarily respected. Best, ‘Maori Eschatology’, p.199.
to access, known as whara.\textsuperscript{57} Anne Salmond has more recently described this process as ‘[a] second mourning ceremony … held before the bones were finally hidden away in a secret place where malicious enemies could not desecrate them’.\textsuperscript{58} The hāhunga system was very tapu, as it continued to bind the living and dead.\textsuperscript{59} The bones of tipuna (ancestors) are considered the ‘bearers of power’ that were ‘a tangible link with the past as they were “living” physical proof of the existence of ancestors’.\textsuperscript{60}

The existence of the caves was known only to a few, according to the press.\textsuperscript{61} ‘Of the thousands who visit One Tree Hill Domain and Cornwall Park each year’, reported the \textit{Auckland Star}, ‘probably few know that underneath the green flats surrounding the old stronghold there exist caves of considerable extent’.\textsuperscript{62} It was clear that the caves were not meant to be found. The human remains had been lowered down through an inconspicuous cavity and then carried to the edge of a cave and placed into a deeper chamber that was not visible from the surface. The visitors guessed that the burial cave was used for ‘the commoner people’, because of the ‘immense deposits’ of human bones found there.\textsuperscript{63} Common people or those who died in battle tended to be placed in a primary burial site, whereas the remains of people of rank and renowned warriors were exhumed from a temporary burial place after they had decomposed and placed in a secondary burial site which was hidden and difficult to access. Though the large number of remains might suggest that this was a primary burial site, the concealed positions of the remains in the cave indicate that it may have been a secondary burial site.\textsuperscript{64}

Like many curators at the turn of the twentieth century, Thomas Cheeseman had been collecting human remains for the Auckland Museum and for museums overseas for some time. He was well aware of the controversy surrounding the practice.\textsuperscript{65} In a talk to the Auckland Institute and Museum in 1906, he cited Best’s earlier work when describing the recent acquisition of burial-chests for the Museum. Cheeseman recalled how government officials had pressured Māori to hand over the remains to the Museum, despite their vocal
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protestations that their removal was ‘an attempt to trample on their most sacred rites and traditions’. 66

The collection of Māori human remains by museums exemplified wider processes of imperialism and colonial domination, in which human remains were used to demonstrate differences between human groups. 67 It was also, as O’Brien has pointed out, part of a wider practice of collecting relics in settler societies, as a way of rupturing the nameless past and the civilised present. 68 According to Daniel Herwitz, the collection and historicizing of pre-colonial things devalued pre-colonial societies: ‘[M]ortified as monstrous, primitive, incapable of modernization, colonialism turned the precolonial past into a mark of inferiority, then stuck it in the museum to be gazed at like a nude alabaster Venus missing an arm and a leg.’ 69 As archaeologist Cressida Fforde has noted, the analysis of human remains ‘also substantiated the widely held European perspective that colonized peoples were as remote in time as they were distant in space’. 70 ‘In essence’, writes Fforde, ‘the west appropriated Aboriginal identity, subsuming it within its own conceptualization of a superior “Self”. Such appropriation strengthened European identity, dominance and control over the Aboriginal “Other”’. 71

Though the men involved in the expedition into the caves may have expected it to be an easy and pleasurable outing, in reality it proved to be uncomfortable and dangerous. The largest cave’s entrance, according to the press, was like a ‘volcanic vent’. 72 It was small, ‘just large enough to allow of a man’s body passing through, but with not sufficient space to permit of this being done in comfort, as the visitors had to wriggle between the rocks’. 73 Entry into the cave required ‘an intricate acrobatic feat’. 74 The cave was around 14 metres deep, but split into three levels, and the caretaker had placed a series of ladders between them. 75 The men climbed down into the cave one by one, except for Campbell, who decided the descent was too risky and stayed on the surface. At the bottom of the first level, the men found themselves

---

70 Fforde, ‘Collection, Repatriation and Identity’, p.30.
71 Fforde, ‘Collection, Repatriation and Identity’, p.31.
72 Manawatu Standard, 6 July 1907, p.5.
73 Auckland Star, 4 June 1907, p.5.
74 Auckland Star, 11 June 1907, p.4.
75 Auckland Star, 4 June 1907, p.5.
in the recesses of the mountain, a dark, cool, quiet space. Although it was strange and unfamiliar, it reminded them of places that they knew: ‘Once through the opening’, the *Star* reported, ‘the visitor finds himself in a dome-like cave … In fact the place is really a cupola with wonderfully even sides, and viewed from below the aperture in the roof looks just like a chimney’.⁷⁶ Arnold described the space as ‘bottle-shaped’, with a length of around eight metres and a width of around four metres.⁷⁷

When the men made their way to the side of this level, they found another opening which led to a further cavern below. At the bottom of this cavern, directly under the opening, was a large pile of human remains, ‘pyramidical in shape’, and around 1.2 metres deep at its highest point.⁷⁸ As they descended the ladder perched directly over the bones, and entered the cave, which was longer and narrower than the more ‘regular’ cave above, they had to ‘squat down on the haunches’.⁷⁹ Here, they paused to inspect the remains, before continuing to the end of this cave, where they found ‘a most peculiar formation’ - a large rock with ripples radiating out from the centre, in the shape of boiling mud.⁸⁰ The rock crystallised a moment from the
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deepest past, when the molten, moving lava from the eruption of the volcano had cooled and solidified.

In the centre of this rock there was a circular opening around half a metre wide, where steam had been released during the eruption. This opening led to yet another cave below, even more irregular in shape, with an uneven floor which ‘still presents the appearance of petrified mud’. As they peered through the opening down into the deepest chamber, they saw the skeleton of an ‘unfortunate rabbit’ lying on its floor. The rabbit, they surmised, had fallen into the cave from the green pastures above, into the lower chamber where it slipped through the small opening and died in the deepest corner of the cave.

This expedition was not the controlled encounter with the past that the men had expected. The more they descended into the interior of the mountain, the more it surrounded and enveloped them. To access the cave, they had to squeeze through narrow spaces, navigate across uneven surfaces and find their way to its very edges. The cave was dark and cold, its walls were rough and porous, its layers were multiple, and the end was unknown. It was a multifarious experience, engaging all of their senses. Moving through the caves, the men encountered a past that was unfamiliar and engulfing, where the boundaries between the past and the present collapsed.

John Logan Campbell, who had farmed on the mountain for over 50 years, expressed astonishment about the discovery of the caves. ‘To think’, he remarked, ‘that in all these years I never heard of the existence of these caves’. Standing on familiar ground, peering through the small vent into the void, Campbell could sense the depths of the mountain, but could not reach them. Hidden beneath his feet were longer histories, rich with human experience, reaching deep into the interior of the mountain. At the very time that Campbell was planning his commemorative obelisk, the cave presented an absence that articulated the fullness of the past in a way that could never be explained in words or material form.

Π Π Π Π Π

In Campbell’s time, Māori perspectives on Maungakiekie were largely absent from the public realm, but the site continued to be understood and mobilised by Māori in their own ways and for their own purposes. As discussed in Chapter Four, Maungakiekie was a highly significant
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place for Te Taoū (later known as Ngāti Whātua o Ōrakei) and other Auckland tribes, and its histories were passed down in oral tradition. As historian Judith Binney has observed, Māori historical figures and narratives become shared narratives within a community, and histories are continuous with the present. To illustrate this point, Binney told the story of Paora Tuhaere, the nineteenth century Ngāti Whātua chief, who recalled the sixteenth century conquest of Hokianga by his ancestors as if he had been there at the time. For the rangatira from Ngāti Whātua whose ancestors had intermarried with Te Waiōhua following their invasion of Tāmaki in the mid to late eighteenth century, the koiwi (human remains) at Maungakiekie were still a living presence. Ancestral stories could be passed on through material things and places, as well as through oral narratives. The fact that the burial sites were hidden and not entered did not mean they were not known and valued by their descendants. The caves were a private and personal place of commemoration for those directly connected with the mountain; they held stories of the deep and intimate connections between people, place, the past and the present. For Māori, Maungakiekie had a power of its own. It did not need an obelisk to declare that it was a commemorative site.

In the week following the expedition, the ‘discovery’ was widely reported throughout New Zealand, along with photographs of the burial site. Experts in the natural sciences commented on the contents of the cave, and reporters speculated that the burials were related to fighting when the Te Waiōhua chief Kiwi Tamaki was based at Maungakiekie, with his ‘garrison of some thousands of dusky warriors’. Newspapers described the battles in considerable, imaginary detail, and assumed the deaths were related to the most ‘savage’ of
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practices. It is not improbable, reported the Poverty Bay Herald, ‘that these bones belonged to Maoris taken in battle and slaughtered for culinary purposes’. Some in the press treated the discovery of the burial cave with disdain, with one paper joking that ‘there is no truth in the rumour that the skeletons found at One Tree Hill are those belonging to the victims of too enthusiastic golfists. In reality, that cave was originally the meeting house of the Maori Savage Club’.

John Logan Campbell had asked the architect, Charles Arnold, to visit the caves and report on the practicality of opening them to the public. In his report to Campbell following the expedition, Arnold wrote: ‘I gathered that you are under the impression that there is a cave of large dimensions which will be a great show place and attraction to the Domain’. However, Arnold’s conclusion was that the ‘Maori sepulchre’, as he described it, was steep, narrow and inaccessible. At the Board meeting after the expedition, Arnold declared that he wanted nothing more to do with the caves.

Only a week after the expedition, the Board made a decision to close the caves to protect them ‘against weather and intrusion’. The reasons for the decision were not discussed in the Board minutes or in the press, which had covered the story extensively up to this point. Perhaps the board simply decided it was impractical to open the caves to the public. Or perhaps Māori had conveyed their disapproval of the disruption of the burial caves to the Board, since objection to the removal of bones was widespread by 1907. It may be that Campbell decided the caves were better left alone. His friend, John Webster, had written to him shortly after reading about the expedition, telling him that Maori had removed all the burials in his area ‘lest the restless Pakeha should desicrate these sacred spots’. Campbell seemed to understand the importance of keeping taonga in their own place, though he could not bring himself to leave them in the ground where they had been found. On the day the

91 The Auckland Star, for example, erroneously stated that Ngā Puhi had attacked Maungakiekie during the musket wars of the 1820s and 1830s, when Maungakiekie was no longer occupied by Māori at that time. It also named Te Tuperiri as one of the Ngāti Whātua chiefs at the time of the Ngā Puhi attacks when he had actually lived many generations earlier at the time of the Ngāti Whātua/Tē Ta MI attack on Te Waiōhua in the mid-late eighteenth century. Auckland Star, 4 June 1907, p.5.
92 Poverty Bay Herald, 11 June 1907, p.1.
93 Observer, 13 July 1907, p.7.
94 Minutes of the One Tree Hill Domain Board, 12 June 1907, OTH 120, Volume 1, Auckland Council Archives.
95 New Zealand Herald, 5 July 1907, p.6.
96 Auckland Star, 4 July 1907, p.6.
97 Minutes of the One Tree Hill Domain Board, 12 June 1907, OTH 120, Volume 1, Auckland Council Archives; Auckland Star, 4 July 1907, p.6.
99 Correspondence from John Webster to John Logan Campbell, 10 June 1907, John Logan Campbell files, MS 51-92, AWMM.
Board decided to close the caves, Campbell asked that the ‘Maori relics now being found at Maungakiekie be taken into the custody of the Auckland Institute’, on the understanding that the Board could return the relics to the mountain once ‘a more appropriate repository may be found on Maungakiekie itself.’

Whatever their reasons for closing the cave, the Board clearly did not consider it to be a ‘monument’. In the early twentieth century, European monuments were designed to be large, awe inspiring structures that were best experienced from a distance. Their form was well-defined and striking, so that visitors could easily understand their message. According to Quentin Stevens and Karen Franck, such monuments typically had ‘a composed visual message that can be observed by a detached body at rest, and analysed until it is understood’. The ‘memorial as spectacle’, as these traditional monuments have been called, offered a distant, disconnected experience, reproducing familiar tropes that required little input from the viewer.

Having decided to close the caves, the Board continued with its planting schedule and finished the work on the road, smoothing and straightening out the pathway to the summit. In the process of reaching the ‘destination’ though, they removed the Maori terraces, taonga and humans remains that lay in their path, destroying the very history they were seeking to commemorate. By putting a lid on the burial cave, however, the Board conversely opened up different potentialities for understanding and memorializing the past in future.

Π Π Π Π Π

At the time when the new road was opened and the burial caves were discovered, a tall oblong rock around two metres high lay in a ‘Statue Enclosure’ that Campbell had created at Cornwall Park. Campbell had organised for this rock to be brought to the park in 1900 after he, George Graham and Thomas Cheeseman saw it lying on the ground on the east side of Mt Eden Road near the Three Kings volcanic cones. Although he did not know the

---
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106 Correspondence from George S. Graham to John Logan Campbell, 6 November 1909, MS 120-N35, AWMM.
history of the rock, Campbell, Māori elders and European scholars considered it to be of
historic and spiritual significance, and he kept it along with the other pieces of sculpture he
had collected, with the plan of erecting a statuary at Cornwall Park sometime in the future.

‘Showing a sketch by Dr Kinder of the Three Kings volcanic crater, Auckland, with (extreme right) Te
Toka-tu-Whenua, the Kumara god in its original location (later transferred to Cornwall Park)’, 4-1194,
Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries.

In the years that followed, the men tried to find out more about the rock.107 William
Cleghorn, who had a farm that bordered the road, told Graham that it had stood on the brow
of the hill at the back of his farm (in the vicinity of St Andrews Road) in 1848, when he was a
boy. Around 1865 the rock had apparently been dislodged and rolled to the bottom of the hill,
where it remained until Campbell removed it.108 The Reverend Dr John Kinder, the architect
and vicar of the nearby St Andrews Church, sketched the stone in its original location in the
early 1860s.109 Cleghorn’s family had been told that it was a landmark of some sort. When
Graham spoke to elders of the Tāmaki tribes, they confirmed that while there had been
commemorative stones on many of the hills around Auckland, they were erected by tribes
prior to the Te Taoū invasions in the mid-late eighteenth century, and their narratives had
been forgotten.110

Although Graham continued to consult with Māori elders and European scholars such as
Percy Smith, he could not find out anything more about the rock. He named it ‘the Rongo
Stone’, on the basis of Smith’s speculation that it was ‘probably an old WaioHua kumara god,

107 Correspondence from George S. Graham to John Logan Campbell, 6 November 1909, MS 120-N35,
AWMM; Correspondence from S. Percy Smith to George S. Graham, 10 March 1910, MS 120-N35, AWMM.
Polynesian Society, 34, 134 (1925), p.175.
109 ‘Showing a sketch by Dr Kinder of the Three Kings volcanic crater, Auckland, with (extreme right) Te Toka-
tu-Whenua, the Kumara god in its original location (later transferred to Cornwall Park)’, 4-1194, Sir George
Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries.
110 Correspondence from George S. Graham to John Logan Campbell, 6 November 1909, MS 120-N35,
AWMM.
but we shall never know for the last of that tribe old Ihaka Takanini died during the war’. In 1909, Graham reported to Campbell, ‘I am very sorry that I have not been successful in finding out something definite as to the history of this interesting stone at Cleghorn’s … If at any time I should be able by any chance to drop on any facts that may through [throw] any light on the subject I will certainly again communicate with you’.

The ‘Rongo Stone’ in its location near Huia Lodge in Cornwall Park, prior to its removal to the barbecue area. Sir George Grey Special Collections, 4-8500, Auckland Libraries.

In an article published in 1925, Graham described how he eventually found out more about the history of the stone, shortly after he had written to Campbell. In the article, he repeated a story he had heard in 1909 from Erui Maihi, a Ngāti Whātua chief. By this time, the basaltic column had been put on a stone cairn and placed near Huia Lodge in Cornwall Park, on the road through the olive grove. According to Maihi, the stone had been found by Tahuhu, the leader of the ancestral canoe Moekakara, on his arrival at Te Arai (north of Auckland). Tahuhu named the stone Te Toka-tu-whenua and set it up as a tuahu, or

---

111 Correspondence from S. Percy Smith to George S. Graham, 10 March 1910, MS 120-N35, AWMM. Ihaka Takanini was the Te Ākitai Āriki from Pūkaki who had been captured shortly after he and his people were evicted from Māngere following the proclamation by Governor Grey in 1863 (see Chapter Three). He was imprisoned on Rakino Island where he had died during the Waikato Campaign. His Te Ākitai descendants still live at Pūkaki and are mana whenua of the Ōtuataua Stonefields.

112 Correspondence from George S. Graham to John Logan Campbell, 6 November 1909, MS 120-N35, AWMM.

113 George Graham, ‘Te Toka-Tu-Whenua’, p.175; Auckland Star, 14 January 1929 p.6. While Graham’s secondary sources have been found to be inaccurate in some cases, particularly when trying to construct a contiguous, causally connected narrative of events that was not provided in the material, the story of Te Toka tu Whenua story came from a named source who Graham consulted with regularly and whose accounts of the Tahuhu connection with Tāmaki correspond with versions of the story by other sources. See Sullivan, ‘Māori Gardening in Taamaki Before 1840’, p.42; Appendix 3.
ceremonial site which held the spirits of the land. Visitors to the village were required to follow the custom of uruuru whenua, or ‘entering the land’, by placing a branchlet on the ground in front of the stone. According to Maihi, the stone was taken to Tāmaki by Te Waiōhua several hundred years later, after a period of fighting with Ngati Tahuhu, where it was eventually placed at Te Tatua (Three Kings), and became known as Te Toka-i-Tawhio, or the stone that travelled around. The stone was later involved in several ceremonies during battles between Te Waiōhua and Te Taoū in the eighteenth century, but was not used after Te Taoū defeated Te Waiōhua. According to Elsdon Best’s work published in 1907, tipua, as these stones were also known, possessed wairua (spirit) from the guardian spirits of the adjacent forest or land. Tipua or tuahu were situated throughout New Zealand (and in the Pacific Islands), but after the arrival of Europeans Māori began to abandon the ceremonies of these tuahu, and the stones began to lose their mana.

The ‘stone that travelled around’ has now been fixed to the ground, in a sea of concrete, as part of a carpark/picnic complex on Maungakiekie created after World War II. It looks completely out of place in this post-war European leisure landscape. Yet even hidden in a corner of the park, and labelled as a ‘rongo stone’, this oblong rock still has a powerful presence. Its connections with long histories, its efficacy as the spirit of the land, and its movements with the flows of people in and out of Tāmaki, give it a potency that commands space and time in a way that eludes the bigger, more prominent obelisk on the summit of Maungakiekie. The presence of the stone also reminds us of the stories that are not often traceable in the monuments, books and speeches about Māori left behind by John Logan Campbell and his friends. These men had a deep, if patronising, interest in the Māori past, and their long search over almost a decade for information about the ‘rongo stone’ shows both the efforts they made to preserve the history of Māori and the silences and failures they encountered in the process.

118 Best, ‘Maori Forest Lore’, p.194.
120 For more discussion about the work of European scholars on Māori at the turn of the twentieth century, see Anderson et al, Tangata Whenua, p.307 and Peter Gibbons, ‘Non Fiction’, pp.55-9.
In 1912, before the obelisk was built, Campbell died and was buried on the summit of Maungakiekie. According to the Board minutes, this had been his ‘express wish’, and the government passed legislation to allow the ‘Father of Auckland’ to be buried on public land. By now, the summit was viewed by the public as a place inextricably linked with Campbell. The press considered his burial on the mountain entirely appropriate, emphasizing the close links between Campbell and Maungakiekie, and describing Campbell as a metaphor for the mountain. The Auckland Star wrote: ‘He is now sleeping peacefully the last long sleep on Maungakiekie’s green crest, that noble watch-tower standing in the midst of the stirring scenes of his heyday. Fitting resting-place for such a picturesque character! … [I]t was felt that no ordinary ground … would be an adequate place of sepulchre for so noble a heart … In life he suggested the nobility of Nature, the expansiveness of wide prospects, and the grandeur of hills, and in death it was fitting that we should lay him to rest on the wind swept mountain-top, to which we in the busy work-a-day valley look up, as symbolic of all we admired in his lofty character’. 

---

121 Minutes of the One Tree Hill Board, 17 June 1912, OTH 120, Vol. 1, Auckland Council Archives; Otago Daily Times, 15 July 1912, Supplement, p.3; Wanganui Chronicle, 24 June 1912, p.5.
122 Leonard Bell has also noted the close association of Campbell with Cornwall Park in visual portrayals of him at the turn of the twentieth century, which portrayed Campbell framed by images of Cornwall Park and One Tree Hill: Bell, ‘Auckland’s centrepiece’, pp.105-6.
The newspaper contrasted Campbell’s burial site with the burial caves below on the mountain, saying that unlike those in the caves, Campbell would never be forgotten: ‘Other heroes lie buried on Maungakiekie’s historic shoulders, … but all trace of them has been swept away by Time’s ungentle hand. They have no monuments, and we would be ignorant of the very fact that they had lived, loved, fought and died, … were it not that their sacred burial caves have been discovered from time to time. One could not imagine the memory of Sir John thus fading away among the unknown and things forgotten’.124 For the European settler, the notion of an autonomous self was central to personal identity. It was only through the presence of the bodily form and relics associated with that person that the living could continue to commune with the dead.125 The unmarked burial caves on Maungakiekie, where hundreds of human remains mixed together, represented the destruction of personal identity after death.

Campbell did not explain why he had asked to be buried on the summit of Maungakiekie, rather than at St Stephen’s Cemetery where his daughter Ida was buried, and where his wife, Emma, would be buried a couple of months later. His request appears to contradict his words at the opening ceremony of the road to the summit in 1907, when he stressed the importance of reserving the summit for a monument to Māori. His desire to be buried there could be partly explained as an act of domination in a prominent site of Māori significance – another act of ‘Firsting and Lasting’, as O’Brien might describe it. But, given his long association with this place, his burial there might also be explained by a desire to connect, in a tangible and lasting way with the landscape and the histories it embodied, as he had tried to do with the obelisk, the burial caves and Te Toka-tu-whenua.

Campbell left £5000 in his will for the erection of a monument on the summit of Maungakiekie. Yet his epitaph, ‘if you need a monument look around you’, appears to challenge the very notion of the obelisk he proposed, whether or not he understood it this way at the time. The epitaph suggests that monuments can be found not only in buildings or structures, but also in wider landscapes. His epitaph, which now stands at the foot of the obelisk, opens the possibility for wider concepts of commemoration, in which monuments but can take a broader form than bricks, mortar and obelisks.

The 33 metre obelisk, with a bronze statue of a Maori chief at its base, was officially opened by the Māori King, Koroki, in 1948. The obelisk was as spectacular as Campbell had intended, standing out on the skyline of Auckland and becoming an instant landmark in the city, alongside the remaining pine tree of the grove that Campbell had planted in the 1870s. It was a monument designed to dominate the mountain and be appreciated from afar. As the architect explained to the Trustees, it had been designed at such a height because ‘as seen against the sky it will appear smaller than it actually is, owing to atmospheric influences’. From a distance, the obelisk appears sharp and clean, a generic object, proportionately mounted on top of the base of the volcanic cone. Yet, up close, the monument is lifeless, offering none of the human experience that Campbell was hoping for. For someone standing in front of it, the obelisk is too big to take in. Its smooth, featureless lines begin far above the visitor’s line of vision. Instead, they are faced with a huge chunky stone base, more than three times the height of the average person, with bronze panels on each side. On each panel, stiff, truncated text recounts the purpose of the obelisk and the history of Māori, reduced to a series of dates and names (since found to be erroneous). Even the statue of the Māori chief, which the architect intended to ‘give emphasis and point not only to the monument, but to the

126 Correspondence R. Atkinson Abbott to Trustees, 24 August 1933, MS 51 311-2, AWMM.
whole combined scheme of Grave, Court and Monument’, stands so far above eye level that none of the details or expression on the statue are visible.  

The obelisk from the summit of Maungakiekie. Photograph by Lucy Mackintosh 2016.

In creating the space for the obelisk, the Board cleared, flattened and remodelled the summit. The architect designed a large, concrete platform, destroying most of the Maori earthworks on the summit, a flat, featureless approach to the monument which was separated from the volcanic cone itself. During the construction process, care was taken to avoid disturbing Campbell’s grave and the tree he had planted, but a tuahu, a Māori sacred ceremonial site, was destroyed. On the site of the obelisk, construction workers discovered the hearth of a house site and two pumice containers, one carved in the shape of a ruru (owl). The containers had been soaked in kokowai (red ochre), and Māori informants at the time identified them as waka iho, containers for the after-birth or hair of a child used during ceremonies for chiefly families. The containers were thought to date back to the birth rites for Korokino, the son of the Ngati Awa chief, in the early seventeenth century. His birth was marked by the planting of the totara tree, which in turn had given the summit its Maori name, Te Totara i ahua. These taonga were associated with named ancestors and their descendants, leading ariki (paramount chiefs). The carved objects were full of character and
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131 Fairfield, ‘Maungakiekie, One Tree Hill, Auckland’, pp.92-104.
movement (with the ruru/owl appearing to be in mid-stride), holding the most intimate, sacred parts of human life.\textsuperscript{132}

The tuki that Campbell had held during the opening ceremony was not placed in the obelisk as he had hoped. Along with the other ‘relics’ discovered during the construction of the summit complex, it is presumably still held in the Auckland War Memorial Museum.\textsuperscript{133} Stripped of intimacy and history, the obelisk, together with the grave and forecourt, is a towering monument that feels disconnected from the place in which it sits.

\textit{Carved Maori objects from Te Totara I Ahua, Cornwall Park}, Sir George Grey Special Collections 646-9169, Auckland Libraries.

\textit{Carved Maori objects from Te Totara I Ahua, Cornwall Park}, Sir George Grey Special Collections 646-9167, Auckland Libraries.

\textsuperscript{132} Fairfield’s article includes a genealogical chart, which shows that Korokino’s descendants included Potatau Te Wherowhero, the first Māori King, and Koroki, the fifth Māori King who opened the obelisk in 1948. Fairfield, ‘Maungakiekie, One Tree Hill, Auckland’, p.104.\textsuperscript{133} The pumice container in the shape of the ruru (owl) is on display in the Volcanoes Exhibition at the Auckland War Memorial Museum. The tuki has not yet been located at the Museum.
If you decide to visit the obelisk at Maungakiekie, rather than viewing it from a distance, you must first climb the mountain. The road to the summit circles around the mountain, weaving slowly to the top. On foot, the mountain engages all the senses. The demanding contours quicken the breath and heat the body. The steep sides of the mountain loom overhead, dwarfing the obelisk on its summit and often obstructing it from view altogether. Instead, the visitor is surrounded by stepped terraces and deep craters covered with pasture and volcanic rock, which shift and disorientate as they wind around the mountain. People, sheep, rabbits and other animals move across the landscape, carving their own pathways across, up and down the mountain. Their movements expose other histories in the eroded land, revealing middens, taonga and occasionally koiwi. People arrange the loose volcanic rocks in the craters, creating messages and signs on the landscape for loved ones. A pine tree, presumably self-seeded, stands on an outcrop half way up the road, an echo of the controversial pine tree that once stood on the summit. Near the top of the road, the landscape is more controlled, and the narratives more prescribed, with rock walls marking the final stretch of the road, and retaining walls supporting the platform of the summit complex. Despite its dominant presence and prescribed narratives, the obelisk is silent. Viewed within the context of its wider landscape, it stands alone and stationary, propped up against the relentless forces of erosion, weather, people, animals and time that surround it and constantly pull against it. Around it, the daily life of the wider landscape continues, full of the sounds, smells and sights of human and natural histories that endlessly shift and evolve.
'History is slippery’, writes architect Arna Mackic about her war-torn home town in Bosnia. ‘Not all historical layers are visible and some are only subtly present’. Over the last 30 years, Western ideas of memorialisation have shifted. Maya Lin’s Vietnam Veterans’ Memorial in Washington D.C., constructed in the early 1980s, signalled a break with traditional monuments and a shift towards more abstract styles of commemoration. Lin’s Memorial, and later works such as the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin, are porous and multi-sensory, forcing visitors to engage with histories not only conceptually, but also physically, offering a close, multifarious engagement with the past. These memorials have moved Western approaches to commemoration from distant, analytical experiences to ones that are immediate and intimate, allowing for more open and personal interpretations.

Deep within the recesses of the mountain, beneath the veneer of pasture, roadways and golf courses, the burial chambers lie, alternative spaces of commemoration. Here, bones were laid according to tikanga so that spirits could leave this world, forging links between the dead and the living, and the dead and their homelands, so that their descent lines could continue to flourish. The outlines of this chamber of commemoration were created along with the mountain itself, steam from the eruption forming the chambers, and molten rock hardening as it cooled to make the cave. Its contents, rich with human experience, became part of the land itself. It is a place of potency, spirituality and memory, deeply connected with its place. These threads of individual stories and remnants, of earlier lives, cannot be told in the grand narrative of a polished obelisk. This place of memory is not a preconceived idea imposed upon a material substance, but a slow, evolving permeation of rock, soil and air with human histories, forming deeply personal histories that are inextricably connected with the physical, human and animal processes of place over time.

Even further below the mountain, deeper histories continue to flow. Every now and then, humans have tapped into these histories when they drill and dig. Underneath the steep scoria mound of the summit of Maungakiekie, ash, lapilli, and tuff mingle with silt, marked with impressions of the raupo leaves that grew there before the eruption around 30,000 years
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Lava flows, now solidified, reach out like tentacles underground, tangled with the ash deposits and lava flows of neighbouring mountains. These volcanic networks carry earlier natural and human histories into pre-volcanic waterways across the isthmus, distributing soils, and subsuming bones and plants. The deeper layers underneath the ground have an ongoing historicity, as Tim Ingold has argued, ‘forever overtaking the formal destinations that, at one time or another, have been assigned to them’. They disrupt the neat boundaries placed around volcanic cones on European maps of Auckland, and the boundaries between human and natural histories, challenging concepts of place, time and history.

For local Māori, Maungakiekie embodies long, complex historical relationships that intermingle with the land. Mana whenua knew about the burial caves in the nineteenth century and are also aware of them today, though they are still little known amongst the wider public. For them, it is not just the prominent, visible parts of the mountain that are important, but the whole of Maungakiekie, including One Tree Hill Domain, Cornwall Park, and the wider slopes now engulfed by suburbia. Ngarimu Blair, of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrakei, says the whole of Maungakiekie is wāhi tapu and its wairua is still present, even if it is not ‘slap in the front of their face all the time’. A focus on the visible monuments on Maungakiekie gives a very narrow perspective on the history of the mountain and its inhabitants. ‘There is a need’, writes Malcolm Paterson, ‘to recognise the reality that cultural and historical landscapes can extend well beyond the individual sites on a planning map … and find ways to regard and, where appropriate, protect them’.

In 2014, Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act was passed, returning the ownership or administration of fourteen volcanic cones, including Maungakiekie, to thirteen iwi/hapū known as the Tāmaki Collective. This was an outcome of the Treaty of Waitangi negotiations between the Crown and the Tāmaki Collective. The Tāmaki Collective have since redefined Maungakiekie and the other volcanic cones of Auckland within their own frameworks and whakapapa. They refer to the volcanic cones as Tūpuna Maunga (ancestral mountains), created by Mataaho (the guardian of the Earth’s secrets) and Ruaumoko (the God of earthquakes and volcanoes), with an unbroken and living

---

connection with mana whenua. The Tāmaki Collective views the volcanic cones not only as places of battle, but as ‘significant areas of settlement, of agriculture, of battles, of marriages, of birth and burial’.  

Reflecting on the use of historical sources from different cultures, Judith Binney wrote ‘[n]arratives adopted by different cultures to depict their historical experiences cannot be amalgamated. But the stories they tell can be juxtaposed. Illumination lies in the juxtaposition … In the telling, there are always silences’.  

This also applies to places of memory. While the obelisk on Maungakiekie is a grand, authoritative and singular statement about the past, the places underneath, beside and surrounding the obelisk tell us different stories. The burial caves, Te Toka-tu-whenua, the destroyed places underneath the obelisk, and the mountain itself, show us everything about the past that the obelisk does not: the gaps in our knowledge, the silences of history, the interiority of remembrance and the intimacy of lives lived.

---


145 Binney, Stories Without End, p.329.
CONCLUSION

Parks are often focal points for grand statements of civic or national identity, but they also allow space to step off the pathways of collective memory and find hidden fragments of the past. These traces of history tell us older, multi-faceted and forgotten stories that need to be understood alongside the more familiar stories of Auckland’s past. If we venture closer to the ground and follow the stories crafted into the contours, stones and hollows, then more nuanced histories become apparent. The landscapes in ‘Shifting Grounds’ resist a singular story about Auckland, and instead open up its histories, making room for the presences and absences, as well as the voices and silences, that have helped shape historical processes in the city.

This work has delved deeply into three landscapes at six moments in time. It has expanded the notion of a historical archive from a repository of written sources to one that includes indigenous narratives, archaeology, geography, material culture and ecology. This more capacious approach has enlarged the scale and scope of history in Auckland, while bringing into view a more textured past that provides new insights into the existing historiographical terrain. Approaching history through the lens of landscapes challenges dualistic divisions of time and space, merging ‘nature’ with ‘culture’, ‘subject’ with ‘object’ and ‘pre-history’ with ‘history’ and reveals traces of the past that have been co-fabricated with particular places and are constantly interacting with wider networks and processes.

------

Following long temporal arcs from past to present at Maungakiekie, the Ōtuataua Stonefields, and the Auckland Domain has opened up deeper natural and Māori histories that recast the shape of stories often told about Auckland. In studying these landscapes it becomes clear that histories prior to the arrival of European settlers in 1840 are not just a prelude, or a pre-history, to the main historical events in Auckland. Rather, they underpin and explain the present in ways that are harder to recognise in historical works that focus on shorter timeframes.

Volcanic cones such as Maungakiekie, Ōtuataua and Pukekawa, for instance, created the rocky, fertile landscape of Auckland and have provided key organisational devices for the shaping of the city. Their lava flows formed large areas of free-draining, fertile soils that have drawn people to them since humans first arrived in Tāmaki. The long connections between these volcanic landscapes and the people who occupied them are plainly visible at
Maungakiekie, the most prominent of the three volcanic cones. Scholarly attention on Maungakiekie has focused on its summit, where long Māori histories, including that of Te Totara i āhua’ (‘the totara which stands alone’) continue to interact with nineteenth and twentieth century attempts at place-making on the summit, including the planting (and removal) of trees to replace the totara, John Logan Campbell’s grave and the construction of the obelisk. On its foothills, however, earthworks, middens and Māori narratives histories also tell of substantial Māori kumara plantations and settlement areas, such as the gardens of Tahuri during the mid-eighteenth century. These geological and Māori histories created the free-draining fertile soils, mixed through with shells from middens, where Campbell’s olive grove flourished in the late nineteenth century and where gardens grow in the suburban properties on the lower flanks of the mountain today.

Vast volcanic underground networks beneath the mountain conceal earlier natural and human histories that sometimes emerge to disrupt the narratives that people craft on their surfaces, as John Logan Campbell and others found when they ‘discovered’ the burial caves at Maungakiekie in 1907. These chambers of history, unique in New Zealand, continue to lie beneath the feet of Aucklanders, occasionally interfering with the rapidly expanding city and reminding us that deeper concepts of time and space underpin the city that we can only occasionally glimpse and partially understand.

A lava cave stretching underneath suburban Auckland, image by Chirag Jindal 2015.

With its prominent defensive earthworks and associations with the Te Taoū (Ngāti Whātua) defeat of Te Waiōhua in the mid-eighteenth century, Maungakiekie fitted neatly into the meta-narratives constructed by early European settlers of a Māori past of constant warfare in Tāmaki. At Ihumātao, however, a different set of deeper stories emerges where there are no European monuments, but where gardening, housing, and ways of living over many centuries remain embedded in the walls, pathways, mounds, and quarried volcanic cones of the Ōtuataua Stonefields. Place names, oral histories, and archaeology reveal a genealogical continuity of occupation from the earliest days of human occupation to the present. The continuities, fluidities and complexities of histories at Ihumātao provide a counterpoint to histories that continue to emphasize the dominant narratives of particular ruptures in
Auckland’s history, such as the Te Taoū invasion of Tāmaki and the establishment of the European town of Auckland in 1840. Though these ruptures had a significant impact on Auckland’s history, they were not experienced uniformly across the isthmus.

At the Ōtuataua Stonefields, some of the deepest foundation stories of Auckland’s human history have been co-constituted with the physical environment and have shifted and evolved in ways that do not fit easily into European concepts of time and space. As Auckland continues to expand, building new roads, runways, and housing complexes at Ihumātao to accommodate a rapidly growing population, it is obliterating some of the city’s oldest histories. These histories, however, are still alive and present for the descendants who continue to live on their ancestral lands at Makaurau Marae and Pūkaki Marae.

Deeper histories of the Auckland Domain or Pukekawa also help to reframe the past in Auckland. Its Māori name, ‘hill of bitter memories’, commemorates those who died during the inter-tribal musket wars of the 1820s and 1830s, highlighting an important but often overlooked factor in the establishment of the European town of Auckland. It was in the wake of these inter-tribal wars that Te Wherowhero escorted the Tāmaki tribes back to their ancestral lands in 1836 and occupied land in Tāmaki gifted to him by Te Tāou in gratitude for

Save Our Unique Landscapes (SOUL) poster advertising an event to protest the proposed housing development adjoining the Ōtuataua Stonefields Historic Reserve, 2016.
his assistance. The continuing political uncertainties after the musket wars prompted Te Tāou to approach Governor Hobson and invite him to establish the British Government in Tāmaki in 1840. Pukekawa reminds us that the history of the European town of Auckland cannot be adequately explained by the arrival of European settlers in 1840, but must be seen as part of ongoing tribal adjustments following the inter-tribal musket wars. Though this site is now marked by a Museum built as a memorial for those who died in the first and second world wars, the earlier, less visible wars evoked by the name of the hill are just as important for Aucklanders to remember.

-----

These landscapes have highlighted more textured histories of colonial Auckland which are at odds with much of the existing scholarship on colonial New Zealand. ‘History’, wrote Judith Binney, ‘is often remarkably arrogant. It can too frequently dismiss whole groups of people as lost causes, or as merely irrelevant’. Histories of colonial towns in New Zealand often present them as ‘neo-Europes’ and focus on connections between New Zealand and Britain towards the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In Auckland, however, Māori tribal networks, missionary circuits, Chinese trading practices and Mediterranean connections all highlight different modes of operation that existed alongside the structures of the British empire that have preoccupied historians of Auckland.

At Ihumātao, Māori continued to live on their ancestral lands and practice ahi kā (fires of occupation) well into the colonial period in Auckland, inviting the missionaries into their space on their own terms. For almost twenty years, the Ihumātao mission station and the Ōtuataua Stonefields operated as hybrid places, where missionaries, Māori and local settlers lived side by side. Alongside the strict routines introduced by the missionaries and the fixed boundaries set upon the land by the Crown, Māori continued to follow more fluid patterns of existence, moving between their dispersed territories and maintaining their tribal networks. The missionaries often established their stations beside existing Māori settlements, at the invitation of Māori, and despite their efforts to encourage Māori to settle in one location they were often forced to fit their preaching around Māori routines and movements. Māori, on the other hand, adopted new gardening and farming methods alongside their existing practices,

and tribal leaders such as Ēpiha Pūtini used the law, Christianity and the press to work towards peace and prosperity in their ancestral lands.

Even in the Auckland Domain, the ‘heart’ of colonial New Zealand, different worlds coexisted in the same space, each with their own notions of identity and place. Just as the governor was establishing botanical and kitchen gardens in the grounds, Potatau Te Wherowhero was moving between his cottage in the Auckland Domain and his other whare (houses) in different locations across Auckland, seeking to forge lasting relationships among tribal groups and between Māori and Pākeha. Tribal leaders such as Pūtini and Te Wherowhero, along with other rangatira, demonstrated an ongoing engagement with the colonial town despite marginalization, and continued operating within their own tribal dynamics and networks alongside European ideas and practices in Auckland.

John Logan Campbell’s olive grove at Maungakiekie was another intricate space where the ideas of Māori, North Americans, Italians and Chinese intersected with the British practices that have been well documented by historians of the nineteenth century. Though Captain James, Giovanni Federli and Ming Quong all eventually left New Zealand, their involvement in the olive grove highlights the finer, less linear workings of a local community over time, as well as the wider international networks outside of the British empire that often get lost with the teleological lens of history.

The archaeological remains of the Ah Chee gardens, which bordered the Auckland Domain, complicate the story of civic identity at the turn of the twentieth century now represented by the picturesque gardens and tea-house that remain in the Domain from this period. While the Auckland Exhibition of 1913-14 aimed to strengthened civic unity around Anglo-Saxon identities, the remnants of the Ah Chee market garden offer glimpses of a Chinese immigrant community that was closely connected with the European settler communities in Auckland, but that also operated within different ontological assumptions, processes and networks. The Ah Chee family continued to build on these processes after they left their market gardens next to the Domain and have since made a substantial impact on Auckland’s foodways, with the establishment of Foodtown and Georgie Pie.
Molly Ah Chee with her four daughters at the 60th reunion of Foodtown in September 2018. Molly’s husband, Tom Ah Chee, was one of the founders of Foodtown, which became one of the most successful supermarket chains in Auckland before it was rebranded as Countdown in 2008. Photo by Lucy Mackintosh.

There are many other gaps and acts of forgetting in Auckland’s history. The forced evictions of Māori from their ancestral lands at Ihumātao and other settlements around the Manukau Harbour on 10 July 1863 created a moment of rupture that had devastating and long-lasting consequences for its Māori communities. Moreover, this moment arguably places the outbreak of the Waikato War in Auckland, rather than at the Mangatāwhiri Stream two days later as it is described in current historical works. The history of Ihumātao brings the New Zealand Wars into the city in a way that not yet been adequately acknowledged in histories of Auckland.

Even at Maungakiekie, one of New Zealand’s most well-known sites, absence forms part of the purposeful material acts of place-making. The places around and underneath the road to Campbell’s grave and obelisk on the top of the volcanic cone track the histories that have been lost in the process of crafting representations of the past, as well as the vulnerabilities and silences that surrounded some of the most dominant voices in our histories. Examining the experiences of John Logan Campbell and Auckland scholars with Te Toka-tu-whenua (the rongo stone) and the burial caves alongside their activities on the summit of Maungakiekie, shows both the efforts of these men to represent the past and their failure to adequately do so.
Entanglements between people and their material worlds are crucial to understanding human experiences not only in wilderness and rural areas, but also in urban areas – even in New Zealand’s most human of landscapes, Auckland. Close attention to landscapes, with their expansive source base and rich contexts, provide insights into the processes of history that are not traceable in less ‘grounded’ histories. ‘Shifting Grounds’ has shown ways that the city has been profoundly shaped by its natural environment and by its long Māori tribal histories and dynamics. The study has tracked how these earlier histories have continued to shape Auckland in unexpected and complicated ways. It has also brought into focus diverse communities and networks that are harder to see in broader histories of the city. Though these stories are often absent from our history books and memorials, they are important to tell if we are to know, understand and reckon with Auckland’s past.
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