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Abstract

Te Hau ki Tūranga is the oldest meeting house in existence. It was built in the early 1840s at Orakaipu Pā, just south of Gisborne, by Ngāti Kaipoho (a hapū/subtribe of Rongowhakaata) chief Raharuhi Rukupō. In the nineteenth century whare whakairo (carved houses) were significant symbols of chiefly and tribal mana (prestige, control, power). They were ‘carved histories’, physical embodiments of tribal history and whakapapa (genealogy) representing a link between the living and the dead. In 1867 Native Minister J C Richmond acquired the whare on behalf of the government to augment the collections of the Colonial Museum in Wellington. Over the almost 150 years since the whare arrived in Wellington, the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga has been the subject of three government inquiries and numerous Rongowhakaata requests for its return. It has also been dismantled and re–erected three times and housed in three different museum buildings. At the close of the twentieth century Rongowhakaata submitted a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal for the ‘theft’ of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Their claim also expressed concerns about the care and management of the whare in the hands of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and its predecessors.

This thesis tells the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga from 1867 until the present. It asks: was the whare ‘stolen from its people and wrenched from its roots’? as Rongowhakaata claim and places the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga in its historical context. It aims to understand the motives and agendas of the characters involved and reach a conclusion as to what most likely happened in 1867. This thesis also breaks new ground by examining the politics surrounding the whare as a museum exhibit and a Treaty of Waitangi claim. Overall this study provides a valuable insight into the history of Crown–Māori relations. It reveals why deep–seated grievances still exist among Māori today and demonstrates the value of the Treaty settlement process as an opportunity for Māori to tell their stories and gain redress for injustices that occurred in the past, but are still being felt in the present.
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Māori Language and its Use

Where applicable, I have mainly used Māori words in preference to their English counterparts (e.g. whare, rangatira, tohunga whakairo). Where Māori words have been used the first usage is followed by the English translation in brackets, taken from Te Aka Māori–English, English–Māori Dictionary and Index, available online from www.maoridictionary.co.nz. A glossary of Māori words can be found at the end of this thesis to aid readers unfamiliar with the Māori language.

The practice of adding macrons to indicate a long vowel and adding hyphens to separate constituent parts of compound names (e.g. Tūranganui–a–Kiwa, Waerenga–a–Hika) have been adhered to the best of my ability except where they are used differently by those most closely associated with the word (e.g. Tūranganui–a–Kiwa not Tūranga–nui–a–Kiwa). The Māori orthographic conventions developed by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (The Māori Language Commission) have been used as a guide and are available from www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz.

Quotations containing Māori words have been kept in their original form and have not had macrons added to them.
Introduction

Under the bright lights and conditioned air a magnificent taonga (treasure) from the past sits silently on level four of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa). Elevated on a platform in a prominent position it stands as the centrepiece of the ‘Mana Whenua’ exhibition, which ‘explores and celebrates Māori as tangata whenua (original people) of Aotearoa New Zealand.’ Tucked away to the left lies a plaque. It reads:

Greetings to all our visitors! We, the Rongowhakaata people of the Gisborne district, welcome you to our great house called Te Hau ki Turanga.

Te Hau ki Turanga celebrates our history and our links with other tribes and nations. We invite you to enter, to join us in sharing our past achievements and our hopes for the future!

Te Hau ki Turanga was built in 1842 at Manutukē, just south of Gisborne, by our most famous carver, Raharuhi Rukupō, in memory of his late brother Tāmati Waka Māngere, a chief of the Ngāti Kaipoho subtribe. Its name, which means the ‘Breezes of Turanga’, alludes to the many influences that all the families and tribes of our district have in common.

This house was acquired by the government in 1867 and was one of the first meeting houses carved entirely with steel adzes and chisels.

Our love for our ancestors and their heritage keeps alive our interest and involvement in this house. Today Te Hau ki Turanga symbolises the proud identity of Rongowhakaata, our contribution to the nation, and our commitment to a bicultural partnership with Te Papa Tongarewa, the Museum of New Zealand.

Although the plaque was produced jointly by Te Papa and representatives of Rongowhakaata, the text reveals little of the deeply contested history of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Over the almost 150 years since the whare (house) arrived in Wellington, the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga has been the subject of three government inquiries and numerous Rongowhakaata requests for its return. During this time, its beauty and allure has also captured the interest and imagination of many. This thesis tells the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga from 1867 until the present. It asks: was the whare ‘stolen from its people

---

2 English text from the plaque adjacent to Te Hau ki Tūranga, Te Papa, sighted 15 May 2008. Māori text is displayed on the left-hand side of the plaque, and the English text on the right.
and wrenched from its roots'? as Rongowhakaata claim and reveals the transformation of the whare over time from ‘curio’, to ‘artefact’, to ‘taonga’.

In the nineteenth century whare whakairo (carved houses) were significant symbols of chiefly and tribal mana (prestige, control, power). They were ‘carved histories’, physical embodiments of tribal history and whakapapa (genealogy), representing a link between the living and the dead. The superior type of wharenui associated with rangatira developed early in Māori history, although they were a lot smaller. Ranginui Walker attributes the development of external carvings a bit later. During their first visit in the eighteenth century, Captain James Cook and Joseph Banks described a ten–metre long wharenui with fully carved interior posts at Tologa Bay. With the advent of steel tools and in response to the size of houses and church halls built by missionaries, wharenui grew bigger and more elaborately carved from the 1820s. Entering an ancestral meeting house is like entering the body of an ancestor, the maihi (bargeboards) are the arms, the amo (posts on either side) the legs, the tāhuhu (ridgepole running down the length of the whare) the back bone, and the heke (rafters) are the ribs, which are linked to each poupou (carved posts on the side walls). A wharenui is considered to be a living thing, not just a work of art, and the poupou do not just represent the ancestors, they are those ancestors. The poupou inside Te Hau ki Tūranga represent important ancestors of the tribes of Tūranganui–a–Kiwa (Gisborne), such as Ngāti Ruapani, Rongowhakaata, Ngai Tāmanuhiri, Te Aitanga–a–Māhaki and Ngāti Kahungunu. Today, whare whakairo assume immense importance as architectural, artistic, and cultural expressions of the Māori people.
Built in the early 1840s, Te Hau ki Tūranga is the oldest meeting house in existence and was renowned in the nineteenth century among both Māori and Pākehā for the magnificence of its carvings. In the early twentieth century it became the prototype for the revitalisation of Māori meeting houses across New Zealand and is today considered one of the ‘top ten’ most precious items in Te Papa, New Zealand’s national museum and art gallery in Wellington.\textsuperscript{12} Scholars also regard it as the finest example of the Tūranga School of carving, which was at its zenith under the leadership of Raharuhi Rukupō, ‘one of the greatest of all Maori carvers.’\textsuperscript{13} With the talent to carve said to have come from the gods, the carver was merely a vehicle for expressing their ‘artistry and genius’. Carving was a

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Dominion}, 19 Jan 2002, p 16.

religious activity associated with the supernatural and only the very best artistic creations, in which the presence of ihi (power) and wehi (fear) can be felt, are credited to the gods.\textsuperscript{14}

The earliest recorded recollection of Te Hau ki Tūranga appears in \textit{Early Maoriland Adventures}, the published manuscripts of missionary J W Stack. As a young boy in 1845 (not long after the whare was built), Stack recalls being taken inside Rukupo’s ‘masterpiece’ with his father, who had been called to attend to an injury Rukupō sustained while carving.\textsuperscript{15} In 1867, following controversy surrounding the removal of the whare, an Auckland newspaper commented:

This house was very much prized by the natives, and famed throughout the whole country as a work of art of its kind unsurpassed, and cost a very large amount of labour.'\textsuperscript{16}

W L Williams, in \textit{East Coast (N.Z.) Historical Records} (1932), describes Orakaiapu Pā (a fortified village) in the nineteenth century and makes special note of Te Hau ki Tūranga:

Besides the ordinary huts there were several buildings of considerably larger dimensions, each the property of one of the subdivisions of the tribe. These were used for gatherings of the people on special occasions or for the entertainment of visitors. These larger constructed buildings...were more elaborately constructed and more freely decorated, sometimes with most elaborate carving. One of these...is now in the Dominion Museum at Wellington. The uprights in the walls of this building were all carved’

Williams goes on to say ‘This building is worthy of better treatment than it has received at the hands of the museum authorities.’\textsuperscript{17}

During its time as an exhibit in Te Papa and its predecessors in Wellington (the Colonial and Dominion Museums), Te Hau ki Tūranga has become the most famous Māori meeting house in New Zealand. The whare was the only major attraction at the Colonial Museum, whose visitor book showed an increase in the number of Māori visitors after Te Hau ki Tūranga was installed in 1868.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[14]{Sidney Moko Mead, ‘Nga Timunga me nga Paringa o te Mana Maori: The Ebb and Flow of Mana Maori and the Changing Context of Maori Art’, in Mead, \textit{Te Maori}, p 24.}
\footnotetext[16]{\textit{Daily Southern Cross} (DSC), 6 Jun 1867; available from Papers Past \url{http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/cgi-bin/paperspast}; accessed 15 Apr 2008.}
\footnotetext[18]{McCarthy, pp 32, 88.}
\end{footnotes}
most popular attractions when it was reinstalled in the ‘Maori Hall’ of the new Dominion Museum in Buckle Street, which opened in 1936. In 1995 Te Hau ki Tūranga was moved to Te Papa on Wellington’s waterfront. Hundreds of thousands of people from New Zealand and around the world have visited the whare since the museum opened in 1998. A search of Google Books - a tool from Google, the American internet search and email giant - will attest that Te Hau ki Tūranga is world famous, appearing in dozens of texts on Māori and Pacific art originating from not just New Zealand, but from the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and Germany.

From the time when Captain Cook and his crew made their first voyage to New Zealand in the eighteenth century, Europeans have collected Māori objects through trade, gifting, barter, and fossicking. Extreme examples of fossicking include the collecting expeditions of Austrian taxidermist Andreas Reischek, who frequently dug up sites and burial caves and took from them waka tūpāpaku (burial chests), human skulls, tools, and ornaments. Reischek is most well known for his removal of two desiccated tūpāpaku (corpses) from a cave in Kāwhia in the 1880s, which ended up at the Imperial Natural History Museum in Vienna. In Victorian New Zealand Māori objects were known amongst commercial collectors and dealers as ‘curios’, a term with nuances of the ‘odd, bizarre, and exotic.’ However, within the Colonial Museum, Māori objects were more commonly referred to as ‘specimens’ and later ‘artefacts’ in line with a more scientific approach to studying and classifying objects. The prevailing view of museums in the nineteenth century was that Māori specimens should be preserved and protected by museums in the interests of science and posterity.

---

19 Estimate based on Te Papa visitor numbers of 15 million from 1998 to 2008 (5.8 million visits of which were made by people from overseas) and Conal McCarthy’s research into ‘Mana Whenua’ (the exhibition containing Te Hau ki Tūranga), which found that the whare was the most popular exhibit visited by 90 per cent of Māori visitors, ‘Te Papa reaches 15 million visits in 10th birthday year’, 16 Dec 2008 Media Release; available from www.tepapa.govt.nz/AboutUs/Media/MediaReleases/2008/Pages/TePapaReaches15MillionVisits.aspx; accessed 10 Aug 2009; McCarthy, p 195.
23 One of the tūpāpaku is said to be the sixteenth century Tainui rangatira Tupahau. For more information on Reischek see Michael King, The Collector: A Biography of Andreas Reischek, Auckland, 1981.
24 McCarthy, p 20.
25 Waitangi Tribunal, p 212.
thought to be a dying race. Elements of Māori culture began to be incorporated into ideas of a unique ‘New Zealand’ culture and identity. Māori taonga thus became part of the nation’s heritage to be preserved for scientific research, art appreciation, and public interest. Effectively, this meant the separation of Māori taonga from their people and their land.

One scholar has described the separation of her ancestral house Mataatua from the whenua (land) in 1878 as a ‘desecration’, forcing the whare to be housed in ‘captivity’ in foreign museums. Witi Ihimaera, in his discussion of the Tokomaru Bay wharenui Ruatopupuke II (now in the Field Museum in Chicago) expressed a similar sentiment:

My personal belief is that all of these meeting houses [in museums] should be brought back. Because, if our marae is our tūrangawaewae, then while they are away the people who belong to them are in limbo.

Nevertheless, Māori anthropologist Hirini Moko Mead credits the practice of European collecting to the existence of taonga today:

Thanks to the Western practice of collecting ‘quaint’ works of art and to modern conservation techniques, the art treasures of a nation can now be likened to a range of mountains. They remain long after they were fashioned by artists of another era. They can be viewed and contemplated a hundred years or more after their manufacture.

The fact that around ninety-five per cent of Māori taonga are held in museums highlights the paradoxical tension that exists between their preservation and salvation by museums on the one hand, and their ‘desecration’ and ‘captivity’ – by being separated from their people and land – on the other. The preservation/desecration dialectic has important implications for Te Hau ki Tūranga. The average life expectancy of a whare whakairo in its natural outdoor conditions in the nineteenth century was one generation or approximately twenty-five years, precisely around the time Te Hau ki Tūranga was removed from

---

27 Waitangi Tribunal, p 212.
30 Mead, ‘Nga Timunga me nga Paringa o te Mana Maori’, p 20.
Orakaiapu Pā. It is most likely that if the whare had not been removed by Crown, Te Hau ki Tūranga - like other wharenui built in the 1840s - would not have survived to the present day.

Similar debates have taken place in Britain over the Parthenon Sculptures (also known as the Elgin Marbles), a collection of classical Greek marble sculptures from the Parthenon temple in Athens. In the early 1800s the British Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Thomas Bruce, the seventh Earl of Elgin, removed the sculptures and sold them to the British Museum in England where they remain today on display. Similarly to Te Hau ki Tūranga, there has been controversy ever since over the nature of the acquisition of the sculptures. Some argue they were taken illegally, but the British maintain they were acquired with the full permission and knowledge of the Ottoman authorities. Those who argue for the sculptures to remain in Britain believe that they were saved from damage, pollution, and other factors that could have destroyed them if they remained in Athens.

In the early 1980s the Greek Government asked the British Museum to return the sculptures but the British Government and the Museum Board of Trustees refused. Greek and British authorities today remain at an impasse over the issue.

At the turn of the twentieth century leading into the new millennium, the Waitangi Tribunal and the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa played important roles in the history of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 1975 the government established the Waitangi Tribunal as a permanent commission of inquiry to make findings on Māori claims against the Crown. During its thirty years of operation the Tribunal has continued to increase public awareness of Māori grievances. In 1997 the Rongowhakaata Trust lodged a claim with the Tribunal for the ‘theft’ of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 2004 the Tribunal released its report, *Turanga Tangata Turanga Whenua: The Report on the Turanganui a Kiwa Claims*. Less than a week later the *Dominion* featured a front-page article entitled ‘Te Papa Treasure Stolen’. Te Papa (branded as ‘Our Place’) is an officially bicultural institution committed

---


to the Treaty of Waitangi. It explicitly recognises ‘mana taonga’, a practice that acknowledges ‘the spiritual and cultural connections of taonga with their people’ and gives Māori the right to ‘care for [their taonga], to speak about them, and to determine their use by the Museum.’ This practice has, in a sense, allowed Te Hau ki Tūranga to be reunited with its people, as Rongowhakaata had little involvement with their whare prior to the late 1980s.

There are many complex layers to the story of the Crown’s acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga. One academic has recently described it as being ‘almost impossible to unravel’. The exact nature of events that occurred in April 1867 is an enigma, plagued by a lack of primary historical sources and set in a context that has the potential for cross-cultural misunderstanding and misrepresentation when different languages, values and belief systems are taken into account. Nonetheless, these are the challenges of studying and unravelling New Zealand history. This thesis has placed the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga and the characters involved in a historical context. It aims to understand the motives and agendas of those concerned and come to a conclusion as to what most likely happened in April 1867.

The major sources for this study are drawn from documentary records held in archival repositories in Wellington, namely Archives New Zealand, the Alexander Turnbull Library, Te Papa Archives, and the Record of Inquiry into the Gisborne Claims at the Waitangi Tribunal. Primary sources on the acquisition of the whare are limited to the text of an 1867 petition by Raharuhi Rukupō for the return of Te Hau ki Tūranga, the minute book of the 1867 Select Committee investigation into the petition, and the minute book of the Native Affairs Committee investigation into an 1878 petition from Rukupō’s family. A fire in Parliament Buildings in 1907 destroyed most of the unbound papers of the Native Department prior to 1891, which may account for the lack of government sources relating to the acquisition of the whare. One extremely useful resource has been Ross B O’Rourke’s ‘Te Hau ki Tūranga: A Chronological Document Bank’ (1994), which is a

38 McCarthy, p 22.
39 Mane–Wheoki, p 5.
comprehensive compilation of material pertaining to Te Hau ki Tūranga from Te Papa and its predecessors. Oral history interviews with Rongowhakaata were not available due to their concurrent negotiations with the government for Rongowhakaata’s Treaty settlement package, and with Te Papa regarding the future of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Briefs of evidence from key Rongowhakaata kaumātua contained in the Waitangi Tribunal’s records have proved invaluable for gaining a glimpse into Rongowhakaata’s view of the history of Te Hau ki Tūranga.

Chapter One of this thesis examines the phenomenon of Crown–Māori relations in nineteenth century Tūranganui-a-Kiwa and focuses on how the immediate historical context shaped and moulded the events of 1867. It traces the complex set of relationships between Tūranga Māori, Pākehā settlers and missionaries, and the external colonial government. A study of the historical context in which the whare existed and was removed is vital. It is the key that unlocks the story and the meanings of the fragments of evidence that remain. Chapter Two attempts to unravel the enigma surrounding the Crown’s removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga from Orakaiapu Pā, a sort of microhistory of that day. Chapter Three explores Te Hau ki Tūranga’s transformation within the museum environment from ‘curio’, to ‘artefact’, to ‘art’; and Chapter Four brings the whare into the present where it exists as both a taonga and a Treaty of Waitangi claim.

The story of Te Hau ki Tūranga is a valuable insight into the history of Crown–Māori relations. It reveals why deep–seated grievances still exist among Māori today and demonstrates the value of the Treaty settlement process as an opportunity for Māori to tell their stories and gain redress for injustices that occurred in the past, but are still being felt in the present. Today, Te Hau ki Tūranga is a living repository of Rongowhakaata history, whakapapa, and identity. It is also famed as a ‘national icon’, an important part of New Zealand’s unique cultural identity. Its story must be told.

---

The first meetings between Tūranga Māori and Pākehā were bloody. James Cook and his crew anchored the *Endeavour* off the mouth of the Tūranganui River on 9 October 1769.\(^2\)

At the place where Cook first set foot on land on the eastern bank of the Tūranganui River, Te Maro of Ngāti Rakai (which later evolved into Ngāti Oneone) was shot dead just as he was about to hurl a spear at a small boat of four boys from Cook’s crew.\(^3\) The following day, after the famous hongi between Captain Cook and a local Māori on the sacred rock Te Toka–a–Taiau, Cook ordered Rongowhakaata chief Te Rākau be shot dead when he snatched a short sword from Charles Green, an astronomer in Cook’s crew.\(^4\) Rongowhakaata oral tradition reports that the party of armed warriors who accompanied Te Rākau had come from Orakaiapu Pā with the initial intention of taking the ship by force of arms.\(^5\)

Mid–afternoon that same day, up to four more Māori were killed when Cook and his men tried to capture a group of fishermen out in their canoe.\(^6\) Thus far, every attempt by Cook and his crew to befriend Tūranga Māori ended in bloodshed or wounding. Joseph

---


\(^6\) Cook’s account states that two or three were killed and one other wounded, whereas Joseph Banks’ account states that four were killed. Mackay, *Historic Poverty Bay*, pp 34–35.
Banks recorded in his journal on 9 October, ‘Thus ended the most disagreeable Day my life has yet seen. Black be the mark for it and Heaven send that such may never return to embitter future reflections!’ It is also likely that among Tūranga Māori, these deaths left feelings of long lasting bitterness towards Pākehā.

Cook had intended to name his place of first landfall ‘Endeavour Bay’. Not having gained much from Tūranga either by way of food, fresh water, or friends, Cook changed his mind and christened the district ‘Poverty Bay’. It is interesting to note that as the Endeavour headed southwards from Tūranga on 12 October, a canoe of four Māori, one of whom Cook recognised from Te Toka–a–Taiau, approached the ship. Without any hesitation they stepped onboard the Endeavour, followed by seven more waka (canoes) full of men numbering around fifty in total. They stayed for a few hours, receiving gifts and trading their patu (clubs), hoe (paddles) and waka in return for Tahitian cloth. Ironically, Cook’s friendly encounter with Tūranga Māori came a little too late. Tūranganui–a–Kiwa would forever be remembered as the unfriendly and hostile ‘Poverty Bay’.

Cook’s experiences are described as an ‘unfortunately appropriate forerunner to later encounters between the two peoples’. Indeed, throughout the period covered in this chapter, the relationship between Tūranga Māori, settlers, and the Crown is characterised by both co–operation and conflict. The Crown considered Tūranga a ‘Native District’, meaning it had little to do with the day–to–day administration of the region and washed its hands of responsibility for Pākehā who chose to settle there. Tensions arose between Māori and settlers over issues such as land and trade, but for the most part settlers peacefully coexisted with Māori. Nevertheless, at the same time as being accommodating of Pākehā settlers, Tūranga Māori remained staunchly independent and fiercely protective of their lands and autonomy. This practical autonomy remained relatively unchallenged until 1865, when the Crown sought to achieve substantive sovereignty in Tūranga through armed conflict at Waerenga–a–Hika. Cook’s visit not only signalled the imminence of small–scale European settlement, but also marked the beginning of a relationship with Britain that would later progress into full–scale colonisation.

---

8 Mackay, Historic Poverty Bay, pp 40–41.
It is within this dynamic context that the carved meeting house Te Hau ki Tūranga was allegedly ‘stolen from its people and wrenched from its roots’. Understanding the history of Crown–Māori relations in Tūranganui–a–Kiwa during this period is critical to unravelling the enigma of whether the Crown actually stole the whare, or whether it was purchased, gifted, or confiscated. An appreciation of the relationships between the key players in the story sheds light on their actions and reveals motives and agendas. This chapter attempts to set the scene by exploring the history of Tūranganui–a–Kiwa from the arrival of traders, whalers, and missionaries in the 1830s, through to the peaceful coexistence between Tūranga Māori and settlers during the forties and fifties, up until armed conflict with the Crown in 1865. Settler–Māori relations began to deteriorate in the late 1850s and early 1860s when Tūranga Māori attitudes towards land began to change and their frustration over the illicit sale of alcohol to Māori intensified. Examining the prelude to war in Tūranga reveals the many built-up layers of tension that came to surface in 1865. The chapter will finish with an examination of the post–conflict environment in which the Crown removed the whare in April 1867.

Tūranganui–a–Kiwa up until 1865 was a Māori domain characterised by almost complete Māori autonomy. European settlement began in the early 1830s with the arrival of whalers, traders, and then missionaries later in the decade. Pākehā were able to survive in Tūranga under the patronage of Māori chiefs and most often intermarried, producing half–Māori children to whom land was given. With European settlement came the benefits of trade and commerce and Tūranga Māori flourished in the local and national economy, buying ships, setting prices and even attempting to build a wheat mill. Tūranga Māori believed they were in full control of their affairs. They looked to the government for economic advice and help when tensions arose with settlers, but did not see the Crown’s authority as ever supplanting their own. As discussed below, the failure of Herbert Wardell, resident magistrate from 1855, to establish administrative control in the region is further evidence that Tūranga Māori held the balance of power. The Crown wielded only nominal sovereignty over the region until the arrival of Pai Mārire (a new Māori religious faith) in early 1865. The perceived threat of large–scale Māori rebellion gave the Crown justification to move in its troops and expel Pai Mārire followers in the district.

---

10 Stirling, p 144.
Traders and shore–based whalers started establishing themselves along the Tūranganui River in the early 1830s. Men such as J W Harris and Thomas Halbert were the founders of the settler community in Tūranga. Both took Māori wives and Harris was gifted land for his part–Māori children. Through these Māori women, relationships were forged between Tūranga Māori and settlers. Raharuhi Rukupō adopted Ōtene Pītau at birth, a son produced from Halbert’s second marriage to Pirihi Konekone of Te Āıtanga-a-Māhaki.\footnote{Elspeth M Simpson and K M Simpson, ‘Halbert, Thomas 1807/1808?-1865’, Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, updated 22 Jun 2007; available from \url{http://www.dnzb.govt.nz}; accessed 10 Oct 2008.} Pītau later became one of the 1878 petitioners for the return of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Halbert’s fifth marriage to Kaikeri of Rongowhakaata produced a daughter Keita, who married settler James Wyllie.\footnote{Mackay, Historic Poverty Bay, p 104.}\footnote{Ibid, p xv.}\footnote{Daly, p 22.}\footnote{Oliver and Thomson, p 18.} Keita was Raharuhi Rukupō’s niece and another one of the 1878 petitioners. Extracts of her testimony regarding the removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga will be examined in the following chapter.

Harris lived under the patronage of Rongowhakaata chief Paratene Tūrangitū (also known as Paratene Pototi) and local Gisborne historian J A Mackay notes that early settlers were ‘regarded by the natives as mere “squatters on sufferance.”’.\footnote{Ibid, p xv.} This is not to say, however, that they were unwelcome in Tūranga. Māori were keen to acquire European commodities and there was a certain amount of prestige associated with having a trader resident in the community.\footnote{Daly, p 22.} Settlement was sporadic but the few settlers that were scattered throughout the region represented what historians W H Oliver and Jane M Thomson call ‘the very thin end of a very large imperial wedge’.\footnote{Oliver and Thomson, p 18.} Although the Crown lacked any kind of presence or authority on the ground in Tūranga, it held British legal sovereignty over the district.

Later in the 1830s the first mission station in Tūranga was established on Rongowhakaata land at Kaupapa near Orakaipu Pā, the original site of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 1844 the mission was moved to Whakatō and William Williams of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) took up residence there with his family early the following year.\footnote{Whakatō is the current site of the Rongowhakaata meeting house Te Mana o Tūranga which opened in 1883. See Rongowhakaata Trust, ‘Rongowhakaata: Te Tipuna, Te Whenua Me Te Iwi – A History of a People’, January 2001, Document A28, Record of Inquiry for the Gisborne Claims, Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, pp 63–66.} Williams first visited Tūranga in 1838 when he brought six native teachers to Poverty Bay and Waiapu to spread the new religion. Early conversion to Christianity was rapid, self–
induced, and mainly due to the efforts of these native teachers as there had been little
direct or regular European missionary involvement in Tūranga to account for the scale and
speed of conversion.\textsuperscript{17} Similar to the way status was attached to having resident traders,
being associated with Christianity gave Māori prestige in the eyes of other Māori.\textsuperscript{18}
Raharuhi Rukūpō himself was a teacher at Williams’ mission from 1843.\textsuperscript{19}

Tūranga Māori integrated elements of Christianity into their existing belief systems.
Williams performed Christian prayers at traditional Māori tangihanga (funerals), and
tohunga tā moko (tattooists) conducted Christian prayers before beginning their work,
even though missionaries strongly opposed tattooing. The carvings done for the new
Church in Manutūkē in 1849 also illustrates Māori belief that the old was compatible with
the new.\textsuperscript{20} Williams found the carvings of the human form to be inappropriate for a place
of worship, but the carvers strongly disagreed and refused to carve replacements. Raharuhi
Rukūpō was one of the carvers and mediated between Williams and the others who
eventually agreed on a less ‘obscene’ design.\textsuperscript{21} A number of traditional Māori customs
discouraged by the missionaries, such as cannibalism and settling disputes by force of arms,
did cease, but Tūranga Māori became no less Māori by converting to a European religion.
Oliver and Thomson explain ‘Maoris [sic] in the mass became Christian....But in the process
Christianity became Māori.’\textsuperscript{22}

Similarly, the arrival of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 in Tūranga caused little
immediate change. Twenty–two Tūranga Māori signed the Treaty between 5 and 12 May
1840, including Rongowhakaata chiefs Tāmati Waka Māngere (Rukūpō’s elder brother for
whom Te Hau ki Tūranga was built as a memorial) and Harris’ patron Paratene Tūrangi.
At the time of signing there were very few Europeans in Tūranga and no official
government representative in the area. The only marked change was in the attitude of
settlers, who assumed that the authority of the colonial government now overrode that of
Tūranga Māori. The Treaty had very few immediate consequences in Tūranga and issues
over land and authority emerged later in the 1850s and 60s.

\textsuperscript{17} Oliver and Thomson, p 29.
\textsuperscript{18} K M Sanderson, ‘These Neglected Tribes: A Study of the East Coast Maoris and their Missionary, William
Zealand, Auckland, 1987, p 76; William Williams Journal, 26 Dec 1843, vol 3, 1841–46, qMS 2250, Alexander
Turnbull Library (ATL), Wellington, in Cecilia Edwards, ‘Tu
ranganui a Kiwa 1840–1865’, March 2002,
Document F10, Record of Inquiry for the Gisborne Claims, Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, p 113.
\textsuperscript{20} Pakariki Harrison and Steven Oliver, ‘Rukupo, Raharuhĩ ? – 1873’, updated 22 Jun 2007, Dictionary of New
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
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In the 1850s Tūranga Māori flourished in the local and national economies. Tūranga growers rapidly increased wheat production during the 1840s and it became the chief export to Auckland in the 1850s. The Australian gold rushes early in the decade caused an increase in demand for foodstuffs and a corresponding increase in the price of wheat. Auckland merchants were eager to fill the shortage and the East Coast was one of their largest suppliers. Donald McLean estimated that in 1855 around 100,000 bushels of wheat were produced between the East Cape and the Wairoa River. Maize, salt pork, and onions were exported on a smaller scale, and potatoes were traded locally. When McLean (then a native lands purchase commissioner) first visited Tūranga in 1851, he observed Māori:

‘returning from reaping their fields, some leading horses and others driving cattle and pet pigs before them...The fat cattle, the large wheat stalks of last year's growth, fine alluvial soil, and contented appearance of the natives made an impression that this was certainly anything but a land of destitution or want.’

McLean remarked that Tūranga did not deserve the name given to it by Cook (Poverty Bay), and went on to describe the splendid land and rich grasses in the ‘beautiful Turanga Valley’.

Supplying the Auckland market proved very profitable and as a result Tūranga Māori enjoyed a substantial amount of material wealth. Income in cash and trade goods is estimated at around £5000 per annum in the later 1850s. Tūranga Māori spent this wealth on European goods or invested in stock and equipment. An example of the level of material prosperity is the hospitality provided by Rongowhakaata to their Tūhoe manuhiri (visitors) when they came to Tūranga in 1854:

...a long temporary shed was constructed with poles, and on the arrival of the visitors these were covered with blankets and pieces of print and calico, while inside were placed hundredweight boxes of biscuit with quantities of flour, sugar, tea, tobacco, and various other articles, all of which were a gift to the visitors in addition to the ordinary food of the people with which they were abundantly supplied.
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What made such a lavish display of luxury so remarkable was that it would have been unimaginable to Tūranga Māori a few years previous. In 1856 Raharuhi Rukupō borrowed £500 from the government to help purchase the Adah, a 37 tonne schooner. By 1861 five trading vessels were operating out of Tūranga. Such a substantial increase in the material conditions of life had occurred over the course of only a few years.

As Tūranga Māori became more experienced in trade and commerce they began to assert control over resources in the district. Vessels were charged for entering the Tūranganui River, for fresh water taken from it per bucket, and for timber. In March 1851 Tūranga Māori began demanding payment in money for grazing rights instead of the one calf for grazing forty head of cattle per year they were receiving. Local trader J W Harris was outraged at their audacity and wrote to McLean in June to complain. Local traders and settlers were further outraged in 1858 when the rūnanga (committee representing local iwi) decided to fix the price of wheat at 12 shillings per bushel in line with markets in Hawkes Bay and Auckland. Their attempts to wield power over economic issues in the district caused a deterioration in their relationship with settlers, who could not escape the laws of the rūnanga and felt powerless against the collective force of Māori autonomy.

The theme of Māori autonomy dominates the history of Tūranganui–a–Kiwa from early European settlement to the outbreak of conflict in 1865. In this context autonomy can be defined as the ‘practical manifestation of day–to–day control in the district’. Oliver and Thomson explain that in the East Coast region before the 1870s, Māori outweighed Pākehā in terms of ‘population, size, social pre–eminence, economic function, political authority and military strength’, and this was particularly true in Tūranga. In 1865 there were approximately 1500 Māori in Tūranga compared to sixty or seventy Pākehā, and almost all the land in the district remained in Māori ownership. Collective political power lay with the rūnanga made of up rangatira from local iwi (tribes), which ruled over both economic and social issues such as trade, European settlement, land sales, and the supply and consumption of alcohol. McLean was unable to purchase any land during his two visits to Tūranga in the 1850s, and when Governor Gore Browne visited in 1860 he was shocked at
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the open displays of contempt for the Queen’s authority. Tūranga Māori did not completely reject the Crown, however, as the rūnanga and individual rangatira wrote regularly to government officials, seeking advice and expressing concern over issues involving settlers and other Māori.

Tūranga’s first real contact with the government took place when Donald McLean paid a visit in February 1851. McLean had been land prospecting in Hawkes Bay and travelled to Tūranga to discuss the possibility of land sales and the establishment of a European township. Tūranga Māori were divided, even within iwi. Rongowhakaata rangatira Te Waaka Perohuka and Paratene Tūrangi were in favour of a township while others, such as Raharuhi Rukupō, were ardently opposed to the sale of any land. Aware of the link between government officials, land sales, and yielding authority to the Queen, several rangatira treated McLean’s proposal with suspicion. At a meeting at Orakaiapu Pā McLean recorded in his journal:

The Chiefs soon assembled, dressed in handsome dog–skin mats, and spoke sarcastically—especially Raharuhi, a second–rate Chief, – as to the benefits of Europeans; remarking that, if, at the towns where we came from, natives could get their goods for nothing, then he would think of having a town also.34

When McLean arrived at Orakaiapu Pā that day he also noted in his journal that he saw ‘the most elegantly carved native house in New Zealand.’35

Shortly after McLean’s second visit in 1855, the government stationed Herbert Wardell in Tūranga as the district’s first resident magistrate. Wardell provided mediation in a court setting and heard small cases from Māori and settlers on matters such as assault, defamation, and theft. He also selected prominent local rangatira Raharuhi Rukupō, Paratene Tūrangi, Kahutia, and Rāwiri Te Eke to act as native assessors in cases involving Māori. Initially, both Māori and settlers welcomed a government presence in the region but later became disillusioned with Wardell’s application of British law. Tūranga Māori employed Wardell’s services on their own terms, accepting or rejecting the courts’ findings as it suited them. Settlers too protected their own interests, often choosing to disregard Wardell’s rulings when it affected them personally and settle disputes the Māori way, which they were well used to by the time he arrived. Wardell was ineffectual because he lacked the power to enforce his own decisions or summon defendants to his court. Oliver and

34 Donald McLean Journal, 7 Feb 1851, Donald McLean Papers, Series 14: Transcripts of Selected Papers, MS–1286, Vol 3, ATL.
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Thomson dub him the ‘local man of war without guns’ and the ‘powerless agent of a powerful queen’.36 Even Wardell himself admitted feeling as such.37

The failure of Herbert Wardell to establish any system of British law or administration during his five years as resident magistrate is also testament to the fact that Māori controlled the district on a day-to-day basis. Tūranga Māori did not recognise the overarching authority of Wardell or British law on the basis that they had not sold any land to the Queen. At the 1858 price-fixing rūnanga, Tūranga Māori expressed very strong sentiments of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) and not one speaker showed any support for the Queen. Paratene Tūrangi emphasised that:

We are not the remnant of a people left by the Pakeha; we have not been conquered; the Queen has her island, we have ours; the same language is not spoken in both. 38

In regard to Wardell, Kahutia (a Te Aitanga–a–Māhaki rangatira) proclaimed:

Let the Magistrate be under the Queen if he likes; we will not consent to Her authority; we will exercise our own authority in our own country...I had the mana before the pakeha came and have it still.39

As fears of British encroachment increased with Wardell’s presence, Tūranga Māori responded with more forceful assertions of their authority and independence. Wardell, who was allowed to attend the rūnanga but not participate, called it ‘The most open defiance of British authority I have yet heard of’.40

When Governor Gore Browne visited in January 1860 he found Tūranga Māori hostile and the settlers anxious. Browne’s visit had stirred talk of Māori expelling all Europeans from the district because their presence gave the governor reason to come to Tūranga and an excuse to seize their lands.41 Rukupō told Browne that Tūranga Māori objected to the Union Jack flying over Wardell’s residence during his stay because they did not recognise the Queen’s authority. Rukupō also told Browne that unless he was there to ‘restor[e] the lands which the Europeans had cheated them out of’, he was not welcome in Tūranga and could take his English Magistrate (Wardell) with him.42 Browne was angered
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and offended by their apparent rudeness and recommended that Wardell be withdrawn and not replaced. Rukupō later wrote to the government on behalf of the rūnanga and explained that they were simply asserting their rangatiratanga (chieftainship) and reacting to perceived attempts to take their land.43

The persistence of Tūranga Māori attempts to maintain control over land in the district became a considerable source of tension between Māori, settlers, and the Crown. Settlers, such as J W Harris, pressured the Crown to buy land in the region, telling McLean in 1851 that ‘Written agreements with the natives here are useless, except as binding the European.’44 Settlers were also keen to acquire Crown titles for their land, whether acquired legally before 1840 or illegally afterwards. Pressure to sell created division amongst Tūranga Māori and quarrels between sellers and non–sellers. Some Māori favoured land sales because they brought settlers and trade, while others – all too aware of the effects of land loss experienced by Māori in other regions - were strongly opposed.

In 1851 a fragmented ‘redemption movement’ began when Kahutia (the principal land seller in the district) confessed to wrongfully selling land after local rangatira threatened to banish him from the region. Kahutia began actively opposing settler claims and attempted to resume possession of all alienated land. Horses and cows received from settlers were returned, rejecting the view that these payments amounted to a purchase.45 In 1859 the Redemption Movement developed into full–blown repudiation of all land sales under the leadership of Raharuhi Rukupō. The movement continued into the early 1860s, by which time Tūranga Māori had attempted to reclaim all land sold subsequent to 1840.

Unresolved land claims caused ongoing insecurity for both settlers and Māori. Correspondence from Wardell and settlers expressing concern over Kahutia’s resumption activities prompted Governor Browne to send land claims commissioner Francis Dillon Bell to the region. Bell arrived in December 1859 to attempt to settle what was collectively known as the ‘old land claims’, which involved pre–1840 land purchases, land gifted for part–Māori children, and land purchased after Governor Gipps’ January 1840 proclamation.46 The claims were met with such strong opposition organised by Raharuhi Rukupō that Bell was unable to settle anything. Fearing that Māori would repudiate all transactions, settlers withdrew their claims and were left frustrated and unable to obtain

43 Stirling, p 6.
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legal title. Rather than resolve land disputes, Bell’s visit served to intensify existing tensions between Tūranga Māori and settlers. When Governor Browne arrived just a few days after Bell had left the district, he stepped right into the heat of tensions over land.

The repudiation of most land transactions in 1859 occurred at a time when settler–Māori relations were at a low. As European settlement increased and government officials began taking an interest in the district, Tūranga Māori attitudes towards land sales began to change. In 1851 Kahutia told Harris that he intended to resume his property as Harris ‘had had it long enough’. Even the missionaries were not exempt; when Williams returned to Tūranga in 1853 after his three–year absence in England, Rongowhakaata were unwilling to sell him land for a school and training college adjacent to the mission station at Whakatō. The sly grog trade also created animosity between some rangatira and local sellers. In April 1858 James Wyllie was found guilty of supplying rum. Later that year Rukupō complained to Wardell about Wyllie’s abusive language towards Māori and even wrote to the governor to complain about Wyllie’s conduct. In 1858 Rukupō banished Captain George Read (Tūranga’s principal trader) from the region for repeatedly selling spirits to Māori. Not long after, the rūnanga met and around a hundred Tūranga Māori gathered to complain about Europeans selling grog. Troubles with land and the consumption and sale of alcohol strained the delicate state of relations between Tūranga Māori and settlers.

During the early 1860s land continued to be a source of tension between settlers and Tūranga Māori as well as amongst Tūranga Māori themselves. Often, rangatira sold land without the consent of all its owners, causing quarrels with other Māori. Raharuhi Rukupō was involved in a land dispute with Kahutia over a piece of land Kahutia sold to Robert Espie which Rukupō had interests in. Rukupō wrote to Browne in May 1860 asking him to send Bell ‘to settle about the payment for my piece of land.’ The following year Rukupō wrote to Bell on behalf of the rūnanga and said ‘tell the European to give us our lands back....Let the Europeans be merely squatters’. Land was of paramount concern to Rukupō and he continued to write to McLean and the governor over the next few years and made further requests to reinvestigate land claims in Tūranga. In 1864 McLean reported that in preparation for the return of Bell, thirty horses had been rounded
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up as payment for improvements made on Espie’s land, but Bell never came. By 1864 the rūnanga ruled against all land sales although some individuals were still willing to sell.

The sly grog trade continued to plague relations in the early 1860s. Tūranga rangatira wrote many times to Governors Browne and Grey about the sale and consumption of alcohol. In 1860 Hirini Te Kani wrote to ask that intoxicating drinks not be taken to Tūranga. In 1862 Anaru Matete, Raharuhi Rukupō, and Tamati Hapimana also wrote to complain about the supply of spirits to Māori, with Hapimana reporting that he had fined a Pākehā for bringing beer into Tūranga. The government supported Tūranga Māori concern over the sale of liquor to Māori but emphasised that it would only work if Māori played their part and named those responsible. During Wardell’s time as resident magistrate he was unable to curtail the supply of alcohol, leaving Māori disenchanted with the effectiveness of British law and settlers involved in the trade resentful.

From the time of first contact with Cook in 1769 to the early 1860s, Tūranga Māori endured an enormous amount of economic and social change. From the arrival of whalers, traders, and missionaries in the 1830s, to the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 and government attempts to gain footing in the district in the 1850s, Tūranga Māori were successful in maintaining their whenua (land) and day–to–day control of the district. At the same time they also managed to reap the benefits of wealth and literacy. The idea that the British Crown would one day supersede their authority in Tūranga would have been inconceivable to them in 1840. But, as relations with the settlers became strained in the 1850s, and the Crown waged war against Māori in Taranaki and Waikato in the early 1860s, Tūranga Māori became more concerned about the possibilities of armed conflict and land loss. The arrival of Pai Mārire in Tūranga in March 1865 sparked off a series of events that eventually led to such a fate: warfare, imprisonment, exile, and confiscation. In the wake of all of this, Te Hau ki Tūranga was also taken.
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Māori in Taranaki and Waikato were ravaged by war in the early 1860s. Armed conflict broke out between the Crown and Taranaki Māori over a disputed land sale at Waitara in March 1860. In July 1863 Governor Grey invaded the Waikato, Hauraki, and Tauranga in an attempt to crush the expanding authority of the Kīngitanga, the pan–tribal Māori King Movement. Hundreds of Māori lost their lives in these conflicts and extensive land confiscation was implemented under the terms of the 1863 New Zealand Settlements Act, which enabled the Crown to confiscate land from any North Island tribe said to be in rebellion against the Queen. As these events swept across the North Island, tensions heightened in Tūranga as they became increasingly aware that Māori who fought against the Crown paid the price of ‘rebellion’ with their lives and their land. Unfortunately, for Tūranga Māori Taranaki and Waikato were the ‘crucibles of war, which would spread far across the island’.  

Tūranga Māori more or less regarded wars outside their rohe as foreign wars and maintained a policy of deliberate neutrality. In 1860 Tūranga rangatira declined to send aid to leading Taranaki rangatira Wiremu Kīngi because they felt their men should remain at home to protect their own lands. Settler J W Harris told McLean that Tūranga Māori were only sympathetic with Pōtatau (the Māori King) in terms of his efforts to stop land sales and reclaim land already sold, but not in terms of his authority. In 1863 at the opening of the carved Anglican Church in Manutūkē, Williams reported that Tūranga Māori agreed with Ānaru Mātete when he told a delegation of the King’s followers that an attitude of neutrality was best when dealing with the government and there was no better unity for Māori than under Christianity. Tūranga Māori saw the Kīngitanga as an attempt to impose outside authority or obligations on them, similar to the Crown. They consistently refused to give active allegiance to either King or Queen.

The Pai Mārire faith had its genesis in 1862 when the archangel Gabriel revealed himself to Te Ua Haumene in a vision. Te Ua was a strong supporter of the Kīngitanga and fought in armed conflict against the government in Taranaki in 1860. Gabriel told Te Ua that God had chosen him as his prophet to cast off the oppression of the Pākehā.
scripturally based faith, historian Judith Binney describes Pai Mārire as a doctrine of peace ‘born in a situation of war’.\(^{61}\) She also suggests that people drew on the faith for strength to defend themselves in times of hardship and warfare, such as when the military were occupying their lands and destroying their crops.\(^{62}\) Oliver and Thomson argue that Pai Mārire was a ‘religious justification of resistance’.\(^{63}\) Pai Mārire gave Hauhau (the term for its religious followers) a way to assert control of their situation, which was becoming increasingly threatening as the Crown pursued war across the North Island. In March 1865 Te Ua sent Pai Mārire emissaries Pātara Raukatauri and Kereopa Te Rau with the preserved head of a British soldier as a tiwha (token) to present to Te Aitanga–a–Hautū rangatira Hirini Te Kani.\(^{64}\) This action set in train a series of events that would change Tūranga forever.

The arrival of Pātara, Kereopa, and their party in Tūranga exacerbated existing tensions between Māori (both intra and inter–tribal), settlers, and the Crown. At Ōpōtiki, on their way through to Tūranga, Kereopa took part in the murder and decapitation of CMS missionary Carl Sylvius Völkner, drinking his blood and swallowing his eyes.\(^{65}\) The news of Völkner’s slaying sent shockwaves through the Māori and settler community at Tūranga, and ensured the presence of Pai Mārire would not be tolerated in the region by the government or its Māori supporters. Williams urged Hirini Te Kani and Ānaru Mātete, the young Ngāti Maru (a hapū of Rongowhakaata) rangatira, to turn them away but was surprised and disgusted when they declined to do so.\(^{66}\) Hirini accepted the tiwha, but made it clear that he did not accept the faith and disapproved of the Pai Mārire visitors. Siân Daly suggests that Hirini did not feel his position in the district was secure enough to order the emissaries away.\(^{67}\) Over 600 Tūranga Māori turned up at Taureka on the outskirts of
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Tūranga to welcome Kereopa and his group on 13 March and Rongowhakaata invited them as their guests to proceed through Patutahi to Whakatō to meet Pātara.⁶⁸

Pai Mārire promises of spiritual salvation and the retention of land and independence induced many Tūranga Māori to convert to the faith. Ānaru Mātete explained, ‘we have joined the hauhau because we think by so doing we shall save our land and the remnant of our people’.⁶⁹ Many also saw in Pai Marire the power to resist European authority, even if they did not believe in the religion. Others used it as a means of asserting tribal or chiefly authority over their rivals. Paul Clark, in his work ‘Hauhau: The Pai Marire Search for Maori Identity’ (1975), believed that the rapid and large-scale conversion of Te Aitanga–a–Māhaki in March 1865 was a move to gain advantage over Ngāti Porou, their traditional rivals.⁷⁰ When contemplating joining, Tūranga Māori also had to consider the political implications of belonging to what the government had condemned a ‘fanatical sect’ whose practices would be resisted by force of arms if necessary.⁷¹

For the same reasons that many converted to Pai Mārire, many aligned themselves with the government or remained neutral. Those Māori who fought on the government’s side were known as kūpapa (collaborator, ally) or kāwanatanga (government) Māori and were also referred to as ‘loyalists’, ‘Queenites’, and ‘friendlies’. Belich describes the ‘kupapa phenomenon’ as a development of later wars such as those on the East Coast and argues that kūpapa were vital to the government after the withdrawal of British troops in Taranaki and Waikato.⁷² Kāwanatanga rangatira saw security in co-operation with what was still a remote government. At a loyalist meeting in July 1865, Rongowhakaata chief Tamihana Ruatapu expressed his belief that it was support for the government, not Hauhau, that would protect their land.⁷³ Paora Kate (Rukupō’s younger brother) agreed, saying that the Queen’s flags will secure their lands, Hauhau will not.⁷⁴ Those who remained neutral did so because they could not see good in either side. Wiremu Kīngi expressed this sentiment when he stated, ‘If I join the Hauhaus there is evil; if I join the Governor there would be
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evil; therefore I remain neutral’.\textsuperscript{75} In spite of their differences, the long–term goals of Pai Mārire, kāwanatanga/kūpapa and neutral Māori were the same: the ‘retention of land, autonomy, [and] resistance of assimilation’.\textsuperscript{76}

However, the political allegiances of Tūranga Māori were not always rigid or clear–cut. Many did not decide straight away or were half–hearted in their commitment. Oliver remarks that Wi Pere, who appeared to be neutral, was one of many ‘concealed waverers’ towards the Pai Mārire side.\textsuperscript{77} Many also changed sides as it suited them and this ambivalence confused and frustrated government officials. Lieutenant Wilson issued a notice in September to ‘the loyal natives of Tūranga’ asking them to be true in their declaration either for or against the government. Wilson would not tolerate friendly relations between kāwanatanga Māori and Pai Mārire, telling them to ‘either be cold or hot, and not remain as sources of trouble and perplexity to both parties’.\textsuperscript{78} Many Māori who remained neutral only took sides when conflict became inevitable and they were forced to choose. This may explain the reason why Māori who fought on the government’s side are historically known as kūpapa, when the term itself means ‘neutral’ or ‘to lie flat in a quarrel’.\textsuperscript{79}

Many of the men who feature in the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga make their first appearance in the lead up to armed conflict between the Crown and Tūranga Pai Mārire at Waerenga–a–Hika pa in November 1865. Raharuhi Rukupō played a crucial role in the months leading up to November as the leading negotiator on behalf of Tūranga Pai Mārire. In the weeks before conflict broke out Rukupō was working hard to maintain peace in Tūranga, although some doubted his sincerity. Mōkena Kōhere, a prominent government aligned Ngāti Porou rangatira, emerged as a key antagonist of Tūranga Māori and was eager to fight Pai Mārire and extend his influence beyond that of Ngāti Porou territory. In early November the government brought in Tāreha Te Moananui, the Ngāti Kahungunu rangatira, to maintain a dialogue with Rukupō and attempt to bring him over to the government side. Donald McLean, superintendent of the Hawkes Bay and government
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agent on the East Coast, arrived not long after Tāreha and issued an ultimatum to Pai Mārie in Tūranga. They had to accept McLean’s terms of surrender or face attack and suffer land confiscation to pay for the cost of repressing their ‘rebellion’ and maintaining order. The repercussions of what ensued on the East Coast over the eight months from March to November changed the fate of Tūranga Māori and broke their independence and neutrality so characteristic of the previous decade.

During the 1850s and early 1860s Raharuhi Rukupō was regarded as one of the principal men in Tūranga.

Born at the beginning of the nineteenth century at Orakaipu Pā, Rukupō was the second son of Te Pohepohe (also known as Pītau) of Ngāti Maru and Hinekoua of Ngāti Kaipoho, both of which were large hapū of Rongowhakaata. Rukupō was adopted by his maternal aunt and grew up in Pakirikiri near Tokomaru Bay further up the East Coast. He returned to Tūranga around 1840 after the death of his elder brother, Tāmati Wāka Māngere, to become the new leader of Ngāti Kaipoho. Some say he was given the name Raharuhi because his return was ‘like that of Lazarus of the Scriptures’, although Raharuhi may have been a baptismal name. In the early 1840s Rukupō built Te Hau ki Tūranga as a memorial to Tāmati Wāka Māngere. Around this time Rukupō also carved the stern post for the waka taua (war canoe) Te–Toki–a–Tāpiri, now in the Auckland Museum. Rukupō was also one of the carvers who worked on the new Anglican Church in Manutūkē in 1849. As well as becoming renowned as one of the greatest carvers of his time, Rukupō rose to ascendency in Tūranga as a leading chief of Rongowhakaata. His name can be found peppered throughout general histories of Tūranga.

Rukupō was frank in expressing any misgivings he had about the government. In a letter to Francis Dillon Bell in 1861 he conveyed his confusion about the government’s intentions: ‘you protect, and you seize, you are kind and you are ready to fight’. The same year in a letter written on behalf of the rūnanga to McLean, Rukupō again questioned the government’s integrity, stating ‘we are aware of the proper view of your word, namely it has two sides, and within ourselves your word will not abide true’. In the same letter, Rukupō maintained that he could not trust the governor and that fighting would come to Tūranga because:

---
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we have the land in possession from which flows fatness, and from the
fatness of our land we derive what we are now possessed of, namely money.
This will be the cause or the reason for which he will fight against us.  

Rukupō considered land to be at the heart of conflict between Māori and the Crown.  

The prelude to conflict in Tūranga unfolded in two phases; the first from March to June,
and the second from June to November following the outbreak of conflict in Waiapu
(further up the East Coast) between Pai Mārire and kāwanatanga factions of Ngāti Porou.
From March to June the situation in Tūranga was particularly tense for settlers who feared
for their safety with the presence of Völkner’s killers in the district, but relatively secure for
Tūranga Māori who set about determining their religious and political allegiances. In June
Pātara Raukatauri arrived in Waiapu and triggered a series of skirmishes that lasted until
October. After suffering heavy losses Pai Mārire ‘refugees’ started arriving in Tūranga in
September and October, followed not long after by their kāwanatanga enemies. At the end
of September outlying settlers came in to Tūranga to the newly built redoubt at Kaiti,
signifying the insecurity in the district. It is at this point, in the face of an imminent crisis,
that Raharuhi Rukupō began to work hard to maintain the status quo and negotiate a
peaceful resolution with military officials and McLean, but to no avail.

---
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Map 1. Places of conflict on the East Coast from 1864-1867.

From March to June settlers were anxious as the security of their situation in Tūranga remained uncertain. In early April William Williams and his family along with a number of European settlers fled to Napier. On 6 April Wī Haronga, Williams’ supporter at the Waerenga–a–Hika mission station, wrote to the Māori newspaper *Te Waka Maori* to explain Williams’ departure, giving reasons including Kereopa making threats against his life.  

Settler J W Harris, who acted as McLean’s informant in Tūranga, wrote to him on 10 April stressing the instability of their situation and suggested that a stockade be built and Captain Read’s trading vessels be held at bay to evacuate the settlers if trouble arose. Nevertheless, that same month the settlers decided unanimously against accepting the government’s offer of arms to avoid complicating the situation. In May the leading chiefs in Tūranga assured settlers they would not be harmed and should remain in the district. Upon embarking for the East Coast, Te Ua had given Pātara and Kereopa strict instructions not to do anything to harm the Pākehā.

While settlers were uneasy about the presence of Pai Mārire in the district, around a third of Tūranga Māori had converted to the new faith by early April. Te Aitanga–a–Māhaki converted almost en masse but Rongowhakaata were only lukewarm at first. It is likely that Rukupō converted around this time or not long after, although he remained politically neutral in the sense that he did not actively rally against the government. At the end of April leading Tūranga chief Hirini Te Kani and others visited McLean in Napier to stress their neutral stance. By this time Pātara and Kereopa had already left the district for Waiapu further north. In early May a hui (meeting) was held at Whakatō (in Rongowhakaata territory) where the majority of attendees spoke in favour of remaining politically neutral. Converting to the Pai Mārire religion was not synonymous with wanting to levy war against settlers and the government. Likewise, government aligned Tūranga Māori did not want to fight against Pai Mārire emissaries and their converts. The central issue of concern for Tūranga rangatira was protecting their control of the district from outside threats such as the Crown and Ngāti Porou.

Remaining politically neutral became difficult for Tūranga Māori when Mōkena Köhere hoisted a flagstaff to fly the British flag on disputed land at Tītirangi (a headland) in May. Mōkena and other Ngāti Porou chiefs arrived in the district earlier in the month.

---

onboard the *Esk* accompanied by Captain Luce, Grey’s representative sent to the East Coast to rally support for the government. On 6 May W I. Williams (William Williams’ son) recorded that rumours were circulating in Tūranga that Mōkena was seeking to banish anti-government Māori and levy war against them.\(^88\) He proposed to blockade Pai Mārire and declare war on them if they resisted but W I. Williams persuaded him against this. Rongowhakaata reacted by telling Kōhere to go back to his own district and not stir up any ‘rāru’ (trouble) in Tūranga. Several days later Mōkena decided to make a stand and erected the flagstaff on 8 May. Hirini Te Kani, as well as Ngāi Te Kete (a hapu of Rongowhakaata) and Te Aitanga-a-Māhaki, had competing interests in the land and Mōkena’s provocative actions enraged Hirini and angered Rongowhakaata. Harris wrote to McLean in late May and reported that Rukupō had threatened to take down the flagstaff and that he believed Rukupō’s intentions were to ‘get this district in a blaze’.\(^89\) Flags were powerful symbols of autonomy and the erection of the British flag as a symbol of British authority resulted in the polarisation of Tūranga Māori into semi–hostile factions, something they had tried to avoid.\(^90\) The flagstaff issue forced Tūranga Māori to declare their political allegiances either for or against the government.

Mōkena Kōhere was a high profile Ngāti Porou rangatira from Rangitukia and assumed importance in the lead up to conflict in November. Like Rukupō, Mōkena was well acquainted with European technology and law. He worked as a native assessor in the combined districts of Waiapu and Tokomaru for the European magistrate William Baker. But unlike Rukupō, Mōkena was firmly opposed to the establishment of the Pai Mārire faith on the East Coast and he sought arms and soldiers from McLean to fight it. Mōkena saw Pai Mārire emissaries as an outside threat to his authority and the autonomy of Ngāti Porou. Mōkena also strongly resisted the Kingitanga and dissuaded his people from becoming involved in the conflict in Waikato, fearing that Ngāti Porou lands would be confiscated.\(^91\) Oliver and Thomson argue that Ngāti Porou loyalists were traditionalists who believed that it was still possible to come to advantageous terms with settlers and the government. They also suggest that many Ngāti Porou joined the government side because of heavy losses suffered in battles against the Crown in Taranaki and Waikato.\(^92\) By
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aligning himself with the government, Mōkena sought to achieve the best outcome for his people.

In the beginning of June the arrival of Pātara Raukatauri at Pukemaire Pā (not far from the township of Tikitiki) in Waiapu triggered a series of armed conflicts that lasted until October. Mass conversions had occurred amongst Ngāti Porou and fighting broke out on 9 June when Pātara resisted Ngāti Porou attempts to arrest him. McLean sent arms and ammunition along with Lieutenant Reginald Biggs and thirty volunteers to support the kāwanatanga party. Nevertheless, the loyalists suffered defeats at Mangaone and Tikitiki and false rumours of great Hauhau victories reached Tūranga in late June. On 13 July after persuading the government to provide military assistance, McLean sent Captain Fraser and ninety military settlers and Hawkes Bay volunteers to Waiapu from Napier. A number of Tūranga Pai Mārire also went north to aid their Ngāti Porou kin in the fighting. It was reported that Pātara wanted to make peace with kāwanatanga Ngāti Porou so that he would only have the European forces to contend with. A letter from a military settler also reported that Pai Mārire wanted to make peace but fighting continued throughout August.93 Pai Mārire suffered heavy losses at Waiapu and many (including Rukupō and Ānaru Mātete) thought of turning loyalist when they heard of these disasters.94 Pai Mārire defeat at Ūawa also prompted talk of pā building in Tūranga out of fear being attacked by Ngāti Porou kāwanatanga.

In September around 200 Ngāti Porou Pai Mārire attempted to escape the conflict and fled to Tūranga. Hēnare Pōtae, a Ngāti Porou kāwanatanga rangatira of Te Whānau–a–Rua from Tokomaru, threatened to chase his people who had supported Pai Mārire and fled south. In response Tūranga Pai Mārire constructed two large pā, one at Waerenga–a–Hika and another on the path to Ōpōtiki. Mōkena Kōhere also threatened to return to Tūranga and destroy any Tūranga Pai Mārire involved in the Ngāti Porou conflict.95 In mid-September Hirini Te Kani – now firmly on the government side – requested arms and troops from McLean when it became apparent that the Ngāti Porou Pai Mārire ‘refugees’ would be followed by Ngāti Porou kāwanatanga into Tūranga. McLean quickly responded and sent a thirty–strong contingent under Lieutenant James Wilson and Captain La Serre and they stationed themselves on the kāwanatanga side of the Tūranganui River. On 18 September the Colonial Defence Force unit arrived and began building a redoubt at Kaiti.
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At the same time Williams informed McLean that local Pai Mārire had requested Hirini remain quiet lest Ngāti Porou come to fight them, although Tūranga Pai Mārire refused to surrender the Ngāti Porou refugees they were harbouring.\textsuperscript{96} On 19 September Raharuhi Rukupō wrote to McLean and assured him of his peaceful intentions, telling him ‘I have no wish to encourage the Hauhau. My behaviour will be peaceable. I will not act treacherously.’\textsuperscript{97} At the end of September, true to his promise, Henare Pōtae arrived in the district with a contingent of Ngāti Porou warriors. As the atmosphere in Tūranga became more tense and the prospect of conflict more probable, Ānaru Māte te advised the refugees to leave and outlying settlers came in to Tūranga for protection.

However, Henare soon returned home to continue fighting and by mid–October the kāwanatanga party had defeated Pai Mārire forces, ending hostilities in the district. During the fall of Pukemaire and Hungahungatoroa Pā at Waipau, Pita Tamaturi, a rangatira of Te Aitanga–a–Māhaki and protégé of Raharuhi Rukupō, was captured by Ngāti Porou kāwanatanga leader Rāpata Wahawaha on 11 October. When Reginald Biggs was informed by Rāpata that he was an important chief, Biggs deliberately shot him with his revolver. Three years later Biggs would pay for his actions with his life. The fall of these Pā also resulted in around 170 more Ngāti Porou refugees arriving in Tūranga in mid–October.\textsuperscript{98} Henare appealed to Ngāti Porou for help to chase them and again announced that he intended to pursue them into Tūranga, ignoring Hirini’s request to stay away. Henare’s return on 30 October with a party of thirty men was a critical turning point. Pai Mārire were on high alert and began plundering deserted settler homes in anticipation of a downwards spiral into conflict.

Throughout the month of October Raharuhi Rukupō worked hard to keep the peace in Tūranga. He was committed to resolving the situation but found it difficult when his Ngāti Porou Pai Mārire guests were at times more aggressive than his own people. For example, in early October W I Williams, the \textit{Daily Southern Cross}, and the \textit{Hawkes Bay Herald} all reported that a large group of Ngāti Porou Pai Mārire planned an attack on Tūranga kāwanatanga but were overruled by Rukupō.\textsuperscript{99} Rukupō also offered compensation for plundering and sent delicacies to troops at Kaiti redoubt but they refused, telling him to
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wait until McLean arrived to settle matters. Rumours were circulating that Rukupō wanted to convert to the kāwanatanga side and Lieutenant Wilson and Captain La Serre (who had brought in thirty more soldiers at the beginning of the month) visited Rukupō at his pā in late October. Ānaru Mātete was also there at the time and discussions among them revealed little mutual understanding.\(^{100}\) W L Williams recorded in his journal that Rukupō and Ānaru blamed Hirini for the troubles in Tūranga, but Wilson and La Serre disagreed, saying it was their own fault and that it was good that Mōkena was on his way.\(^{101}\) Rukupō and Mātete strongly disapproved of Henare and Mōkena coming to Tūranga. During the last week of October Rukupō made repeated attempts to talk to military officers but they declined to speak to him. Further plundering coincided with their rebuff, which led settlers to doubt Rukupō’s sincerity.

During November Rukupō continued his peacemaking efforts but faced a very difficult situation as kāwanatanga Māori in Tūranga were unwilling to negotiate. There were also conflicting reports about Pai Mārire intentions, with some accounts stating they were ready to ‘fight to the death’ and others saying they wanted peace and were ready to surrender.\(^{102}\) On 4 November Ngāti Kahungunu rangatira Tāreha Te Moananui arrived from Hawkes Bay to act as a mediator between Tūranga Pai Mārire and the government. Around this time Lieutenant St George of the Colonial Defence Force noted in his journal that he heard Rukupō intended to surrender and Pai Mārire were collecting the goods stolen from settlers’ homes to return them.\(^{103}\) W L Williams also wrote to his father on 7 November to report that Tāreha had made a convert of Rukupō and peace would now prevail.\(^{104}\) On 7 November Rukupō sent a message to Hirini, Henare, and others that he wanted to discuss peace terms but they declined his offer and told him they wanted to wait for McLean before taking any action. Rukupō decided to be proactive and crossed the river. A rūnanga (committee meeting) was subsequently held at Tītīrangi Pā and Rukupō offered to return plundered property to settlers and surrender the Ngāti Porou refugees. But once again, in the absence of McLean, they rejected Rukupō’s offers.

On 9 November the district braced itself in anticipation of conflict when McLean arrived in the district at the same time as 260 Ngāti Porou warriors under Mōkena Köhere
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and Rāpata Wahawaha. Tāreha pleaded with McLean to talk to Rukupō but he was suspicious of Rukupō’s intentions and refused. Later that afternoon reinforcements of colonial forces, Forest Rangers, and Hawkes Bay Military Settlers arrived from Napier under Major Fraser, Lieutenant Reginald Biggs, and Major Westrupp. The following day McLean issued his Terms of Surrender, which accused Tūranga Māori of inviting and entertaining Pai Mārire after the murder of Völknner and having murderous and destructive aims. McLean’s terms were: 1) that they surrender all Māori in the district involved in any murder or serious crime, as well as all Māori who fought against the government at Waipu, Ōpōtiki and elsewhere; 2) that they expel from the district all Pai Mārire emissaries who had come from a distance and 3) that they surrender their arms. If they did not comply with his terms McLean threatened to take the lands of the ‘promoters of disturbance for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the European and Maori Soldiers who [would] have to be employed to secure peace’.

Pai Mārire rangatira met to discuss McLean’s terms. W L Williams recorded that there were reports that Pai Mārire were ready to surrender, but in order to save their reputation they wanted McLean to make peace with them first. On 12 November Rukupō replied on behalf of Tūranga Pai Mārire in a letter transcribed by his younger brother Paora Kate who was on the government side. Rukupō stated that all the other Pai Mārire chiefs had now turned from their earlier path and wanted peace. He asked Mclean for the opportunity to meet and discuss the terms:

There remains just one thing that we await and that is for you to come here and let us all make final arrangements [to settle the matter]. Let any conflict be withheld until it is established where the fault lies, [and it is proven] only then may fighting be justified. If you accept this proposal to come then please do it with urgency.

Pai Mārire wanted to negotiate rather than be forced into submission. McLean was aware of what Rukupō was asking and he visited W L Williams the next day to seek his advice on the matter. W L Williams advised McLean that he thought the chiefs were only trying to buy time.

McLean did not cross the river to discuss the terms with Rukupō. He was instead determined on having a showdown and issued a final ultimatum insisting that Pai Mārire
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submit to his terms by noon 16 November. In response Rukupō and Wi Kingi Te Paia visited McLean and guaranteed him that 270 of their people would come in the next day. Rukupō believed he had brokered a deal with McLean through Tāreha. On 15 November he wrote to both of them saying that he had arranged for a representative to travel to Napier and return with firearms, food, and a sword. In exchange it seemed as though Rukupō was going to guarantee his neutrality or accept the terms of surrender. The same day McLean drafted instructions to Major Fraser in the case that Pai Mārire did not come in before the deadline. Fraser was to take charge of the district and would be responsible for enforcing the terms of surrender. Noon on November 16 came and went without any appearance from Rukupō and his people. When reports came in of buildings burning at Waerenga–a–Hika, McLean handed over control of operations in the district to Fraser. It appears that Rukupō was unable to convince his people to surrender. The chances of getting them to lay down their arms in the presence of a large body of armed Ngāti Porou in the district were very slight. In its 2004 report on the Tūranganui–a–Kiwa claims the Waitangi Tribunal argued that the failure of Rukupō to bring in his people was not evidence of diminishing support for his leadership but a consequence of McLean’s impractical and inflexible terms of surrender, as Pai Mārire rangatira had no guarantee of their people’s safety.

On 16 November Fraser and his troops began marching towards enemy quarters. The majority of Fraser’s troops were Māori, around 500 in number and made up of Henare Pōtāe’s men, a force from Tūpāroa (west of Ruatōria), and Māori allies from Tūranga under Hirini Te Kani and the older Rongowhakaata chief Paratene Tūrangi. The next day Fraser commenced his attack on Waerenga–a–Hika Pā, a Te Aitanga–a–Māhaki fort. Inside were 800 people, 300 of whom were women and children over twelve. Several hundred of those inside the pā were Rongowhakaata and many Tūranga kāwanatanga participated half–heartedly in the siege, which lasted almost a week. Both sides exchanged heavy firing, sometimes all night. On 19 November Ānaru Mātete arrived with 200 armed
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reinforcements carrying Pai Mārire flags, first thought to be flags of truce. Fraser fired on them and they rushed forward ‘with their palms held up against the bullets in accordance with their belief that God would protect them’. Thirty–four were killed and a similar number wounded. On 22 November Fraser employed a single six–pounded howitzer with no carriage and fired two salmon tins filled with shrapnel into the pā, which lead to the surrender of those inside. Four hundred men, women, and children came out with more following over the next few days, including Raharuhi Rukupō and Wī Kingi Te Paia. At the same time, Ānaru Mātete led a group out the back of the pā and they escaped into the hills.

Approximately seventy–one Māori were killed in the siege and around 200 men and 200 women and children were taken prisoner. Colonial and kāwanatanga forces then looted Waerenga–a–Hika Pā and gathered up guns, greenstones and other valuables. Lieutenant St George recorded in his diary that on 23 November, the day after Pai Mārire surrendered, Mōkena paraded the prisoners at 7am and commenced a haka over them. Fraser intervened and told Mōkena that the prisoners belonged to the government not Ngāti Porou, which left Mōkena irate although he did not say anything at the time. Raharuhi Rukupō also complained that Mōkena had looted his pā and stolen his horses. On 25 November Harris wrote to McLean complaining angrily that ‘the Pai Mārire have not done us one tenth of the damage inflicted by Morgan [Mōkena] and his men’. It seemed that Mōkena believed the victory over Pai Mārire in Tūranga was also a Ngāti Porou victory over their rivals and gave them the right to loot and destroy property in the district. Mōkena’s actions immediately following their victory at Waerenga–a–Hika are important for understanding his attitude towards Te Hau ki Tūranga in 1867; that it too was property of the vanquished and became part of Ngāti Porou loot.

The Crown’s move on Tūranga was convenient rather than necessary and conflict in Tūranga was avoidable right up until the last minute. From the arrival of Pātara and Kereopa in March up until the siege of Waerenga–a–Hika, Tūranga Pai Mārire had not committed any violent crimes and Rukupō offered to compensate for any plundering or damage to property. He even offered to bring in the Ngāti Porou refugees whose presence
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had enraged Mōkena and Henare, but no one was willing to talk peace terms with him, not even McLean. Rukupō and the other Pai Mārire rangatira wanted McLean to make peace with them first but he was not willing to negotiate. The determination of Mōkena and Henare to chase their people who had fled south, coupled with McLean’s inflexible approach, sealed the fate of Tūranga Māori. McLean wanted to crush the influence of Pai Mārire on the East Coast while he had the chance and Mōkena and Henare were eager to gain advantage over their long-standing rivals. The battle at Waerenga–a–Hika was relatively small-scale in comparison to conflicts in other parts of the North Island, but the repercussions for Tūranga Māori were immense.

In early 1866 Pai Mārire were apprehensive about the government’s intentions following their defeat in November. Biggs wrote to McLean in January 1866 telling him that ‘The impression among the Maoris at Turanga is, that all those who are in any way implicated with the Hauhau, will lose the whole of their lands’.118 Those Māori who surrendered in November were detained at Kōhanga Kārearea or given to Rongowhakaata kāwanatanga at Īweta Pā and placed under the guard of rangatira Tamihana Ruatapu. Defence minister Colonel Haultain visited Tūranga in February 1866 and suggested that the government send the prisoners to Wharekauri (the Chatham Islands) to get them out of the way while they deal to the question of land confiscation on the East Coast. The government agreed and on 3 March McLean and Governor Grey arrived in Tūranga to arrange for the first lot of detainees to be shipped to Wharekauri. They met briefly with Tūranga kāwanatanga rangatira and proposed to hold the prisoners on Wharekauri for a period of around twelve months. The chiefs agreed and three lots of prisoners were dispatched between March and June. In total there were over two hundred Tūranga Māori (including women and children) detained without trial on Wharekauri, and they lived in harsh conditions on the island for over two years.119

While Tūranga Māori were being sent to Wharekauri the government set about determining how it would implement land confiscation in Tūranga. Land confiscation had a number of purposes, including punishing rebels, deterring Māori in other regions from fighting against the government, as well as rewarding loyal kāwanatanga Māori and military settlers with rebel land. The government also hoped that it would help open up ‘Native Districts’ like Tūranga to European settlement. The standard confiscation legislation used
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119 Waitangi Tribunal, Turanga Tangata Turanga Whenua, p 169.
by the government up until then was the Native Settlements Act 1863, but it proved
difficult and costly to implement. Frederick Whitaker, superintendent of the Auckland
Province (who had responsibility for administering confiscated lands in Tūranga), worked
with the Stafford government to draw up the East Coast Land Titles Investigation Act
(ECLTIA), which passed into law in October 1866.\(^\text{120}\) The act enabled the Native Land
Court to determine title to land in the area on its own initiative or upon application by the
Crown, regardless of whether those Māori who actually owned the land applied to the
court. Land deemed to belong to rebels would be awarded to the Crown but the act was
riddled with problems. It contained drafting errors and the complexities of Māori alliances
and kinship meant that Pai Mārire and kāwanatanga Māori were often closely related and
held common interests in land. If the Crown was only awarded rebel land interests it
would be left with numerous small blocks of land all over the district rather than a few
large blocks that could be used for European settlement. Māori were also unwilling to
provide information on customary ownership and ‘rebel’ status. Thus, two years later the
act was abandoned and replaced by the East Coast Act 1868.

The prospect of impending land confiscation made Tūranga Māori anxious. They
first became aware that land would be confiscated in McLean’s November 1865 terms of
surrender when he warned that if they did not meet the terms, ‘the lands of the promoters
of disturbance’ would be taken ‘for the purpose of defraying the expenses’ of Pakeha and
Māori military settlers.\(^\text{121}\) In April 1866 a rumour was circulating that the government
intended to deport all Tūranga Māori to Wharekauri and divide their lands between the
Queen and Ngāti Porou.\(^\text{122}\) As a result Tūranga Māori began selling their land as well as
land belonging to Pai Mārire who had been exiled to Wharekauri. Settlers in the district,
such as George Read, were also trying to persuade Māori to sell their land before the
Crown confiscated it. However, the Native Lands Act 1865 was still in operation in
Tūranga, which meant that native title had to be extinguished by the Native Land Court
before private transactions could take place. Both Māori and settlers were therefore eager

\(^{120}\) Oil springs were discovered on ‘rebel’ land in Tūranga in early 1866 and the ECLTIA allowed Whitaker to
legitimately acquire the land interests of ‘rebel’ Māori. Lands confiscated under the Act would be handed to
the province of Auckland to administer as wastelands of the Crown. Extracting oil from the springs was later
found to be uneconomical and the issue died down in 1867. See Vincent O’Malley, ‘The East Coast
79.

\(^{121}\) ‘A True Copy’ of the Terms of Surrender, 10 Nov 1865, in Waitangi Tribunal, *Turanga Tangata Turanga
Whenua*, pp 85-86.

\(^{122}\) Harris to McLean, Hawkes Bay Province inward letters, 66/587, in Vincent O’Malley, ‘Report for the
Crown Forestry Rental Trust on the East Coast Confiscation Legislation and its Implementation’, Wellington,
for the Native Land Court to sit as soon as possible but the government tried to prevent the court sitting before it had implemented land confiscation in the area. The Crown had a vested interest in land in Tūranga and wanted to forestall any private sale that might affect its acquisition, through confiscation, of the best land in the district.

In November 1866 the government appointed Captain Reginald Biggs, who had fought with the Hawkes Bay volunteers at Waerenga–a–Hika, as Crown agent on the East Coast. His authority now superseded that of McLean in the area although he continued to consult McLean for advice. Biggs was responsible for administering land confiscation under the ECLTIA and was instructed to determine the names of all the iwi and hapu entitled to land within the boundaries mentioned in the Act and supervise a survey of the area. He encountered considerable difficulty trying to separate ‘loyal’ from ‘rebel’ land interests and in early 1867 recommended that the government confiscate one large block of land by way of cession and compensate ‘loyal’ Māori with interests in that block. On 12 April at a meeting with Tūranga Māori at Whakatō, Biggs proposed an extensive cession of over 200,000 acres of land, but was unanimously rejected. Native Minister J C Richmond, who was present at the meeting, suggested they set up a committee of six to eight chiefs representing the main hapū in Tūranga to reach an agreement with Biggs over the area and boundaries of land to be confiscated. Biggs was under pressure to settle the issue as soon as possible, as long delays in implementing land confiscation contributed to the unwillingness of Tūranga Māori to co–operate.

Biggs continued to push for a large cession of land. Later in April Paratene Tūrangi, Wi Pere, and other kāwanatanga Māori complained to Richmond and Governor Grey that Biggs had refused their offers and was demanding land belonging to loyal Māori. They protested that the government did not provide any official notification in the two years since hostilities had ended that it intended to confiscate their land. They only became aware that land was going to be confiscated after

124 Harris to McLean, 20 Apr 1867, McLean Papers, ATL, in O’Malley, pp 91-92.
125 Petition no 9, Petitions Presented to The House of Representatives and Ordered to be Printed, AJHR, 1867, G–1, p 10.
the adjournment of the Native Land Court in October 1866 when Biggs tried to prevent the court from sitting. They also expressed their belief that the deaths of their whanau (family) and exile to Wharekauri were punishment enough. At the same time Raharuhi Rukupō submitted his petition for the return of Te Hau ki Tūranga, which Richmond had arranged to remove in April while he was in the region discussing land confiscation.

As a short epilogue, Biggs’ failure to secure a session of land during 1867 prompted the government to send McLean back to Tūranga in February 1868 to try to effect a settlement. Due to the determination of Tūranga Māori to hold on to their land, he too was unsuccessful. In 1868 the ECLTIA was repealed and replaced by the East Coast Act 1868, which was passed on 20 October. However, events that occurred on Wharekauri meant that not one inch of land was confiscated under this act. In July 1868 the Rongowhakaata prophet leader Te Kooti Rikirangi seized the schooner Rifleman and escaped from Wharekauri with 289 prisoners who were dedicated followers of his Ringatū religion. They arrived back on the mainland and under Te Kooti’s leadership and military skill they wreaked havoc on Tūranga. On the night of 9 November 1868 Te Kooti and his men attacked Matawhero, a small settlement ten kilometres inland from Tūranga. Biggs was slain as revenge for his part in exiling Te Kooti, as well as for the murder of Rukupō’s protégé Pita Tamaturi, and for living on land in Matawhero which Te Kooti had interests in. The attack on Matawhero, as well as subsequent attacks in the area, left Tūranga Māori in a vulnerable position. The Crown threatened to withdraw military protection from the district and in December 1868 Tūranga Māori (including Raharuhi Rukupō) signed a deed of cession that transferred over 1,000,000 acres of land to the Crown. After almost thirty years the Crown finally got its hands on land in Tūranga. In 1870 the government purchased land for a European township and the small settlement of Tūranga was renamed Gisborne.

After existing as an autonomous district for decades, Tūranga Māori finally felt the full power of British imperialism when the Crown attacked Waerenga–a–Hika Pā in November 1865. For both Pai Mārire and kāwanatanga Māori in Tūranga it was a war they did not want. Fighting was avoidable but the involvement of Ngāti Porou on the one hand, and the determination of McLean to crush the influence of Pai Mārire on the other, rendered conflict almost inescapable. The independent spirit and mindset of Tūranga Māori was broken and the power relations changed forever. Land confiscation opened up the district to European settlement and the tables were now turned. Prominent New
Zealand historian James Belich argues that it was the New Zealand Wars, not the Treaty of Waitangi, that finally broke Māori independence in New Zealand. The removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga was an indirect consequence of the Crown’s military intervention at Tūranga and its attempts to enforce its authority on the East Coast.

Chapter Two

Confiscation or Sale; Gift or Theft?
The Crown’s acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga

‘Our very valuable carved house has been taken away, without pretext, by the Government: we did not consent to its removal.’

Raharuhi Rukupō Petition, 8 July 1867.¹

At a meeting of the Wellington Philosophical Society in August 1868, Tāreha Te Moananui – a Ngāti Kahungunu rangatira, kūpapa leader, and Member of Parliament (MP) for Eastern Māori - explained to a group of local scholars that the house in which they were assembled was once the valued possession of Poverty Bay chief Raharuhi Rukupō. His purpose being to provide an account of the ‘Maori House’, Tāreha enlightened them with the assistance of McLean who interpreted:

Such a building, as this, is only erected by men holding a high position among the tribes, it is a sign of chieftainship, and the proprietor becomes a noted man.

On how the whare came to the museum he continued:

This is considered an important and valuable property among the Maoris, but misfortunes visited the land, troubles were cast upon us, the tribes were scattered, and the result is that the house now stands here. When the king movement commenced, dissension and jealousy arose among the natives; it was found to be wrong, and you all know how the evil had been atoned for. Then other natives created a new god, and called him ‘Hau Hau’; this movement commenced on the [west] side of the country and crossed over to the [east], and led to the death of Mr Volkner. In consequence of all this, and through other troubles and dissensions, the house has become your property.²

Tāreha associated the arrival of Pai Mārire on the East Coast with the fate of the whare in the Colonial Museum.

¹ ‘Petition of Natives at Turanga’, 8 Jul 1867, AJHR, 1867, G–1, p 12.
This chapter provides an account of the Crown’s acquisition of the magnificent and much-celebrated whare whakairo Te Hau ki Tūranga. Shrouded in controversy from the very beginning, the story is complex and multi-layered. On 6 June 1867 the Daily Southern Cross reported that Te Hau ki Tūranga had been taken without the consent of its owners. The next day the pro-government New Zealand Herald reported that the whare was a gift from all the people of Tūranga. Hugh Francis Carleton, MP for the Bay of Islands whom Rukūpo had first petitioned, admitted that there were contradictory reports in Tūranga at the time the whare was taken. To this day, documentary sources that reveal the full story have not been found. The key to understanding the most probable nature of events lies in the historical background and underlying currents working at the time of the acquisition. The relationships between Tūranga Māori, the government, and key players involved in the acquisition such as Raharuhi Rukūpo, Tāreha Te Moananui, and Mōkena Kōhere, are crucial to understanding how the government was able to gain possession of such a valuable and coveted Rongowhakaata taonga.

The chapter begins with an account of how the Crown acquired Te Hau ki Tūranga in April 1867, followed by an analysis of whether the whare was confiscated, sold, gifted, or stolen. In 1867 Rukūpo and eight other Tūranga Māori petitioned the government for the return of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 1878 after Rukūpo’s death, Wi Pere, Paora Kate (Rukūpo’s brother), Keita Wyllie (Rukūpo’s niece), and Ōtene Pītau (Paora Kate’s successor) petitioned the government again asking for the return of Te Hau ki Tūranga or compensation. Primary evidence relating to the acquisition of the whare is scarce, and the minute books of the 1867 Select Committee and 1878 Native Affairs Committee, along with a few newspaper articles, make up the majority of the contemporary historical sources. The only eyewitness account that has survived is the 1878 evidence of Captain John Fairchild, who orchestrated the physical removal of the whare. Although recorded over ten years after the event, Fairchild’s testimony is most consistent with other contemporary accounts and is therefore heavily relied on. Fairchild had nothing to gain in giving evidence, and consequently, his testimony is more neutral than Richmond’s or Rukūpo’s.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the failure of Captain Reginald Biggs, Crown agent on the East Coast and resident magistrate at Tūranga, to reach an agreement with Tūranga Māori over an area of land to be ceded to the Crown brought Native Minister J C
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3 DSC, 6 Jun 1867.
4 New Zealand Herald (NZH), 7 Jun 1867.
5 Extract of a letter copied into the minutes book, evidence of George Graham before the Select Committee, 16 Aug 1867, Le 1 1867/13, Archives NZ.
Richmond to the district in April 1867. James Crowe Richmond, an educated middle class Englishman, emigrated to New Zealand in 1850 with his younger brother and settled in Taranaki. Richmond began his political career as a member of the Taranaki Provincial Council in 1858 and two years later became an MP for Omata on the outskirts of New Plymouth. Richmond was Native Minister in the Stafford Ministry from 1866 to 1869. As a politician and settler he was committed to the progress of colonisation and devoted to what he called ‘“opening up the country” and the need to overcome Maori obstruction to it’. In Tūranga Richmond held meetings with local rangatira and threatened to use harder laws if they did not co-operate. His efforts too proved fruitless and negotiations remained at a standstill.

Nevertheless, Richmond’s visit was not entirely in vain. On his way through to Tūranga he came across what looked like a giant heap of dried raupō (rushes). G S Cooper, the resident magistrate at Wairoa, was riding with Richmond at the time and explained to him that it was the famous whare whakairo. They set about examining it excitedly. Richmond alleged that (to his regret) the whare was:

utterly neglected, the porch denuded of its smaller carvings, the roof defective in many places, the carved slabs which formed the sides rotten where they were slightly fixed in the ground.

In a later recollection of events, Richmond also emphasised that ‘at any moment a person passing by with a lighted pipe might set the whole [house] in a blaze.’ Richmond stressed the state of disrepair of Te Hau ki Tūranga and portrayed the acquisition as being in the interests of restoring and preserving this ‘very fine specimen of Native work’. Yet, Captain John Fairchild, who physically dismantled the whare, gave evidence that he ‘took great pains in taking it down, so that it should not be destroyed.’

After inspecting the house Richmond ascertained that Ngāti Kaipoho rangatira Raharuhi Rukupō represented the owners and asked him if he could take the house to Wellington. According to Rukupō, he told Richmond ‘No, it is for the whole people to
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6 Under the Stafford government the portfolio of native minister did not exist officially, however, Richmond acted in this capacity and was openly addressed as native minister.
8 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition, Minutes of Select Committee, 17 Aug 1867, Le 1 1867/13; Journals of the House of Representatives (JHR), 20 Aug 1867, p 100.
9 New Zealand Parliamentary Debates (NZPD), 13 Jul to 8 Aug, 1888, p 342.
10 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition, 1867.
11 Evidence of Captain Fairchild before the Native Affairs Committee, 22 Oct 1878, Le 1 1878/6.
consider....the house is mine, but the work was done by all of us.”

Rukupō supervised the construction of Te Hau ki Tūranga along with a team of eighteen other carvers at Orakaipu Pā, then the principal pā in the district. Tāreha estimated that it took them around five years to complete the carvings. It also would have cost a considerable amount of labour and food to procure the necessary materials, in which the whole iwi would have been involved. Inside the whare Rukupō is depicted in the poupou to the right of the entrance holding a toki poutangata (greenstone adze), signifying his chiefly authority and tribal leadership (see Figure 2).

At this point, Rukupō says that Richmond accepted his answer but Richmond’s account differs, claiming that Rukupō referred him to Tāreha of Hawke’s Bay:

His reply was that he was ‘dead’, – the property had gone from him, and referred me to Tareha, of Hawke’s Bay, as the person to whom he had given the house.

Richmond said that he continued to pursue the matter at a large meeting of between 300 and 400 Māori the next day and recalls that only one man objected. The protestor may have been Rukupō but there is no evidence to suggest that these Māori represented Ngāti Kaipoho or Rongowhakaata, the actual owners of Te Hau ki Tūranga.
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12 ‘Petition of Natives at Turanga’, 8 Jul 1867.
13 The original source for the names of the carvers is Biggs’ letter to the Under–Secretary of the Native Office, 27 Aug 1868, which provides a short history of the whare. See O’Rourke, ‘Te Hau ki Turanga: A Chronological Document Bank’. Regarding Orakaipu see W I. Williams, East Coast Historical Records, p 87.
16 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition, 1867.
Figure 2. Poupou on the right of the entrance depicts tohunga whakairo (master carver) Raharuhí Rukupō with a toki poutangata (greenstone adze) in hand, a sign of his chiefly authority and tribal leadership.

(© Werner Forman Archive, London/Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington, 55404950).

Despite the lack of real consent, Richmond sent Captain John Fairchild of the government Steamer *Sturt* to uplift Te Hau ki Tūranga for shipment to Wellington. Richmond also sent Reginald Biggs along to endeavour to obtain Rukupō’s consent.
Richmond informed Fairchild that the whare was a gift to the government and told him he had arranged with the owners for Fairchild to collect it. Fairchild steamed up the Tūranganui River on the *Sturt* with his sailors. On arrival at Orakaiapu Pā where Te Hau ki Tūranga was situated, the Māori present told him that he could not have the house. Fairchild replied ‘Either pay me for the coal I have burnt in coming after it, or give me the house.’ It is unlikely that those Māori present had the money to pay Fairchild, and perhaps assuming that he would take the house anyway, they agreed he could have it for a price. Fairchild offered them £80, which they laughed at. Governor George Grey had offered them £400 not long before, and Fairchild himself had offered £300 for the whare three years previous. Tūranga Māori were therefore well aware of Te Hau ki Tūranga’s worth.

Intent on securing the house after having gone purposely for it, Fairchild offered them £100. At this point Biggs arrived and took over negotiations. According to Rukupō’s 1867 petition, Biggs asked him to give up the house for the governor at Wellington, to which Rukupō adamantly replied ‘no’. In spite of Rukupō’s refusal, Biggs paid £100 taken from the military chest onboard the *Sturt* to unknown recipients. The government refunded this money to Biggs who then paid Fairchild back. Evidence of who the money was paid to and papers relating to the refund have never been found. In 1878 Fairchild testified that Biggs paid ten Māori ten pounds each onboard the *Sturt* in Fairchild’s cabin, which they signed receipts for. H T Clarke, the Under–Secretary for Native Affairs in 1878, also testified that there were papers in his department (most likely receipts and evidence of the refund to Biggs) that would ‘show it all’ but the Native Affairs Committee never saw these papers. Most unbound papers of the Native Affairs Department prior to 1891 were destroyed in the Parliament Buildings fire in 1907. Biggs was killed in an act of retribution during Te Kooti’s raid on Matawhero in November 1868.
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17 Evidence of Captain Fairchild, 22 Oct 1878.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 Regarding Grey’s offer see evidence of Keita Wyllie before the Native Affairs Committee, 8 Oct 1878, Le 1 1878/6; J C Richmond to Emily E Richmond, 24 Apr 1867, Richmond - Atkinson Papers, Vol 2, pp 240-41. Regarding Fairchild’s offer see Evidence of Captain Fairchild, 22 Oct 1878.
21 ‘Petition of Natives at Turanga’, 8 Jul 1867.
22 Evidence of Captain Fairchild, 22 Oct 1878.
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25 Evidence of H T Clarke before the Native Affairs Committee, 21 Oct 1878.
and his house burned to the ground. No personal papers of Biggs survive that give any clue to the payment of money.

Two credible witnesses who gave evidence close to the date of the acquisition indicate that money was paid. George Graham, MP for Newton and a ‘consistent advocate for Maori rights’, presented the first petition by Rukupō and eight other Tūranga Māori to the Select Committee in August 1867. Graham recommended that the government return the house as he believed ‘the Natives would receive it as a peace offering, & would return the £100.’ Graham also revealed that Rukupō first petitioned Hugh Francis Carleton, another strong advocate for Māori rights at the time. An extract from a letter to Mr Carleton from Tūranga was copied into the committee minutes book:

There are contradictory reports in the Bay regarding it, but the Natives all and some of the Europeans assert that the Government never came to terms with them, but gave two Natives £100 for it, and that was not until after it was on board the Steamer.

It is clear that the money was paid, but there is little evidence who it was paid to.

Rukupō does not reveal in his July 1867 petition whether he received any part of the £100, either as one of the recipients or passed on to him subsequently. The New Zealand Herald is the only contemporary source that maintains Rukupō himself, along with ‘Te Matiki Tumuoko’, received £100, but it wrongly reported that the money was paid through Captain G E Read. Read was the principal trader and moneylender in Tūranga at the time and Rukupō was heavily in debt to him, owing £1800 by 1869. The Herald acknowledged Read as their informant and given his knowledge of Rukupō’s financial affairs, it is possible that Rukupō received all or part of the money.

Immediately after Biggs paid the money he left, leaving Fairchild and his sailors to dismantle the whare and load it aboard the Sturt. As the region was still relatively unsafe at
the time, Fairchild kept one man up on the Sturt’s topsail mast the whole time to watch for anyone coming over the flats. In his 1878 evidence, Fairchild discussed the opposition he continued to face when removing the whare, even after money was paid:

“We took the house down; the natives objecting all the time. They objected as I took stick after stick....The natives objected to my taking the house after the money was paid. When they objected, I said – “Give me back the £100”. I had to take the house by force. I own to that.”

There is early corroboration of Fairchild’s testimony in the extract of the letter from Mr Carleton:

Captain Fairchild of the “Sturt” told me himself that the Natives were protesting the whole time they were taking it away and speaking of how well they managed it, he said he kept arguing with them while his men were carrying the boards away

Hence, Fairchild’s 1878 evidence is consistent with what he reported to others in 1867.

The only reason Fairchild believed he was able to remove the whare was because those Māori present at Orakaiapu Pā thought he would harm someone:

“I took it with the tomahawk against their will. I believe they thought I would harm someone. I said “You have got my £100; I want my money back, or the house.” As the money was not forthcoming, I proceeded to take the house down.”

At first, Fairchild employed a few Māori to help dismantle the whare but dismissed them when he realised they were trying to keep pieces of it. Their protests were incessant. Even after he dismantled the whare there were still around fifty Māori present. That night they returned with a bullock team to try and remove what was left of the house. Fairchild had to keep guard over it all night, hanging lanterns from the Sturt all around.

Rukupō and his descendants’ protests have spanned over a hundred and thirty years, and they have consistently maintained that Te Hau ki Tūranga was taken without their consent. In 1867 the Crown’s official view was that:

“A considerable sum of money was paid over to the Natives for the house; and in considering the proceedings connected with its removal it is not to

33 Evidence of Captain Fairchild.
34 Evidence of George Graham.
35 Evidence of Captain Fairchild.
be overlooked that both the House itself and the land on which it stood belonged to rebel Natives, and were, strictly speaking, forfeited to the Government.

The Crown also emphasised the ‘permanent destruction to which it seems to have been fast advancing when discovered by the Hon J C Richmond.’ In its findings on the 1878 petition the Crown focused more on the financial nature of the transaction:

the payment of £100 appears to the Committee to be inadequate, and they recommend that a further sum of £300 be paid to the native owners, when they have been ascertained by the Government, in final satisfaction of all claims.

The following section will examine whether Te Hau ki Tūranga was confiscated, sold, gifted or stolen. Finally, the acquisition of two other nineteenth century whare whakairo, Mataatua and Hinemihi, will be briefly discussed as they provide useful comparisons to the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga.

The only reference to Te Hau ki Tūranga being gifted to the government is in the New Zealand Herald’s June 1867 article written in reply to the Daily Southern Cross. The Cross alleged that Te Hau ki Tūranga was:

shipped on board and taken away without the owners being consulted on the subject any more than one old man [Rukupō] was pressed into giving his unwilling consent.

The Herald’s reply was:

An old and respected resident [Captain Read] of Poverty Bay (Tauranga) [sic] informs us that the Government, through himself, paid £100 for the “carved house-boards”, which the proper owners had actually made over to the Government as a gift

In actual fact, Read was not involved in any way with the payment of money for Te Hau ki Tūranga, with the exception that he may have been aware of it through his financial dealings with Rukupō. Therefore, Read had no firsthand knowledge of the acquisition to know whether Rukupō and Ngāti Kaipoho had gifted it. Fairchild also testified in 1878 that Richmond told him the whare was a gift, only to find out otherwise on arrival at
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Orakaiapu Pā.⁴⁰ Only Richmond and Captain Read claimed that Te Hau ki Tūranga was a gift with no corroboration from any other sources.

Nonetheless, the gifting of significant taonga to the Crown following defeat in warfare did occur in the nineteenth century. In 1887 Ngāti Tūwharetoa rangatira Te Heuheu Te Horonuku (Te Heuheu Tūkino IV) gifted the maunga (mountains) Ruapehu, Tongariro, and Ngauruhoe, to the Crown for a National Park. Te Horonuku fought against the government in Waikato in the 1860s and also joined Te Kooti in fighting the government in 1869. The common view of Te Horonuku’s gifting is that on the advice of Pākehā, he gave the maunga to the Crown to protect them from being confiscated (due to his anti–government activities) and then sold and broken up through the Native Land Court.⁴¹

In his thesis on the influence of Te Kooti within the Ngāti Tūwharetoa region from 1869 to 1870, Kenneth Gartner explored the different views on Te Horonuku’s gifting. One view was that Te Horonuku’s mana was ‘badly battered’ - as a consequence of his relationship with Te Kooti and their defeat - and needed to be restored, so he ‘sacrificed’ the maunga to get back in favour with the government.⁴² Gartner also discussed an alternative view that the government’s Māori allies wanted reward for their loyalty following the defeat of Te Kooti, but the government refused to confiscate Tūwharetoa lands. Gartner extrapolated:

‘[this] may have (along with his depression at having been regarded as part of Te Kooti’s defeated party) cast a shadow on the mana of Te Heuheu, for he then owed the government a favour…. He felt an indebtedness to the government, and somehow he had to clear that wahanga [load or burden], which was why he gave Tongariro [National Park].’⁴³

The story of Te Horonuku and National Park reveals the complexities in nineteenth century relationships between ‘rebel’ Māori, the Crown, and its Māori allies. Taken at face value, the actions of rangatira can seem straight forward, but scratch the surface, and there are many layers to the story.

---
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Similar dynamics are apparent in the Crown’s acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In his 1867 statement to the Select Committee, Richmond alleged that before Rukupō went into rebellion, he gave the whare to Tāreha Te Moananui, a Ngāti Kahungunu rangatira from Hawkes Bay. In the lead up to conflict in November 1865, Tāreha Te Moananui, an important government ally, was brought in to Tūranga to mediate between Rukupō and McLean and bring about peace. Rukupō therefore trusted Tāreha, and it may well be true that Rukupō bestowed Te Hau ki Tūranga upon Tāreha to safeguard it. Rukupō and his family had abandoned Orakaiapu Pā shortly after the conflict at Waerenga–a–Hika in 1865 and he may have suspected the whare was in danger of being appropriated, given that it was very well known and many had offered to buy it in the past. There is also the possibility that Rukupō felt indebted to Tāreha for his attempts to broker peace and offered him the whare as a gift.

Donald McLean gave further evidence on the matter in a memo he presented to the committee in 1867. He revealed that Tāreha relinquished his claim to Te Hau ki Tūranga upon hearing that Ngāti Porou rangatira Mōkena Kōhere had protested:

The “carved house” was offered by Raharuhi Rukupo to the chief Tareha of Napier. Morgan [Mōkena] of Waiapu heard of this and protested against it being given to Tareha, and considered that he and the Govt had the best right to it. Tareha relinquished his claim to it.  

Mōkena believed he had claim to the whare because of Ngāti Porou’s victory over Tūranga Pai Mārire in November 1865. Richmond went on to explain:

[Mōkena] objects to any payment having been made to the Turanga men. He asserts that the owners were all Hau Haus, and that the house was one of the spoils of victory over the rebels. The house stood on Rahurui’s [sic] land.

Mōkena’s reported reference to the rebel status of the owners, and the mention of the house as a ‘spoil of victory,’ is similar to the official view of the Crown in 1867.

44 Donald McLean Memo presented to the Select Committee, 17 Aug 1867, Le 1 1867/13.
45 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition.
46 In a short undated letter in Māori from Rukupō to McLean, Rukupō wrote that Mōkena says for Rukupō’s house (presumably Te Hau ki Tūranga) to be burnt. Rukupō also wrote that he agrees with Te Hāpuku (a pro-government Ngāti Kahungunu rangatira) and Tāreha that they should come and get his house. This may be a reference to Rukupō relinquishing the whare to Tāreha. However, because the letter is undated the exact historical context is not clear (although it is most likely post–1865) and it is not certain that they are referring to Te Hau ki Tūranga. Rukupo to McLean, undated, Donald McLean Papers, Letters in Maori, MS–Copy–Micro–0535–116, ATL, also available from Manuscripts and Pictorials: Collections of the Alexander Turnbull Library, http://mp.natlib.govt.nz/detail/?id=1030524&recordNum=25&ct=items&q=rukupo&s=a&l=en; accessed 13 Mar 2009, (translation provided by Lee Smith, 16 Mar 2009); Edwards, Document F5, p 15; Transcript
Although Richmond initially informed Fairchild the whare was a gift, he later upheld that he purchased Te Hau ki Tūranga on behalf of the government. In 1883 historian G W Rusden released his three volume *History of New Zealand*. In it he wrote that Richmond was refused the house, but after he departed Biggs returned and carried it away without the sanction of the tribe. Rusden went on further:

There was no prophet to step in and say to the covetous Pakeha – Thou art the man! – and there was little attempt to glaze the transaction, which yet could not fail to embitter the feelings of the disaffected at Tūranga.

In defence of his actions, Richmond gave an account of the acquisition to the Legislative Council in 1888 that differed considerably from his earlier statement in 1867. Richmond claimed that at a meeting of 600 Māori he offered to buy the whare and the whole 600 agreed, with the exception of one man. He alleged that he was present at the removal of the whare and paid more than £150 on the spot, borrowed from the military chest and that Captain Fairchild ‘found no difficulty or obstacle in obtaining possession of the building’.

In contrast, Richmond’s earlier statement to the 1867 Select Committee claimed that Biggs paid money to ‘obtain the assent of the Natives’ and emphasised the rebel status of Rukupō, as well as the state of disrepair of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Richmond changes his story, inflating the amount paid and the number of Māori present at the meeting, and claims that he himself paid the money.

A number of other accounts given in evidence to the 1878 Native Affairs Committee represent the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga as a purchase. H T Clarke stated that he ‘always understood that it was purchased by the Govt, at least that the Govt paid £100 for it.’ Keita Wyllie, Rukupō’s niece and one of the petitioners, alleged that Rukupō accepted the £100 and was promised around £500 more by Captain Wilson and Major Westrupp who were military officers in Tūranga at the time. Wyllie also stated that Rukupō and his family made frequent verbal requests to Donald McLean during his visits to Tūranga for the remainder of the money, but McLean’s answer was always ‘Taihoa’ (wait).

Samuel Locke, resident magistrate at Tūranga at the time he gave evidence, claimed that Richmond and Biggs paid £100, or £150 to loyal natives that had a claim to it,
and refuted Wyllie’s allegation that Rukupō was promised more money. As neither Clarke nor Locke had any official standing or involvement with the removal of the whare in 1867, their accounts are based on second hand information, most probably obtained from Richmond. Wyllie’s account is also based on second hand information, and much of the rest of her account does not match up to the evidence given by those who were actually involved, such as Richmond, Rukupō, and Fairchild.

A number of scholars have also portrayed the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga as a sale. W J Phillips, ethnologist at the Dominion Museum, published an article in 1938 entitled *Maori Carving*. He referred to Te Hau ki Tūranga as ‘[o]ne of the most outstanding examples of Maori art workmanship in existence’ and proceeded to give a short history of the whare. Phillips relied solely on Richmond’s 1888 account for information, concluding that with one exception, possibly Rukupō, the meeting of 600 ‘natives’ consented to the purchase. Similarly, Terrence Barrow’s booklet *A Guide to the Maori Meeting House Te Hau–ki–Turanga* (1965), also relies primarily on Richmond’s 1888 account and portrays the acquisition as a purchase.

In the early 1980s Gisborne historian Sir Robert de Zouch Hall produced an unpublished manuscript that focused exclusively on the history of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Hall employed a comprehensive range of primary sources, including the texts of both the 1867 and 1878 petitions and minute books, as well as Richmond’s later account. Hall concluded that Te Hau ki Tūranga was purchased, although he admits there was an element of duress involved. In a letter to the director of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre (where Hall was based) in 1980, J C Yaldwyn, director of the National Museum, wrote ‘It was most interesting and to my concern, but by no means surprise, I find our Meeting House [Te Hau ki Tūranga] was for all intents looted from your area.’ Yaldwyn’s suggestion prompted a sharp response from Hall saying that he disagreed with any suggestion of looting, his reasons being that Mōkena Kōhere approved of the removal.

---

52 Evidence of Samuel Locke before the Native Affairs Committee, 8 Oct 1878, Le 1 1878/6, Archives NZ.
54 Barrow, pp 10–11.
56 John Yaldwyn to Warner Haldane, 21 Nov 1980, in O’Rourke.
£100 was paid for it, and Raharuhi Rukupō had moved from the area and left the house in ‘a dudgeon and some ruin’.\(^{57}\)

At the time of the Crown’s acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga, there existed a strong market for the whare and the 1878 committee heard evidence that the whare was worth much more than £100. As mentioned above, several years previous Governor Grey had offered £400 and Fairchild admitted that he offered £300 for the whare in 1864.\(^{58}\) The *Daily Southern Cross* confirmed that offers were made, stating ‘the owners were offered several hundred pounds for it a few years ago, which they refused.’\(^{59}\) In *Te Mana o Turanga* (1974) about the meeting house at Whakatō, Leo Fowler claimed that Samuel Locke, who gave evidence to the committee in 1878, offered to buy the whare in 1865.\(^{60}\) Richmond also divulged in his 1888 account that the Kingites at Waikato offered £400 for it, although he did not disclose his sources. H T Clarke believed that Te Hau ki Tūranga would have cost at least £1000 to build and Fairchild revealed that he could have sold it in London for at least £1000.\(^{61}\) If Rukupō and his people intended to sell Te Hau ki Tūranga to the Crown, they would not have accepted such a low price of £100.

Furthermore, Rukupō and his people could not have sold Te Hau ki Tūranga because there was no prior agreement with Richmond to pay money for the whare. Biggs’ payment of £100 to those Māori onboard the *Sturt* was a last minute resort thought of by Fairchild to try to obtain consent to physically remove the house after they told him he could not have it. The fact that money changed hands does not change the underlying nature of the transaction. Moreover, the money was effectively compensation for something they had little power to stop, rather than payment in return for title to the house. The only other option was to resist physically, and the Māori present would have been reluctant to do so; firstly, because Fairchild and his crew of around half a dozen were most likely

---

57 Ibid, Mrs F S Robinson to Yaldwyn, 22 Apr 1982. Hall’s manuscripts reveal that Mōkena Kōhere had a claim, by descent, to interests in Rongowhakaata land. Following the defeat of Pai Mārire in November 1865, Mōkena went to stay at Tapatahi across the Te Årāi river from Manutūkē. Ngāti Maru (a hapū of Rongowhakaata that took up arms against the government at Waerenga–a–Hika) ceded their lands to Mōkena to protect them from confiscation by the government. See Native Land Court, Gisborne Minute Book 6, Paokahu 249–50, 20 Aug 1880, and Reweti T Kohere, *The Story of a Maori Chief: Mokena Kohere and his Forbears*, Wellington, 1949, p 42, both in Hall, p 7.

58 Hall speculates that Grey had an opportunity to make an offer when he visited Tūranga in March 1866, Hall, ‘Te Hau ki Turanga References and Notes’, p 2.

59 DSC, 7 Jun 1867.

60 Leo Fowler, *Te Mana o Turanga*, Auckland, 1974, p 7. Not all the pages of Locke’s evidence given before the 1878 Native Affairs Committee have survived as his testimony ends abruptly. It is possible that in the missing pages he revealed that he offered to buy the whare.

61 Evidence of H T Clarke; Evidence of Captain Fairchild.
armed, and second, because Ngāti Kaipoho would have been reluctant to cause any trouble given the presence of Colonial and Ngāti Porou troops in the district.

Richmond’s motives for acquiring Te Hau ki Tūranga shed significant light on these events. As the acting Superintendent of Colonial Museum, Richmond would have had a genuine interest in restoring and preserving the whare for all to see and admire in Wellington. Richmond had the option of accepting their refusal to relinquish Te Hau ki Tūranga, but he chose to pursue the matter further. The prestige associated with securing for the government such a large and magnificent ‘curiosity’ may have been what motivated Richmond to obtain the whare by any means necessary. In a private letter to his sister–in–law written shortly after the taking, Richmond boasts in a semi–humorous tone:

> So far my East Coast dealings have not had brilliant success. The only great thing done was the confiscation and carrying off of a beautiful carved house with a military promptitude that will be recorded to my glory. The Governor and an agent of the Melbourne Museum were trying to deal for it but the broad arrow and Capt. Fairchild and the *Sturt* carried the day.

In her 1878 evidence Keita Wyllie affirmed that the government, upon hearing that Governor Grey wanted to buy the house, ‘stole it to prevent his getting it’.

Her accusation is consistent with Richmond’s letter to his sister–in–law that he outdid both Grey and the agent of the Melbourne Museum in confiscating Te Hau ki Tūranga. Hall also speculated that it may have been the chance to go ‘one–up on Sir George Grey’ that damaged any sensible approach by Richmond to acquire the whare. He continued, ‘[i]f Richmond had shown some sense of diplomacy and courtesy, followed by having money available for a large koha [gift, offering] to Raharuhi and [his] people, it is not impossible that he might have got the house for next to nothing – in Pakeha terms.’

Although various individuals have described the acquisition of the whare in terms of a purchase or gift, there existed right from the very beginning a discourse about confiscation. News of the removal of the whare first appeared in the *Daily Southern Cross* on 6 June 1867 and was heavily critical of the government’s actions:

---

O’Rourke speculates that the agent of the Melbourne museum may have been James Dall, but no evidence has been found to confirm this. Broad arrow is defined as ‘an arrowhead mark identifying British government property’, ‘Broad arrow’, Dictionary.com, *WordNet® 3.0*, Princeton University; available from [http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/Broad arrow](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/Broad arrow); accessed 3 Nov 2008.
63 Evidence of Keita Wyllie.
64 Hall to Neich, 28 Apr 1984, Hall Papers, Tairawhiti Museum, Gisborne.
It seems that the greed of the Stafford Richmond firm of printers, publishers, and general jobbers does not stop at getting all the good land that they can possibly by any means lay hold of. They go even further: the last piece of spoil they have got hold of is in the curiosity line....We are at a loss to conceive what can have been the object of this paltry conduct on the part of the government, who seem to be doing all they can to annoy and injure these people. Surely we have had troubles enough out of land disputes without having a feeling created in the minds of the natives that the whole aim of our institutions is to get all the plunder we can lay hold of.\footnote{DSC, 6 June 1867, p 3. Cecilia Edwards suggests that James Wyllie, husband of Keita Wyllie (niece of Rukupō), is the author of this article and the Cross’s Poverty Bay correspondent. See Edwards, Document F5, p 10.}

The Cross depicted the government as greedy and the article referred to the whare as a piece of ‘spoil’ and ‘plunder’, implying that its fate was tied to the recent defeat of Tūranga Māori in conflict with the Crown.

In evidence given to both the 1867 and 1888 committees, the issue of rebellion is touched on frequently. Richmond's 1867 statement is quick to refer to the rebel status of the owners in defence of his actions, naming Rukupō a ‘leading rebel in the Poverty Bay District’.\footnote{Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition.} The 1867 committee’s report on the petition makes special note that:

\begin{quote}

it is not to be overlooked that both the House itself and the land on which it stood belonged to Rebel Natives and were strictly speaking forfeited to the Government.\footnote{Report on the Petition, 17 Aug 1867.}
\end{quote}

The 1878 committee's examination of Keita Wyllie focused in even more detail on the issues of rebellion and confiscation. Wyllie was constantly questioned about whether or not Ngāti Kaipoho and Rongowhakaata were in rebellion. The committee made causal links between Pai Mārire emissary Kereopa Te Rau’s visit in March 1865, conversion to Pai Mārire, rebellion against the Crown, and confiscation of the whare. Captain Russell explicitly asked Keita, ‘was it not in consequence of that [Poverty Bay] fighting that this house was taken?’\footnote{Evidence of Keita Wyllie.} Despite Keita’s reply that they belonged to the government party and were fighting against the ‘Hau Haus’, Captain Russell was of the same view as Mōkena Kōhere that Te Hau ki Tūranga was a ‘spoil of victory’\footnote{Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition.}.

The committee also carefully questioned H T Clarke about whether Ngāti Kaipoho rebelled, his answer being that the majority of them did. Acting chairman Mr Hamlin asked Clarke outright, ‘You don’t think the house was confiscated for their being in...
rebellion?’, to which Clarke replied, ‘So far as my memory serves me they were paid £100.’ Clarke disclosed that fighting took place where Te Hau ki Tūranga was situated and Mr Mahe prompted him again, ‘was it confiscated on account of the fault of the people or not?’ Clarke replied that to his understanding the whare was not confiscated. 70 The link between conflict with the Crown and the removal of the whare is plain, yet the witnesses hedge around the issue. If Wyllie admitted to confiscation, she would have deprived herself of further payment for Te Hau ki Tūranga. If Clarke admitted confiscation, he would have acknowledged wrongdoing on the part of the government. The committee simply concluded that the payment of £100 was inadequate and recommended further payment of £300 in ‘final satisfaction of all claims’.71 Thus the committee appeared to accept that the whare was not confiscated.

A number of recent publications have portrayed the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga as a confiscation rather than a purchase. In Te Mana o Turanga, Fowler relied on Rusden’s History of New Zealand and Richmond’s 1888 account. He concludes that Rukupō and his people did not consent to the removal of the house nor did they receive any money for the whare. He cited the view of local kaumātua (elders) that Te Hau ki Tūranga was ‘summarily confiscated’ from Rukupō and that Ngāti Kaipoho were ‘denied redress’.72 Judith Binney’s Redemption Songs: A Life of Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki (1995), emphasised the role of Reginald Biggs in the acquisition. Binney concluded that the whare was taken without proper agreement and in the face of active protest, and quoted the text of the 1867 petition, Captain Fairchild’s evidence, and Richmond’s letter to his sister—in—law. Binney also suggested that the unjust removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga was a further take (cause) for Te Kooti’s attack on Matawhero, during which Biggs was beaten to death outside his home.73 Deidre Brown’s 1996 article in the Journal of the Polynesian Society incorporated pieces of the story from both Fowler and Binney. Brown concluded that it was not certain whether the Crown’s removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga was an act of retribution or compassion; and that it was unclear whether the Crown had any justification for ‘confiscating’ Te Hau ki Tūranga.74

Two other whare whakairo acquired by the Crown in the nineteenth century provide useful comparisons to the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga. The first, Mataatua from

70 Evidence of H T Clarke.
71 Native Affairs Committee Findings; Committee’s Published Report, p 23.
72 Fowler, pp 7–8.
73 Binney, pp 114–15.
74 Brown, pp 13–14.
Whakatāne, was acquired by the Crown in controversial circumstances. The second, Hinemihi from Te Wairoa near Rotorua, was purchased by the Crown complete with a deed of sale. There are a number of similarities between the stories of Te Hau ki Tūranga and Mataatua. Both involve local resident magistrates, the payment of money, and reports that the whare were gifted. But the story of Hinemihi, on the other hand, provides a contrast. Unlike Te Hau ki Tūranga, the Crown’s acquisition of Hinemihi has never been controversial and both Hinemihi and Mataatua traversed the globe to England where they were put on display in museums and at international exhibitions.

Mataatua was built in the post–New Zealand Wars period to unite the kinship ties of the Mataatua Confederation of tribes. The whare opened in 1875 and several years later George Preece, the resident magistrate at Ōpōtiki, approached Ngāti Awa on behalf of the government and requested the use of the whare for exhibition in Sydney in 1879. The government paid £300 to Ngāti Awa as ‘compensation’, but the principal owners of the whare, including the chief and master carver Wēpiha Te Apanui, did not receive any part of the money. At the time the whare opened there were reports that it was presented to Queen Victoria as a gift, but Ngāti Awa refute the claim and deny that ownership was relinquished when the whare was given to the government to display in Sydney. Ngāti Awa expected that Mataatua would be returned to them after the exhibition. In his report on Mataatua for Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa, Hirini Moko Mead explained their reasons for giving in to the government’s request:

our people have always believed that the reason the chiefs of Ngati Awa acceded to the request to allow Mataatua to be displayed in Sydney was that they expected that their goodwill would be reciprocated and that this would help the tribe get more of its land back and help remove the stigma of “tangata hara” (sinful man) and “rebel” which was placed upon Ngati Awa in the name of the Queen Victoria by her kith and kin in the Government of New Zealand.

The idea of a stigma upon Ngāti Awa for rebelling against the Crown is similar to the idea of a shadow being cast upon Te Horonuku’s mana for his association with Te Kooti’s defeat. As with the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga, there were complex dynamics at work between the Crown and ‘rebel’ Māori in the nineteenth century.

---

75 Allen, p 145.
76 Mane–Wheoki, p 63.
In comparison, the Crown’s acquisition of Hinemihi was relatively straightforward, and unlike Te Hau ki Tūranga and Mataatua, there have been little or no protests for the return of the whare. Hinemihi was built in the late 1870s under the direction of Wero Taroī of the famed Ngāti Tarawahi school of carving and commissioned by the Tūhourangi rangatira Aporo Te Wharekaniwha.⁷⁹ The whare opened in 1881 but was buried in the eruption of Mount Tarawera in 1886. Five years later William Hillier, the Fourth Earl of Onslow and Governor of New Zealand from 1889-1892, purchased Hinemihi from Mika Aporo (son of Aporo Te Wharekaniwha) for £50.⁸⁰ A deed of sale signed by Mika and Lord Onslow’s agent in 1892 hangs in the ‘Maori Room’ at Clandon Park, a National Trust property (and Lord Onslow’s family residence) near Guildford, Surrey, in England. Hinemihi was erected by the lake at Clandon Park where it was used as a boat shed. In the 1970s the whare was moved to its present site, closer to the main house, where it remains today.

Theft is defined as ‘the wrongful taking and carrying away of the personal goods or property of another’.⁸¹ The Crown did not have any form of consent from Rukūpō - who rightfully represented the owners - to remove the house. The continuous protest of Māori present at Orakaipō Pā, from the moment Fairchild arrived until the moment he left, even after money was paid, as well as the two petitions for its return, confirms that the nature of the acquisition was not a sale or gift. The findings of the 1867 committee that ‘the House itself and the land on which it stood belonged to rebel Natives, and were, strictly speaking, forfeited to the Government’ are incorrect. At the time Te Hau ki Tūranga was removed from Orakaipō Pā, not one inch of land in Tūranga had been confiscated either formally through the Native Land Court or informally. In fact, it was not until 1868 after Te Kootī’s attacks on Tūranga, that any formal confiscation agreements were entered into. The 1867 committee inferred that because Rukupō was a well-known ‘Hauhau’ during 1865, he had therefore rebelled against the Crown, and considered his lands confiscated before they had become so. If the Crown intended to confiscate Te Hau ki Tūranga, it would not have gone to such great lengths to obtain Rukupō’s consent. Richmond, as an amateur painter and acting Superintendent of the Colonial Museum, would have appreciated the aesthetic beauty of Te Hau ki Tūranga and realised its value as a potential

⁸⁰ Ibid.
exhibit. Although his initial motive may have been a genuine interest to preserve the whare for all to see, or to outdo Governor Grey, the manner in which the events unfolded amounts to theft. As Rongowhakaata claim, Te Hau ki Tūranga was, in fact, ‘stolen from its people and wrenched from its roots’.
Chapter Three

‘The Finest Maori House in the Whole World’

The Exhibition of Te Hau ki Tūranga

1867–1970

A most interesting addition to the Museum has been effected by the erection of the carved Maori house, which was originally built at Turanganui, Poverty Bay....An account of the history of this remarkable building, and the signification of the various grotesque carvings with which it is lined, will, it is hoped, be soon available.

- James Hector, 1868.

In August 1868 the Colonial Museum was furnished with a short history of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Produced by Reginald Biggs from information gathered at Tūranga, the history set out the names of the eighteen carvers involved and the names of all the ancestors depicted in the poupo. Biggs’ short history, along with information from other sources, formed the basis of a card entitled ‘History of the Maori House’, which hung inside Te Hau ki Tūranga for over fifty years. This chapter covers the exhibition of Te Hau ki Tūranga up until 1970, during which time the museum gave little more thought to the history of the whare. When Te Hau ki Tūranga arrived in Wellington in 1867, it had been ‘wrenched from its roots’ and severed from its people. The beginning of its life as an exhibit in the museum marked a new chapter in Te Hau ki Tūranga’s history. During the nineteenth century the whare existed primarily as a ‘curio’ or ‘specimen’, a great spectacle to be marvelled at. In the early twentieth century its status changed to ‘artefact’ and then later, to ‘art’. When the new Dominion Museum opened in 1936, Te Hau ki Tūranga was considered its ‘jewel’, and a ‘prized exhibit’. This short chapter examines these transitions and traces the rising mana of Te Hau ki Tūranga within New Zealand’s national museum.

The carvings that Fairchild and his men loaded aboard the *Sturt* make up the majority but not every piece of the fully erected whare whakairo that now stands at Te Papa. The accession date for Te Hau ki Tūranga has been established as 12 June 1867, the

---

1 *Dominion*, 5 May 1936.
3 *Dominion*, 31 Jul 1937.
date the whare first appeared in the Colonial Museum’s account book. The exact number of pieces acquired is unknown, but is likely to have numbered around a hundred. The collection of carvings which became known as the ‘Maori House’ were made up of a tāhuhu, thirty two poupou, thirty two heke, twenty epa (end wall posts), and around twenty papaka (skirting boards that go in between the poupou and epa). However, with the exception of four poupou from the porch, the whare arrived at the museum without any of its exterior carvings, such as the maihi, amo, koruru (gable mask), tekoteko (figure on the gable) or poutokomanawa (central supporting posts inside the house). In Richmond’s 1867 statement to the Select Committee, he claimed that ‘the porch [was] denuded of its smaller carvings’. Therefore, it is likely that the smaller carvings on the porch were not there to begin with and the larger carvings, such as the maihi and amo, were either taken away by Māori Fairchild employed to help him or lost in transit. The exterior carvings, poutokomanawa, and a number of smaller carvings inside the whare today, are either nineteenth century carvings borrowed from other wharenui or replacement carvings installed in the 1930s when the whare was re-erected at the Dominion Museum in Buckle Street.

The original Te Hau ki Tūranga as it stood at Orakaiapu Pā was quite large, approximately 13.2 metres long and 5.5 metres wide with an earth floor and thatched roof of raupō. The walls were 1.4 metres high and the apex of the roof reached 3.7 metres, given by the height of the pou tuarongo (carved panel at the centre of the back wall) and pou tāhū (carved panel at the centre of the front inside wall). The elaborately carved poupou that adorned the side walls of the whare were roughly 60 centimetres wide and 15 centimetres thick, although they varied throughout the whare. The heke were dressed down from long planks of wood to leave a raised carved figure at the bottom and the spaces in between were thatched with kākaho (toetoe grass stems). On the contrary, the

---

4 £3 10s is entered on 12 June 1867 ‘For carting Maori Carvings to Museum’, General Accounts from 1 Apr 1865, Colonial Museum Account Book, in O'Rourke.
5 James Hector (director of the Colonial Museum from 1865–1903) stated that the side walls contained thirty two figures in total, the end walls twenty pieces of carving in total, the ridge pole was made up of two pieces, and rafters from each side panel reaching to the ridge, which would equal thirty two rafters, Third Annual Report on the Colonial Museum, p 4, in O'Rourke. Hamilton’s board mount c.1896 of a single papaka (skirting boards in between the poupou and epa) from Te Hau ki Tūranga shows that there were original papaka, Copy Negative B. 24456 in O'Rourke. In May 1939 Oliver wrote that the Maori meeting house committee recommended twenty new papaka be carved in addition to the original ones and the six carved by Heberley. There would have needed to be around 30 papaka in total for the side walls, and maybe 16 or 18 for the end walls equaling around 47 in total. Therefore there could have been around 20 original papaka to make up the 47 needed. See memo on the Turanga House from Oliver to Secretary of Board of Trustees, National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum, 3 May 1939, in O'Rourke.
6 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition.
7 Third Annual Report on the Colonial Museum, p 4, in O'Rourke.
replacement heke produced in the 1930s are milled boards with the carved figures attached separately at the bottom.\(^8\) Bernie Kernot, an expert on Māori art, observed of Rukupō’s work: ‘His carved panels are notable for their complex figure and relief structures and his figures have a remarkably robust vitality in pose and expression.’\(^9\) Carved in deep relief from great tōtara logs, Te Hau ki Tūranga was one of the first houses carved entirely with steel adzes and chisels.

Over the almost 140 years since the whare was removed from Orakaiapu Pā, Te Hau ki Tūranga has been re-erected three times and housed in three different museum buildings. In 1868 the whare was first erected as an adjunct to the Colonial Museum in Wellington where it was known as the ‘Maori House’. In the mid 1930s, under the supervision of Apirana Ngata (Minister of Native Affairs), the whare was partly restored and built into a concrete enclosure in the ‘Maori Hall’ of the new museum in Buckle Street. Ashamed that the whare was not completed on time, Ngata was conspicuously absent from the museum’s opening ceremony in August 1936.\(^10\) It was not until 1940, almost a hundred years after the whare was originally erected at Orakaiapu Pā, that the restoration was finally completed and the whare opened to the public as a complete whare whakairo with tukutuku panels (ornamental lattice-work) in between the poupou and a fully carved porch.

During the period a number of key themes emerge on the exhibition of Te Hau ki Tūranga in Wellington. One is that the whare has always received attention, care, and consideration in the museum. Successive directors often took into account the whare when considering new premises for the museum, and there are screeds of documents that track the care and restoration of the whare. Another theme is that the whare has always been a major attraction for many Pākehā, as well as Māori, in New Zealand and internationally. Museum records reveal numerous enquiries from curious patrons requesting more information about the whare. Barrow’s booklet, *A Guide to the Maori Meeting House Te Hau ki Tūranga*, was immensely popular in the Dominion Museum’s shop, selling over two thousand copies between 1976 and 1986.\(^11\) As the mana of Te Hau ki Tūranga began to rise, other Māori began to take interest in the whare, such as Apirana

---

\(^8\) Barrow, p 17.
\(^9\) Kernot, p 155.
\(^10\) NZPD, 31 Jul 1936, p 225. Ranginui Walker points to Ngata’s perfectionism as an explanation for his comments that he was too ashamed to attend the opening because the whare was incomplete, Ranginui Walker, *He Tipua: The Life and Times of Sir Apirana Ngata*, Auckland, 2001, p 322.
\(^11\) Guide to Maori Meeting House, handwritten notes by Pat Byrne, undated (c.1986) in O’Rourke.
Ngata and later the Lazarus Descendants Society, both from Ngāti Porou. The whare is now recognised as one of Te Papa’s most prized taonga.\textsuperscript{12}

The Colonial Museum (known as the Dominion Museum from 1907) was established in 1865 at the rear of Parliament House, one of the first buildings constructed when the capital moved from Auckland to Wellington. Its activities were tied up in the colonial project of ‘exploring, describing and classifying the country.’ Inside as well as out, the design and layout of the museum mirrored British models and contemporary modes of Victorian architecture. It grew to become a cramped ‘cabinet of curiosities’ and all sorts of specimens lined the walls in cases or on shelves, or were suspended from the ceilings and rails. James Hector, the museum’s first director, was a geologist and Māori specimens were of secondary importance in what was essentially a natural history museum.\textsuperscript{13} The museum did not hold exhibitions as we know them today; the collections themselves were the exhibitions.

As the most important and largest object in the Māori collection, Te Hau ki Tūranga was erected in 1868 as a separate wing attached to the museum. Earlier in the year Hector forwarded plans for the ‘Maori House’ to the government and suggested that J C Richmond might like to be consulted, presumably as the procurer and only person to have seen the whare in its original state.\textsuperscript{14} No evidence survives as to whether Richmond had any input into the whare’s design, but the house was re–erected with a wood exterior and iron roof. Inside, the poupou were elevated on a plinth 76 centimetres above the ground so that the eye of the visitor was at the same elevation as if sitting on the floor in the house in its original construction (similar to its current display in Te Papa).\textsuperscript{15} In what would now be considered as peculiar, entrance to the whare was from the side via a hinged poupou.\textsuperscript{16} With the absence of a porch, front door, and window, the whare was poorly lit, so gas jets were installed and the whare was first lit up in August 1868.\textsuperscript{17} Hector also wanted to use the whare to display other Māori exhibits and table cases were placed inside and Māori

\textsuperscript{12} Dominion, 19 Jan 2002.
\textsuperscript{13} McCarthy, pp 16, 21,43.
\textsuperscript{14} Record of a Memo from Hector to Under Colonial Secretary, 10 Jan 1868, Colonial Museum Letter Book 1865–1870, no 505, in O'Rourke.
\textsuperscript{15} Third Annual Report on the Colonial Museum, p 4, in O'Rourke.
\textsuperscript{16} Memo on the Maori House from Augustus Hamilton to the Colonial Secretary, undated (c.1904), in O'Rourke.
\textsuperscript{17} Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute, p 3.
flags draped along the ceiling.\textsuperscript{18} There was no Māori hall or designated area for Māori exhibits except inside Te Hau ki Tūranga.

A number of photographs from the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century reveal how various carvings from Te Hau ki Tūranga were exhibited in the ‘trophy’ style of display of Māori ‘curios’ that was common at the time. A photo taken at the 1872–3 Colonial and Vienna Exhibition in Christchurch shows a poupou from the whare displayed in the centre of a ‘fan like’ arrangement of taiaha (long weapons of hard wood with one end carved and often decorated with dogs’ hair), tewhatewha (long wooden or bone weapons with a flat section at one end like an axe), hoe (canoe paddles) and a tauihu (figurehead of a canoe).\textsuperscript{19} The poupou was draped in korowai (cloaks ornamented with black twisted tags or thrums) and kākahu (garment, clothes) and flanked by examples of weaving and two taller poupou from another house. Conal McCarthy, author of \textit{Exhibiting Māori: A History of Colonial Cultures of Display} (2008), remarks that in these times and types of display, ‘Exhibiting Māori implied the possession of the people and their land who...were apparently doomed to extinction.’ These early colonial displays were triumphal and made visible the links between material culture and imperial power, and between object and subject. McCarthy also suggests that Te Hau ki Tūranga was displayed in Wellington during the New Zealand Wars as a ‘trophy of colonial conquest’.\textsuperscript{20}

In the twentieth century the status of Māori carvings as ‘curios’ or ‘specimens’ began to change; first to ‘art’, then to ‘artefact’, and eventually, Māori carving(s) became incorporated within the category of ‘Maori arts and crafts’. In 1903 Augustus Hamilton, amateur naturalist and ethnographer, took over as director of the museum. In 1901 he published \textit{Maori Art}, a large illustrated book that helped to establish the popular status of Māori visual culture as art.\textsuperscript{21} Hamilton also reorganised the museum so that the main hall was exclusively for specimens of Māori art. Te Hau ki Tūranga featured as a kind of Māori art room, and displays during Hamilton’s directorship reflect the increasing admiration for Māori carving.\textsuperscript{22} In 1914 J A Thomson succeeded Hamilton as director until 1928, and during his time there was an even greater change in the way the museum viewed Māori exhibits. Items in the Māori collection became ‘artefacts’ (a term from the emerging discipline of Anthropology) and museum staff began to refer to most of the items by their

\textsuperscript{18} McCarthy, p 23.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, Figure 1.1, Trophy display, Colonial and Vienna Exhibition, Christchurch, 1872, PA1–q–166–052, ATL, p 14.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, pp 13, 22.
\textsuperscript{21} A Hamilton, \textit{Maori Art}, Wellington, 1901.
\textsuperscript{22} McCarthy, p 47.
specific names. At the same time, men such as Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck (Te Rangihiroa), a doctor, politician, and later anthropologist, became involved in the revitalisation of traditional Māori decorative arts including carving, weaving, tāniko (border for cloaks, etc. made by finger weaving) and tukutuku, all of which became collectively known as ‘Maori arts and crafts’.

Ngata’s revitalisation efforts were extended to Te Hau ki Tūranga in 1935 when he approached the museum and offered to oversee the restoration of the whare. In the early 1900s Augustus Hamilton lobbied the government for a new museum building and made plans to restore the whare, one of his reasons being that it was in a bad state of disrepair.\(^\text{23}\) The First World War forestalled plans somewhat, but finally in 1924 the government allocated funding for new premises and construction was underway by 1933. Restoration of the whare, however, began much earlier. In 1925 the Maori collection was packed up and relocated to the Dominion Farmers Institute on the corner of Featherston and Balance Streets and Te Hau ki Tūranga was dismantled and stored in the Sydney Street shed. In 1926 the museum employed Thomas Heberley, a Te Āti Awa carver, to prepare Māori exhibits for the museum. Newspaper articles from the early 1930s document Heberley carving the replacement window lintel, koruru, and tekoteko for Te Hau ki Tūranga, but Heberley passed away in January 1937 before restorations were fully completed.

Inside the new Dominion Museum in Buckle Street the interior carvings of Te Hau ki Tūranga were installed inside a concrete enclosure and the porch extended out into the Maori Hall. The enclosure was slightly too long, so Ngata decided to extend the length of the walls by two poupou so that there were fourteen on each side. Ngata employed carvers from the Rotorua School of Māori Arts and Crafts to help carve the extra poupou, heke, papaka, and carvings for the porch. He also employed a group of women from Ōtaki to complete the tukutuku panels, as well as Mr W Bevan, a carpenter, to install Te Hau ki Tūranga into the concrete enclosure. The women and Mr Bevan had recently completed work on the newly opened Ngāti Raukawa wharenui in Ōtaki.\(^\text{24}\)

With only twelve months to go before the opening of the new museum, Ngata and his team had a considerable amount of work to complete in a short time. Notable Ngāti Porou tohunga whakairo Pine Taiapa, as well as Charlie Tuarau (who replaced Heberley after his death) were among the group from the Rotorua School. W R B Oliver (director

\(^{23}\) Hamilton to Colonial Secretary, 9 May 1904; Memo on the Maori House from Augustus Hamilton to the Colonial Secretary, undated (c.1904), both in O’Rourke.

\(^{24}\) Copy of Memo for Minister of Internal Affairs from A T Ngata, 14 Sep 1935, in O’Rourke.
from 1928–1947) had difficulty obtaining wood large enough to carve a replacement ridgepole and heke. The work also took longer than expected, as Ngata wanted the house to be complete with extra poupou, papaka, new porch carvings, a full set of tukutuku panels, kākaho thatching on the porch and between the rafters, as well as a thatched raupō roof. Unfortunately, the restoration of Te Hau ki Tūranga was not completed in time for the museum’s opening ceremony on 1 August 1936. The *Dominion* reported:

Sir Apirana said that there would probably be required some 50 pieces of carving, and as this was a class of work which could not be rushed it would be well on in next year before “Te Haukiteranga” [sic] would be finished. Then it would be the finest Maori house in the whole world.  

After the museum’s opening Oliver continued to try to secure carvers to complete the whare but was told that the Rotorua School was no longer operating. In the end Charlie Tuarau and another carver finished the remainder of the work on the whare and added carvings borrowed from other nineteenth century houses. In 1940, just in time for the New Zealand Centennial Exhibition and almost one hundred years after it was built, Te hau ki Tūranga was opened to the public for the first time as a fully carved whare whakairo.

The intermittent involvement of Ngāti Porou is an interesting thread in the history of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Their interest in the whare dates back to the nineteenth century when, according to the evidence of J C Richmond, Mōkena Kōhere laid claim to the whare on the basis that Ngāti Porou had conquered Rongowhakaata, and it was one of the ‘spoils of victory’. Raharuhi Rukupō also wrote to McLean saying that Mōkena wanted it to be burnt. It is likely that Mōkena threatened to burn Te Hau ki Tūranga, in line with his looting and destruction of property in Tūranga following the defeat of Tūranga Pai Mārire in November 1865. However, Richmond got to the whare before Mōkena could, and stole it before he could burn it.

In 1935, to make the whare fit into the concrete enclosure in the Dominion Museum, the Public Works Department severed the bottoms off many of the poupou where the ancestors’ names were inscribed. As an advocate of the revival of traditional Māori culture, Ngata would have appreciated the value and importance of identifying the ancestors depicted in the poupou. It seems strange, therefore, that he would authorise their truncation without recording their identity in some way. But, given the traditional

25 *Dominion*, 5 May 1936.
26 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition, 1867.
27 Rukupo to McLean, undated, MS–Copy–Micro–0535–116, ATL.
28 Barrow, p 21.
rivalry between Rongowhakaata and Ngāti Porou, and that Ngata was strongly influenced
by his great–uncle Rāpata Wahawaha – who was enslaved as a child by Rongowhakaata and
led forces against Tūranga Pai Marire in 1865 – Te Hau ki Tūranga might have become the
subject of inter–tribal rivalry once again. Ngata may have been trying to assert mana over
the whare. Indeed, Te Hau ki Tūranga became the prototype for Ngata’s revitalisation
of the Māori meeting house across New Zealand.

During its time in the Colonial and Dominion museums Te Hau ki Tūranga was
used for a variety of purposes, not all of them befitting of a whare tipuna (ancestral
house). While Te Hau ki Tūranga was in the Colonial Museum it was a busy function
centre for Wellington’s scientific elite. It was used as a meeting room for the New Zealand
Institute, which was set up for the advancement of science and art, the Wellington
Philosophical Society (part of the New Zealand Institute), and the New Zealand Academy
of Fine Art. The minutes of the inaugural meeting of the New Zealand Institute on 4
August 1868 record that ‘A most attractive subject was the interior of the Māori house,
which was lighted up for the first time’. The proceedings of the Wellington Philosophical
Society also recorded a meeting held inside the whare on 25 August 1868, when Tārēha
gave his account of the history of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 1873 Wellington College
requested the use of the whare as a lecture room for a series of natural science lectures.
To these groups the whare was a magnificent spectacle to be marvelled at.

While in the Dominion Museum the whare was used to store chairs and also served
as a wedding chapel. Because of the Second World War the museum was temporarily
closed to the public from June 1942 and used as office space to accommodate the Royal
New Zealand Air Force. Due to lack of space a large number of chairs from the lecture
hall were stored inside Te Hau ki Tūranga and table cases and a mixture of other exhibits
were packed on to the porch. The air force vacated the premises in August 1946 but the

30 McCarthy, p 85; Brown, pp 7,16, 21. In Te Mana o Turanga, Fowler reported that in 1935, Ngata told Hone
Taiapa that he saved Te Hau ki Tūranga from being shipped overseas. The carvings had been sold to a Mr
Nielson and they were waiting at Wellington wharf to be shipped to England. But Nielson passed away and
Ngata wrote to his sister to suggest they be deposited with the museum. According to Fowler, Taiapa said
that Ngata was very proud of saving Te Hau ki Tūranga for the nation. There is no evidence in the
museum’s archives of selling the whare, and it is unlikely that the museum would do so given its value
as an exhibit.
31 ‘Brief of Evidence of Lewis Moeau on Behalf of Rongowhakaata’, Document D28, Record of Inquiry for
the Gisborne Claims, Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, pp 8–9.
32 Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute, p 3.
Institute, p 445.
34 Charles Graham (Secretary of Wellington College) to Hector, 28 Feb 1873, in O’Rourke.
museum did not re–open to the public until October 1949. In the late 1980s a couple from Wellington were married inside Te Hau ki Tūranga and the ceremony was performed by the museum protocol officer Erenora Puketapu–Hetet of Te Āti Awa. She reported to the *Evening Post* that the museum ‘welcomed such use of the meeting house as it brought life to the museum and encouraged visitors.’

Consistently throughout its time in Wellington Te Hau ki Tūranga has been of enormous importance to the museum. Its erection in 1868 attracted an increase in Māori visitors and by the end of the nineteenth century it was the only major attraction at the Colonial Museum. When Hamilton lobbied the government in 1904 for a new museum building, one of the reasons he gave was the need to re–erect the ‘very fine Maori House’, which at the time was in a state of disrepair. When the whare was moved to the Dominion Museum (later renamed the National Museum of New Zealand in 1972) and built into the ‘Maori Hall’, Te Hau ki Tūranga remained one of the museum’s most popular attractions. McCarthy notes that the ‘Maori Hall’ was the ‘central shrine’ of the whole museum and held the nation’s ‘priceless treasures’. When the Dominion Museum re–opened in 1949, the ceremonial address to the whare performed by cabinet minister Eruera Tirikatene on the marae ātea in front of the house was the highlight of the reopening ceremony. Te Hau ki Tūranga was recognised as a ‘rare masterpiece’, and the museum gained considerable prestige from having the whare in its collections.

---

36 McCarthy, pp 45,32.
37 Ibid, p 88.
38 *Dominion*, 1 Aug 1936, in McCarthy, p 81.
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Chapter Four

Into the Present 1970–2009

The Rongowhakaata view of the Crown’s actions in respect of Te Hau ki Turanga is simple: it was a blatant theft. Rongowhakaata have had to suffer the indignity of watching others hold one of our most precious assets.

- Lewis Moeau, Rongowhakaata, 2002.¹

This chapter brings Te Hau ki Tūranga into the present. It looks at the history of the whare from 1970 and examines the politics surrounding it as a museum exhibit and a Treaty of Waitangi claim. As a museum exhibit Te Hau ki Tūranga became the subject of intense intertribal rivalry in the 1970s when a group of Ngāti Porou claimed that Raharuhi Rukupō was their tipuna (ancestor). During its time in the museum the whare’s status changed from ‘artefact’ to ‘art’ and then finally to ‘taonga’ in the 1980s, mainly as a result of the groundbreaking international Te Maori exhibition.² Later in the decade the museum began to consult Rongowhakaata on matters relating to the whare and in 1995, they assisted the museum in moving Te Hau ki Tūranga to Te Papa on Wellington’s waterfront. Controversy surrounding the whare’s acquisition resurfaced in 1997 when Rongowhakaata lodged their Treaty of Waitangi claim with the Waitangi Tribunal for the ‘theft’ of Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 2004 the tribunal expressed its opinion that Te Papa did not legally own Te Hau ki Tūranga. At present, Rongowhakaata (along with the other Tūranga claimants) are in detailed negotiations with the Crown for their combined settlement package, which will include a Crown Apology, a Historical Account, and financial and cultural redress to the value of $59 million. Finally, the history of the nineteenth century whare whakairo, Mataatua from Whakatāne will be briefly examined. Its story provides a useful historical comparison and may provide a model for the future of Te Hau ki Tūranga.

As described in the previous chapters, Ngāti Porou interest in Te Hau ki Tūranga dates back to the nineteenth century. However, their most controversial involvement with

¹ Evidence of Lewis Moeau, p 8.
² Te Maori featured traditional Māori artwork and was hugely successful. It toured the United States in 1984 and then returned to tour New Zealand in 1986. See Sidney Moko Mead, Te Maori.
the whare occurred in the 1970s. In 1974 a one hundred–strong group of Ngāti Porou representing the self–proclaimed ‘Lazarus Descendants Society’ presented a series of genealogical plaques to the museum. The plaques established that Raharuhi Rukupō, the carver of Te Hau ki Tūranga, was Raharuhi Tapore, their Ngāti Porou tipuna from Te Araroa on the East Coast. Several years beforehand, Rongowhakaata Halbert, a Rongowhakaata historian, wrote to the Gisborne Herald refuting Ngāti Porou claims to Raharuhi Rukupō and Te Hau ki Tūranga. The museum ethnologist, Terrence Barrow, defended the museum’s actions in accepting the plaques saying, ‘We are simply a depository for artifacts [sic] and for history, and acceptance by the museum doesn’t necessarily validate any claims made by anyone.’ Rongowhakaata later described the display of the plaques as one of most hurtful examples of the absence of a relationship between themselves and the museum.

Members of the Lazarus Descendants Society applied to the Maori Land Court to succeed to the interests of Raharuhi Rukupō in the Mangaotane Trust Estate but were unsuccessful, the court finding that Raharuhi Rukupō and Raharuhi Tapore of Ngāti Porou were not the same man. The interim decision was delivered by ETJ Durie, who explained the significance of the case:

‘[Raharuhi Rukupō] maintains a position of such esteem that the right to succeed to him is a matter of considerable pride. What is more important is that the identification of this ancestor as belonging to one or other tribal group is a matter of collective pride for the tribe as a whole.’

Members of the society then appealed the decision in the Maori Appellate Court but the court upheld the previous decision. As the land interests in the estate were relatively small, the case was argued from a non–materialistic motive and was therefore about determining who would bear the ‘mana of the carver’s prowess’. McCarthy also argues that the incident illustrated the rising mana of Te Hau ki Tūranga amongst tribal groups.

As the mana of Te Hau ki Tūranga began to rise, its status as an exhibit also changed over the years from ‘artefact’, to ‘Maori art’, then finally to ‘taonga’, the term that is used today. A taonga is defined as:

---

4 Dominion, 15 Feb 1974.
5 Brief of Evidence of Lewis Moeau, Document D28, p 10.
7 Ibid.
8 McCarthy, p 120.
any item, object, or thing [tangible or intangible] which represents a Māori kin group’s (whanau, hapu, iwi) ancestral identity with their particular land and resources.

Foundation Professor of Māori Studies at Victoria University of Wellington, Hirini Moko Mead (Ngāti Awa), describes the term as a ‘tool of explanation’ that can help scholars understand a Māori perspective on art. Before Te Maori in 1984, Māori had little or no involvement with their museum-held taonga, and these remained ‘captured’ by the dominant culture in museums where they existed purely as specimens of art. However, Te Maori paved the way in New Zealand as an example of bicultural museum practice and Māori were involved in the planning, display and interpretation of their taonga.

Mead describes both antiquity and kōrero as highly valued dimensions of taonga. Antiquity associates taonga with the ancestors, who form the basis of Māori identity. Therefore greater value is placed on older taonga than those produced recently. Antiquity also links taonga back in time to the founding ancestors of the iwi and forward to the living descendants, who exist as trustees by right of whakapapa. Kōrero refers to the talk associated with the creation of a taonga, enriching it and providing it with a history. Kōrero links a taonga to a particular whanau, hapū, or iwi who have cultural rights to the kōrero and taonga itself. As Te Hau ki Tūranga stands today, it is both very old and clothed in rich kōrero. The whare provides a strong and important link between Rongowhakaata and their tīpuna. Paul Tapsell, recently appointed Professor of Māori Studies at Otago University, explains:

taonga are time travellers, bridging the generations, allowing descendants to ritually meet their ancestors, face to face. Furthermore, taonga are vital threads from the past, acting as guides (here) to interpreting the past. They assist descendents to understand the often complex genealogical relationships (whakapapa) which remain patterned across the ancestral lands (whenua) of modern tribal New Zealand.

The ancestral spirit (wairua) inherent in a taonga is experienced by its descendants as ihi (presence or power), wehi (awesomeness) and wana (authority), a three-in-one concept that the artist worked hard to instil. This concept, coupled with antiquity and kōrero, result in a taonga of great mana such as Te Hau ki Tūranga.

---

11 Ibid, pp 182–84
12 Tapsell, p 13.
Rongowhakaata have only recently become involved in the care and management of their whare. In 1989 the museum began to consult the iwi over plans to move Te Hau ki Tūranga to its current location at Te Papa on Wellington’s waterfront. Rongowhakaata agreed that Te Hau ki Tūranga could remain in Wellington as an exhibit. In return they asked to take part in the relocation of the whare from Buckle Street to the new building, and that their proprietary rights be considered. The museum recognised that Rongowhakaata had hereditary rights to the whare but that it was legally owned by the museum. In 1990 Rongowhakaata asked that the whare be symbolically given back to them before the opening of Te Papa, and in return they would ceremonially ‘entrust it to the nation’ and into the museum’s care. Rongowhakaata believed they were only giving custodianship of the whare to the museum, and that they still owned the whare outright.

During the 1990s the museum established a working relationship with Rongowhakaata. In October 1992 the museum hosted more than a hundred people for the 150th anniversary celebration of Te Hau ki Tūranga. The event was organised by Walter (Rota) Waipara of Rongowhakaata who was at the time Pou Takawaenga (Māori Liaison Officer) at the museum. One of the highlights of the weekend for the iwi was being able to sleep inside Te Hau ki Tūranga, the first time anyone had slept inside the whare since it was removed from Orakaiapu Pā in 1867. This was very special and significant for Rongowhakaata, as it was the first time the carvings’ eyes were able to rest upon its uri (descendants). In 1993 Rongowhakaata endorsed the establishment of an exhibition team to proceed with the planning for Te Hau ki Tūranga. As a gesture of goodwill, in 1994 the museum returned the six Manutūkē Church panels to Rongowhakaata, the first time in the museum’s history that a Māori collection was repatriated to its original owners.

On Queen’s Birthday weekend in June 1995, Te Hau ki Tūranga was deinstalled at the Buckle Street museum. A Rongowhakaata working group had been established to work with Te Papa to carry out the two year project of dismantling, transporting, and reconstructing the whare at the new waterfront site. The working group ensured that the re-installation of the whare was carried out in accordance with Rongowhakaata tradition and that the iwi were kept informed. Lewis Moeau, spokesperson for Rongowhakaata,

---

15 Evidence of Lewis Moeau, p 12.
17 Hilliard and Evans, p 3.
described this relationship as ‘the very best example of a joint partnership with the Crown’. The process this time was very different from when Te Hau ki Tūranga was dismantled from Orakaiapu and the Colonial Museum. First, the mauri (life force) of the whare was laid in the foundation of Te Hau ki Tūranga at its new site before the whare arrived. A container of earth from where Te Hau ki Tūranga once stood and a pīngao kete that contained a pounamu called Kahutia were presented to the museum by the late Heni Sunderland, a prominent Rongowhakaata kaumātua. Second, the de-installation was carried out in partnership with Rongowhakaata and began with two men at a time extracting screws from poupou on the porch, one representing Rongowhakaata and the other representing the museum. Finally, Rongowhakaata were full of happiness, excitement, and anticipation to be involved in the process of relocating their whare. The ceremony was full of emotion and Cliff Whiting, Kaihautū (Māori leader) for Te Papa at the time, acknowledged that Te Hau ki Tūranga was a taonga of great significance with immense spiritual memory and context.

The new display of the whare inside Te Papa reflected an official shift within the museum to a bicultural policy and their working relationship with Rongowhakaata. A large amount of research and consultation went into designing the display of the whare within ‘Mana Whenua’ and a series of consultation hui were held in which various design concepts were discussed. Unlike previous re-erections, Rongowhakaata wanted the whare to be displayed as a free-standing house, facing north in a prominent position. In the end the whare was placed in a central position and raised up on a platform as if sitting on a hill, complete with a fully thatched roof and set against a backdrop of stockade posts. It was still flanked by the Ngāti Pikiao pātaka Te Takinga as it was in the Māori Hall, but it now appeared much larger out of its concrete enclosure. A plaque standing adjacent to the whare, and a video playing at the foot of the steps provide a link between Rongowhakaata and their taonga. Conal McCarthy, author of *Exhibiting Māori*, argues that what is on display in ‘Mana Whenua’ is the ownership of the social group and tangata whenua are now looking at themselves, rather than being observed by Pākehā.

---
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developer of the exhibition who also has tribal affiliations to Rongowhakaata, affirmed that the exhibition spoke with the authority of the people.\(^{23}\)

Yet, in 1997 Rongowhakaata lodged a claim with the Waitangi Tribunal regarding land and resources in the Rongowhakaata rohe that included a claim for the theft of Te Hau ki Tūranga.\(^{24}\) During the hearings held in Gisborne over five days in February 2002, members of Rongowhakaata gave evidence regarding the Crown’s acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Lewis Moeau, spokesperson for the iwi, stated that Rongowhakaata’s view of the acquisition was that it was ‘blatant theft’ and the loss of their whare tipuna has remained a significant and continuing grievance for the iwi.\(^{25}\) To Rongowhakaata, the theft of Te Hau ki Tūranga also meant a loss of ancestors and connection with their past and identity.\(^{26}\)

The question of ownership was a highly contested issue at the hearings and in the tribunal’s 2004 report on the Tūranganui-a-Kiwa claims. Rongowhakaata maintained that they owned the whare legally and morally. Moeau explained, ‘there has never been a time when anyone from Rongowhakaata has ever said that we do not own the whare. This is totally inconceivable to our people.’ He also expressed his view that the pounamu presented by kuia Heni Sunderland to be laid at the foundation confirmed that the mauri of the whare is with Rongowhakaata.\(^{27}\) In 2001, before the hearings began, counsel for the Crown conceded that the removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga was in breach of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi because it was removed without the consent of all its owners and without identifying all those who had rights to agree to the ‘transaction’.\(^{28}\) However, the Crown still believed that Te Papa legally owned the whare.\(^{29}\) Te Papa supported the Crown’s stance, citing section 17 of the National Art Gallery, Museum and War Memorial Act 1972. The Act set out that where it cannot be clearly established that the Board of Trustees of the museum or any other person owns an exhibit, ownership is by default vested in the Board. The tribunal disagreed with both the Crown and Te Papa’s views on ownership of Te Hau ki Tūranga. It declared that title could not pass to the museum.

---
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because in 1972 there was no doubt about who owned the whare as Crown agents had ‘freely admitted in 1867 that Te Hau ki Turanga was stolen.’

In his brief of evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal Moeau made a number of complaints against the museum regarding the care and management of Te Hau ki Tūranga. He claimed that the museum let the whare deteriorate in the early twentieth century. He also expressed his dismay that artists from other iwi were commissioned to produce the tukutuku panels and replacement carvings and that Rongowhakaata were never consulted or approached to complete this work. Moeau’s claims are not unfounded but the museum did not intentionally neglect the whare and neither did it directly commission those who carried out the replacement work. For example, while in the Colonial Museum vandals defaced some of the poupou, they were slashed with a pocket knife and the pāua (abalone) shell eye inlets were removed but Hamilton stopped public access to the whare soon after. Some of the poupou also suffered from rot when an overgrown tree was blocking the spout but Hamilton’s successor, JA Thomson, took up the matter with urgency and had the Public Works Department mend the roof and spouting straight away. Years of using gas to light the whare obliterated the kowhaiwhai patterns on the heke by the 1930s, but the museum carefully retraced and repainted them. In 1935, it was Ngata who commissioned the women from Ōtaki and carvers from the Rotorua School of Maori Arts and Crafts to complete the replacement work for the whare. The museum believed Ngata was going to re–erect the whare in ‘true Maori style according to the customs of the East Cape district’.

Māori exhibitions in Te Papa have also had their critics. In 2000 the late Peter Munz, Emeritus Professor of History at Victoria University of Wellington, criticised the lack of historical truth in Te Papa’s Moriori exhibition, which omitted any reference to the 1835 massacre of the Moriori people by Taranaki Māori, an event that he argues ‘fundamentally determined the social composition of the Chatham Islands.’ Munz believed that Te Papa was supposed to be educational, not just amusing and entertaining. He continued:

31 Evidence of Lewis Moeau, pp 8–9.
32 ‘Vandalism in the Museum’, undated newspaper article, in O’Rourke.
33 Memo from Thomson to the Under–Secretary of Internal Affairs re: Roof of the Maori House, 24 Jul 1919; Memo from Under–Secretary to Thomson, 14 Aug 1919, both in O’Rourke.
34 Memo from W R B Oliver to Under–Secretary of Internal Affairs re: Maori Meeting House, 14 Aug 1935, in O’Rourke.
as a matter of educational policy it is unacceptable that New Zealand’s National Museum should so blatantly contradict the standards of truthfulness upheld and cultivated in the country’s tertiary educational institutions.\textsuperscript{35}  

Te Papa defended what Munz believed was a distortion of the truth. Their response was that the exhibition was created in consultation with Moriori, and the iwi did not wish to make it part of the exhibition.\textsuperscript{36}

The way taonga are displayed in ‘Mana Whenua’ does not divulge the sometimes dramatic historical context from which they were wrenched.\textsuperscript{37} Museums evolved not from a European desire to document history, but from a desire to study the material culture of the ‘Other’. This disjunction highlights the difference between ethnography and history. For example, from a historical perspective taonga in museums are remnants of the past, and a historian’s interest lies in capturing the stories that surround them – where they come from and how the museum acquired them, what Mead calls the ‘kōrero’ that clothes taonga – rather than their aesthetic qualities. The consequence of a dominant ethnographic tradition that emphasises visual qualities over explanation has been to remove indigenous people from the events of history.\textsuperscript{38} This rings true in the current display of Te Hau ki Tūranga. Very little of the history of the whare is able to be gathered from the plaque that stands adjacent or the video at the foot of the steps, even though the association with Rongowhakaata is reasonably clear. Many visitors are even unsure if the whare is authentic or not, many thinking it is a replica or a model.\textsuperscript{39} 

The story of Mataatua, the Ngāti Awa whare whakairo from Whakatāne, provides an interesting comparison to the story of Te Hau ki Tūranga. After the Sydney International Exhibition in 1879 and without Ngāti Awa’s permission, Mataatua was displayed in Melbourne and then shipped to the South Kensington Museum in England, where it remained for the most part dismantled until the early 1920s. The whare was repatriated to the New Zealand Government in 1925 for display at the New Zealand and South Seas Exhibition in Dunedin where it was re-erected in the Otago Museum. When the museum hosted the homecoming tour of \textit{Te Maori} in 1985, the presence of the whare

\textsuperscript{36} For further discussion on the issue see McCarthy, p 192.
\textsuperscript{38} P H Williams, p 142.
‘spurred’ Ngāti Awa to include the whare in its Treaty of Waitangi claims.40 After over a decade of negotiations Mataatua was finally repatriated in 1996 after the Waitangi Tribunal recommended the whare be returned home.41

At present Mataatua is being temporarily housed at the Whakatāne museum, awaiting the construction of a marae complex where it will be finally re–erected on Ngāti Awa land. In 2008 the government announced funding of $7 million to ‘re–establish the Mataatua Whare to her original beauty and to insure [sic] that it is erected in her original home, where she rightfully belongs.’42 The government believed that the repatriation of Mataatua would bring economic benefits to the wider Whakatāne region through an increase in cultural tourism. More importantly the government saw the repatriation of Mataatua as an opportunity to ‘acknowledge and help...re–right the wrongs that were done to Ngati Awa’.43

Since the release of the Waitangi Tribunal’s report on the Tūranganui–a–Kiwa claims in 2004, Rongowhakaata have made good progress, moving through three of four stages of negotiations with the Crown. In August 2005 the Crown recognised the Rongowhakaata ‘Deed of Mandate’, which set out and validated those with the authority to represent the iwi in negotiations. The Deed also defined the claimant group, their rohe (district), and claims to be settled. In May 2007 Rongowhakaata, along with the other Tūranga claimant groups, signed the ‘Terms of Negotiations’ with the Crown, which set out how the parties would negotiate a durable settlement. Just over a year later the scope and nature of the Crown’s settlement package was revealed when the parties signed an ‘Agreement in Principle’ for the settlement of their historical Treaty claims. The agreement detailed an offer that included cultural and commercial redress for Tūranga Māori to the substantial monetary value of $59 million. For a combined population of 12,000, this quantum looms large in comparison to $43 million for Ngāti Awa with a similar population

41 Allen, p 152.
43 Ibid.
of 13,000. This quantum reflects, to a certain degree, the extent of loss in terms of land (whenua) and lives (tangata) lost.

At the signing of the Agreement in Principle Dr Michael Cullen, the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations, acknowledged the suffering endured by the tribes of Tūranganui–a–Kiwa at the hands of the Crown:

Your history is one of great resilience, strength, and pride. But it is also a tragic history; a history of state violence, confiscation of land, and stigmatisation within your own communities. As the result of Crown action your people have at times suffered poverty, famine and significant hardship.

Rongowhakaata and the other Tūranga claimants are currently working on a draft Deed of Settlement, which will contain all the details of redress, such as the wording of the Crown’s apology, an account of the historical basis of the claims, what the commercial assets might be, and what the cultural redress covers. This draft then needs to be ratified by the wider claimant groups using a postal ballot. Members of the claimant groups also need to ratify the Governance Entity (or Entities) for settlement. A Governance Entity is a legal entity that will hold and manage settlement assets and carry out the forms of cultural redress provided. Once the Deed of Settlement and Governance Entity (or Entities) have been ratified, negotiations will reach the fourth and final stage of enacting legislation to implement the settlement and transfer settlement assets.

That Rongowhakaata’s Treaty claims are nearing settlement begs the question: ‘What now for Te Hau ki Tūranga?’ The Agreement in Principle does not set out any measures for the repatriation of the whare but provides a number of reconciliatory measures. First, as part of the cultural redress, the Crown recognises that Rongowhakaata never relinquished ownership over the whare and offers the option of an investigation into legal title to the whare. Second, Rongowhakaata will be given an enhanced kaitiaki (guardian) role over Te Hau ki Tūranga and the Crown will provide for a ‘relationship instrument to be entered into between Rongowhakaata and Te Papa to address the ongoing


care, display, and maintenance of the wharenui. Last, the Crown will provide an apology for the ‘circumstances in which [it] assumed control of Te Hau ki Tūranga in 1867 and its removal from Orakaiapu Pa, Manutuke’. For the most part, these measures are a direct response to requests made by Rongowhakaata at their hearings in 2002. Recognition of ownership, both culturally and legally, was of particular importance to the iwi, who stated emphatically, ‘We can settle for nothing less because it has always belonged to us.’

The Waitangi Tribunal’s findings and recommendations with regard to Te Hau ki Tūranga were prudent. Not wanting to prejudice the very delicate nature of relations between Rongowhakaata and Te Papa, the tribunal only made one suggestion. In reference to the plaque quoted at the beginning of this thesis, the Tribunal found:

the reference on the board to Te Hau ki Turanga being ‘acquired by the government in 1867’ is an inadequate explanation of the unhappy circumstances in which the whare was removed....We consider that Te Papa should consult with Rongowhakaata on a revised wording which reflects, appropriately and honourably, the forcible removal of the whare in the aftermath of the siege of Waerenga a Hika in 1865.

Yet, in 1996 the Tribunal recommended the return of Mataatua, even though the circumstances surrounding the Crown’s acquisition of the whare reveal a larger degree of cooperation between Ngāti Awa and the Crown in comparison with Te Hau ki Tūranga. Even wharenui that have been sold by its owners, such as Ruatepupuke II from Tokomaru Bay on the East Coast, have been the subject of calls for repatriation.

Hence, there are strong historical, political and cultural arguments for the repatriation of Te Hau ki Tūranga. From a historical perspective, chapter two has clearly shown that Te Hau ki Tūranga was, in effect, stolen from its people by the Crown. Richmond did not have the consent of Rukupō or the wider consent of Ngāti Kaipoho and Rongowhakaata when he sent Captain Fairchild to dismantle the whare in 1867. The payment of money to a number of unknown Māori is immaterial to the nature of the transaction and the Waitangi Tribunal’s historical research affirmed that the whare has never belonged to the Crown. Within a political framework of restitution, restorative justice, and Māori rangatiratanga (sovereignty) – the ultimate goals of the Treaty claims process – the repatriation of Te Hau ki Tūranga would go a long way in mending the

47 Ibid, para 23 (a) ii, 25c.
48 Ibid, para 25a.
50 Waitangi Tribunal, Turanga Tangata Turanga Whenua, p 607.
51 Hakiwai and Terrell, p iv.
relationship between Rongowhakaata and the Crown. 52 Culturally, as a taonga, the return of Te Hau ki Tūranga is of utmost importance. Mead explains:

What is important for the owning group is that the taonga is ‘brought home’ so it can be slotted into the art style, the history, and the oral traditions of the people. When the taonga is not brought home into the tribal territory but rests instead in some museum hundreds of miles away, the object and its associated korero remain lost to the owning group.53

If Te Hau ki Tūranga was returned home to Tūranganui–a–Kiwa, a phase of ‘retribalisation’ would be added to the whare’s history.54 Te Hau ki Tūranga would be able to live among its descendants, and witness and participate in their life cycles. Rongowhakaata would be able to exercise their rangatiratanga over the whare and do with it whatever they please, no longer having to watch others hold one of their most precious assets.

As a museum exhibit and a Treaty of Waitangi claim, the mana of Te Hau ki Tūranga has risen throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, assuming an even greater status today than it did in the nineteenth century. The irony is that if the Crown did not forcibly take Te Hau ki Tūranga in 1867, it most likely would not have survived to the present. However, this does not negate the unlawful taking of the whare and the enormous loss for generations of Rongowhakaata. The Crown has little justification for holding on to Te Hau ki Tūranga, and the fact that the whare is on display at Te Papa today, provides a chance for the Crown to make amends with Rongowhakaata. The repatriation of the whare to Tūranganui–a–Kiwa would be a huge symbolic gesture and an opportunity for reconciliation and restoration of a partnership entered into in 1840 when Tāmati Wāka Māngere (Rukupō’s elder brother for whom Te Hau ki Tūranga was built) signed the Treaty of Waitangi.

The value of the whare to Te Papa cannot be greater than its value to its own people. The disjunction between the purposes of history and museology, in that the former is interested in the kōrero attached to a taonga, and the latter is focussed on its aesthetic qualities, is reflected in this dilemma. Te Hau ki Tūranga in Te Papa is an exhibit to most people, something that is pleasing to the eye, but that does not necessarily have any

53 Mead, ‘Nga Timunga me nga Paringa o te Mana Maori’, p 29.
54 P H Williams, p 146.
meaning or significance to them.\textsuperscript{55} On the other hand, to Rongowhakaata Te Hau ki Tūranga is a living, breathing thing, imbued with Māori cosmology and whakapapa. Jody Wyllie, one of the mandated Rongowhakaata negotiators made clear his views on Te Hau ki Tūranga in 2002:

\begin{quote}
I tend to think [of] it like an encyclopaedia. It’s just that the pages have all been muddled up and I believe that if...title is returned to our people, we will put the pages back in the right order. Then you will see the true beauty and the true potential of this taonga.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{55} Neil Anderson, pp 3,5.
\textsuperscript{56} Cross Examination of Jody Wyllie, Hearing Transcript 4.23, Record of Inquiry for the Gisborne Claims, Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, p 113.
Conclusion

This thesis set out to explore the claim by Rongowhakaata that Te Hau ki Tūranga was ‘stolen from its people and wrenched from its roots’. It has focussed largely on the historical context by examining the power relationships between Tūranga Māori and the Crown leading up to and immediately after the outbreak of conflict in November 1865. The defeat of Tūranga Pai Mārire at Waerenga–a–Hika was a pivotal moment in Tūranga’s history – the ‘hinge of fate’– following which Tūranga ceased to be an autonomous Māori district.¹ The historical background to the removal of Te Hau ki Tūranga is critical to understanding whether the whare was confiscated or sold; gifted or stolen. This thesis has also broken new ground by tracing in detail the history of the whare from 1867 until the present, examining it as a museum exhibit and a Treaty of Waitangi claim.

This study differs from the majority of scholars in the twentieth century who have portrayed the acquisition as a purchase, and from the few that have described it as a confiscation. Many of these accounts are riddled with errors and have not made use of all the available historical sources. This study agrees, however, with the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal in 2004 that Te Hau ki Tūranga was stolen. The research reports produced in the process of the tribunal’s inquiry are valuable sources, but none go as far as examining in detail the history of the whare as a museum exhibit. Unlike these reports, this thesis was not limited by the jurisdiction of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Treaty claims process.

In the nineteenth century Tūranganui–a–Kiwa was a relatively autonomous Māori district. The Crown held only nominal sovereignty up until 1865 and Tūranga rangatira and the local rūnanga maintained day–to–day control of the district. Upon the arrival of missionaries in the 1830s, Tūranga Māori converted rapidly and integrated elements of Christianity into their existing belief systems. In the 1850s they flourished in the local and national economies, reaping the benefits of material wealth. Government attempts to purchase land in Tūranga were kept at arms length, and up until the 1868 Deed of Cession the majority of land remained in Māori ownership. But this autonomy was not set to last. Tūranga Māori attempts to exert control over land and resources in the district strained

¹ Oliver and Thomson, p 94.
their relationship with settlers, who called for greater government involvement in the region. In the early 1860s armed conflict between the Crown and Māori in Taranaki and Waikato signalled the end of Māori autonomy in Tūranga. In March 1865 Pai Mārire emissaries arrived in the district, forcing Tūranga Māori to declare their allegiance either for or against the government. The situation also provided an opportunity for Ngāti Porou to settle old rivalries and extend their authority beyond Ngāti Porou territory. For the Crown, it was an opportune time to enforce British authority in the region. Nevertheless, armed conflict was avoidable but McLean was unwilling to negotiate. The government was determined to establish administrative control in the region while it had the chance.

The battle at Waerenga–a–Hika between Tūranga Pai Mārire and the Crown and its Māori allies was short and relatively small–scale but had far reaching implications. In the aftermath of defeat, Tūranga Māori faced imprisonment, exile, and the threat of land confiscation. During 1866 and 1867, Biggs was relentless in pressing for the cession of a large area of land to the Crown in punishment for the alleged rebellion of Tūranga Pai Mārire. The failure of Biggs to bring about an agreement brought J C Richmond to Tūranga, and although his efforts too were fruitless, his visit was not entirely in vain. While riding in to Tūranga he stumbled across the whare. The immediate historical context in which the Crown acquired Te Hau ki Tūranga was Māori defeat and unrelenting pressure to cede their lands.

Throughout the period 1830–1867, the key players in the acquisition of Te Hau ki Tūranga emerge. Raharuhi Rukupō stands out as a rangatira who tried hard to protect the autonomy of Tūranga Māori and was well known for speaking out against the government. In the lead up to conflict in 1865 Mōkena Kōhere also surfaced as one of Rukupō’s antagonists, treating the victory over Tūranga Pai Mārire as a Ngāti Porou victory and laying claim to Te Hau ki Tūranga as a ‘spoil of victory’. Tāheha Te Moananui also appeared as a mediator between Rukupō and McLean to bring about peace, but to no avail. In the wake of defeat, Richmond took advantage of fortuitous circumstances to score a coup for the government and go one–up on George Grey by appropriating Te Hau ki Tūranga.

The way in which agents of the Crown orchestrated the removal of the whare in April 1867 amounts to theft. Richmond sent Captain Fairchild to remove the whare without the consent of Rukupō and all those who had rights to agree to the transaction.

2 Written statement from J C Richmond appended to the Report on the Petition.
When he arrived at Orakaipu Pā, Fairchild faced continuous opposition from those Māori present from the time he arrived until the time he left. Fairchild offered £100 to subdue the protesters then Biggs arrived and took over the matter, paying £100 to unknown Māori. Several months later, Rukupō and eight other Tūranga Māori petitioned the government for the return of their ‘very valuable carved house’.³

The 1867 Select Committee’s investigation into the acquisition found that the whare was confiscated based on allegations that Rukupō was a ‘rebel’ and the house and the land on which it stood were, therefore, forfeited to the government. Yet, no land confiscation took place either formally or informally in Tūranga until 1868. Neither had it been determined in a court of law that Rukupō had actually rebelled against the Crown. Most importantly, if the Crown intended to confiscate Te Hau ki Tūranga, Richmond would not have gone to great lengths to obtain consent to remove it. Neither would Fairchild have offered £100 for it. Te Hau ki Tūranga was stolen: the Crown did not have consent to remove it from Orakaipu Pā and when faced with opposition, it continued to persist in dismantling the whare.

When Te Hau ki Tūranga arrived in Wellington it ceased to be treated as a living, breathing thing. It was now a ‘curio’ or ‘specimen’ and a ‘most interesting addition to the museum’.⁴ The whare remained in the Colonial Museum for almost 60 years until it was moved to the new Dominion Museum in Buckle Street. In preparation for its installation in the new museum Te Hau ki Tūranga was restored under the supervision of Sir Apirana Ngata, an influential Māori politician at the time. Ngata wanted Te Hau ki Tūranga to be displayed as a fully carved house, complete with tukutuku panels and a thatched porch, only then would it be ‘the most famous Māori House in the whole world’.⁵ As well as becoming renown as national icon and the jewel of the museum, Te Hau ki Tūranga became the prototype for Ngata’s revitalisation of Māori meeting houses across New Zealand.

Rongowhakaata involvement with their exiled whare did not occur until the late 1980s, when the museum began to consult the iwi over plans to move the whare to Te Papa on Wellington’s waterfront. This marked the beginning of a working relationship between Rongowhakaata and Te Papa to manage and care for Te Hau ki Tūranga. In 1998 Te Papa opened with the whare as the centrepiece of the ‘Mana Whenua’ exhibition. Around the same time, Rongowhakaata lodged a claim with the Waitangi Tribunal for the

---
³ ‘Petition of Natives at Turanga’.
⁴ Third Annual Report on the Colonial Museum and Laboratory, p 4, in O’Rourke.
⁵ Dominion, 5 May 1936.
theft of Te Hau ki Tūranga, claiming that the loss of their whare tipuna meant a loss of ancestors and connection with their past and identity. In 2004 the Waitangi Tribunal released its report on the Tūranganui–a–Kiwa claims, and found that Te Hau ki Tūranga was effectively stolen in 1867, taken without the consent of its owners and in the face of considerable protest. Given the Tribunal’s findings and the precedent set by the return of the Ngāti Awa whare Mataatua in 1996, Rongowhakaata have a strong case for repatriation. It remains to be seen, however, whether the museum will relinquish ownership over Te Hau ki Tūranga. The mana of Te Hau ki Tūranga has risen throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the museum has gained considerable prestige from housing the whare.

This thesis has shown that Te Hau ki Tūranga was, as Rongowhakaata claim, ‘stolen from its people and wrenched from its roots’. Its forcible removal from Orakaiapu Pā in 1867 was in many aspects an act of desecration, the whare severed from its people and land. But there is a silver lining. Because of J C Richmond, Te Hau ki Tūranga – unlike other wharenui built in the 1840s – survives to the present day and has been well cared for by museums. Its existence provides an opportunity for reconciliation and restitution between the Crown and Rongowhakaata, and the Crown and Māori in general.

---

6 Evidence of Lewis Moeau, p 30.
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Glossary of Māori Words

amo (posts on either side of the front of a meeting house)
epa (end wall posts inside a meeting house)
hapū (subtribe, section of a large kinship group)
Hauhau (the term for religious followers of the Pai Mārire faith)
heke (rafters inside a meeting house)
hoe (canoe paddle)
hui (meeting)
ihi (presence or power)
iwi (tribe)
Kaiahuatū (Māori leader)
kaitiaki (guardian)
kākaho (toetoe grass stems)
kākahu (garment, clothes)
kaumātua (elder)
kāwanatanga (government)
kōrero (talk)
korowai (cloak ornamented with black twisted tags or thrums)
koruru (carved face on the gable of a meeting house)
kūpapa (collaborator, ally)
maihi (bargeboards on the gable of a meeting house)
mana (prestige, control, power)
manuhiri (visitor, guest)
maunga (mountain)
mauri (life force)
Pai Mārire (Māori religious faith)
papaka (skirting boards that go in between the poupou and epa inside a meeting house)
patu (club)
pāua (abalone)
pou tāhū (carved panel at the centre of the front inside wall of a meeting house)
Pou Takawaenga (Māori Liaison Officer)
pou tuarongo (carved panel at the centre of the back inside wall of a meeting house)
poupou (carved posts on the side walls of a meeting house)
poutokomanawa (central supporting posts inside a meeting house)
rangatira (chief)
rangatiratanga (chieftainship, sovereignty)
raru (trouble)
raupō (rushes)
rohe (district)
rūnanga (committee representing local iwi, meeting)
spirit (wairua)
tāhuhu (ridgepole running down the length of the inside of a meeting house)
taiaha (long weapon of hard wood with one end carved and often decorated with dogs’
hair)
taihoa (wait)
take (cause)
tangata whenua (original people)
tangihanga (funeral)
tāniko (border for cloaks, etc. made by finger weaving)
taonga (treasure)
tauihu (figurehead of a canoe).
te koteko (figure on the gable of a meeting house)
tewhatewha (long wooden or bone weapon with a flat section at one end like an axe)
tino rangatiratanga (self-determination)
tipuna (ancestor)
tīpuna (ancestors)
tiwha (token)
tohonuga tā moko (tattooist)
tohonuga whakairo (master carver)
toki poutangata (greenstone adze)
tukutuku panels (ornamental lattice–work inside a meeting house)
tūpāpaku (corpse)
Tūranga (short form of Tūranganui-a-Kiwa)
Tūranganui-a-Kiwa (Poverty Bay, Gisborne)
uri (descendant)
waka (canoe)
waka taua (war canoe)
waka tūpāpaku (burial chest)
wana (authority)
wehi (awesomeness, fear)
whakapapa (genealogy)
whare (house)
whare tipuna (ancestral house)
whare whakairo (carved house)
Wharekauri (Chatham Islands)
whenua (land)