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Abstract

This thesis uses a micro-historic approach to explore the personal relationships between Māori and settlers in Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth between 1840-1860 [prior to the Taranaki Wars] as they are presented in personal diaries and letters of early settlers of the New Zealand Company. The vast majority of the scholarship in the area of colonial history is based on ‘official records’, such as New Zealand Company material, as well as sources from the Government, the military, surveyors and newspapers. This research, however, focuses on private records to present the ‘lived experiences’ of the early settlers of the Wakefield settlements with Māori in the ‘contact zone’. As I will argue, settler and Māori in the case study towns did establish a positive space of interaction, a so called Middle Ground, which is characterised by trust, help, trade and exchange, mutual needs, language adoption and knowledge exchange, resulting in real accommodation of ‘the other’. However, this positive space decayed as a result of the shift of power to the settlers’ side in conjunction with increasing prominence of the so-called ‘land question’. This project uses the Hutt Wars in Wellington, the Wairau Incident of 1843 in Nelson and lastly the events in New Plymouth that led to the Taranaki Wars, to determine when and how the Middle Ground was weakened and eroded. Emerging conflict, inevitably, influenced positive personal relationships in the ‘contact zone’ between Māori and Pākehā, which broke down and quickly led to a negative perception of the tangata whenua that, in some areas, still profoundly influences perceptions today.

The Middle Ground, as a theoretical framework, was first developed by Richard White for the American Indians and their interaction with the French in the Great Lakes region, but has more recently been used by Vincent O’Malley to theorise the relationship between Pākehā and Māori in Northland prior to 1840. This research extends these findings in time and space and seeks to set Māori-Pākehā history in an international and intercultural context as an example of a possible common colonial experience. This thesis represents the only attempt to construct an overview and critical reflection of the shared experiences of settlers with Māori based on private records. This project is significant in the wider context of early New Zealand history as well as in the context of the Treaty of Waitangi and its impact on current race relations because it offers the possibility of seeing and interpreting Māori-Settler relations in a new, and perhaps far more positive light. We can determine whether Māori experiences are a general experience typical of colonised countries and whether the Middle Ground can be found in different forms in different times and places.
Preface


“A German in Māori Studies?”
This, and similar questions have been put to me so many times since I started my PhD journey, that I feel the need to explain why I chose my subject area. I decided early on to base my research in Māori Studies. It is a field that is not exclusively Māori – it is multi-disciplinary and it values both Māori views and alternative views about things Māori. I wanted to broaden my horizon, work in an interdisciplinary fashion and step out of my comfort zone. Te Kawa a Māui encouraged and supported me to take up this thesis topic. And it is a topic that is certainly not without controversy: Interactions between Māori and settlers in early New Zealand history.

Talking to people, reading and learning about Aotearoa/New Zealand made me realise how complex the colonial past is. For me, this realization was compounded while working as a guide in the Education section of Te Papa Tongarewa, where it became very clear that there are significantly different views and opinions on the core elements of our colonial history, especially relating to the period of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Many people seemed to endlessly repeat the same dogmatic phrases, apparently without much reflection, and many non-Māori often seemed not willing to even consider that there has been significant wrong-doing in the past. Often Pākehā talked negatively about Māori, and Māori talked negatively about Pākehā. The views were so strikingly opposed that it made it seem like the two groups have lived in completely different places with vastly different experiences. I found this both confusing and intriguing at the same time and quickly found myself ‘wandering between the worlds’.

This experience shaped my research questions and clarified the perspective I could bring to this project and to New Zealand history. I am an outsider. I am not Māori. I am not a New Zealand Pākehā. I am not even British. What am I: I am German and I come from a country with a very difficult past, growing up in the ‘melting pot’ of Europe and raised with European ideas. Colonial past is not a topic that finds much expression in German schools. What did I know about the British Empire and most importantly Māori? Not much; but I also had no preconceptions. I felt like a blank canvas that was waiting to be filled. First, I filled this space with questions, many of which still remain. It became clear to me that the pain of the past determined the actions of the present, as well as altering how we remember the past. Then I ‘visited’ both worlds – Māori and Pākehā – as
much as I could, in order to learn where these negative perceptions about each other were rooted. I realised quickly that I would have to immerse myself in the Māori world to counter the domination of the non-Māori perspectives in New Zealand history. Hence I began to learn te reo, helped on the Marae, and listened and learned. I encountered racism and hostility towards myself and my research, but also encountered plenty of interest and brilliant mentors on my way. I have been transformed during my journey and the ideas of Kaupapa Māori. Maybe I became less German and more Kiwi, (I certainly aimed to be an ally to Māori). At least that is what my friends and family are saying. But most importantly I have grasped the opportunity to contribute a unique piece of research that is a testament of a much more complex past than widely remembered.

Notes for the Reader

Throughout this thesis Māori terms and concepts have been used. To enhance readability and understanding across disciplines some definitions will be given in a Glossary at the end.

Māori place names have been used where appropriate to indicate Māori concepts and powers eg. Aotearoa/New Zealand. Similarly, the term ‘Indigenous People’ has been capitalised as well as ‘Indigenous’ where appropriate, to indicate power eg ‘the British and the Indigenous’.

Throughout the thesis all the quotes are given in their original spelling which also affected the use of macrons. Research comments and additional comments for better understanding and readability are indicated by square brackets [...]. Round brackets (...) indicate that these are original from the manuscript or the original text and therefore no comment of the author of the thesis.

The reference style for this thesis is Chicago according to the style manual of the 16th edition. References in the footnotes appear in their repetition in a short version and as ibid.

A revised and shortened version of the chapter, ‘Wellington Settlers and Māori’ as well with parts of the ‘Methodology Chapter’ are currently under preparation for publication in a special edition of the Journal of Settler Colonial Studies [ISSN 2201-473X (Print), 1838-0743 (Online)] for 2014.
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1. Introduction

“Something was always exchanged on the first contact.”¹

This statement, made by John Sutton Lutz about the contact between the indigenous and the explorer and/or Coloniser encapsulates the importance of exchange for colonial contact; that exchange between societies and consequent change that contact brought about was one of the fundamentals that shaped relationships between peoples.

Colonial contact in different countries occurred at various times and with different intensities. Some aspects of this contact resulted in experiences which, particularly for Indigenous People, seem collective: land loss, violence, clash of cultures, demonization and subsequently the loss of human rights, to name just a few. For instance, Penelope Edmonds’ work on Urbanising Frontier illustrates that the experiences of Australian Aborigines are not much different from Māori in those general terms and it can be argued that these effects of colonisation have proven to be similar around the globe.²

However, closer and more careful examination highlights the differences in the experiences. The colonial experiences of Australian Aborigines, as well as Canadian First Nations, as shown by Edmons, were based on a more violent encounter with the British, than, for example, in the New Zealand context, where, at least in the earliest days of colonisation, a Treaty was shaped and land was bought from Māori by the New Zealand Company and Crown, rather than taken.³ Furthermore, as pointed out by Ellingson, different Indigenous People were seen differently by the Colonisers too.⁴ Thus, it is beneficial to explore the indigenous-coloniser encounter on a smaller scale, away from generalisation and broad experiences.

Small-scale analysis within the framework of New Zealand’s Pākehā–Māori engagement enables us to see beyond British civilisation theories and the propaganda of the New Zealand Company. This thesis uses a micro-approach that gives agency to individual people, individual regions, as well as to individual iwi, hapū and whānau. This project seeks to present the

³ Ibid.

However this changes by the 1860s with land confiscation by the Crown as a reaction to the previous wars between Māori and British. For further reading see: Richard Boast and Richard Hill eds., Raupatu: The Confiscation of Māori Land (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2009).
personal experiences of the Pākehā settlers with Māori, as presented in personal records of 1840-1860 for the Wakefieldian settlements of Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth. The records of these individual settlers provide a more complex and detailed picture of settlers’ experiences with different Māori, in geographically different regions, than more generalised accounts.

New Zealand had been settled long before Pākehā arrived, as with most of the colonised countries around the globe. According to archaeological evidence, Aotearoa, the *Land of the Long White Cloud*, was first discovered by the east Polynesian ancestors of Māori around 1250 A.D. or even later. It appeared on the map as westerners were searching for new opportunities to expand their empire. Europeans such as Abel Tasman started exploring the Antipodes to prove the existence of the ‘Southern Continent’ [1642] and James Cook circumnavigated and established the shape and size of the new land [1769 onwards]. Cook’s encounters with the often proclaimed ‘Savage of New Zealand’, Māori, were diverse and resulted in a considerable gain of knowledge for Britain. Other European explorers, Vancouver [1791], de Sureville [1769] and Marion du Fresne [1772], as well as, according to Belich, some Russian, American and Austrian exploration parties, also contributed to knowledge about the Antipodes.

However, it is James Cook’s considerable effect on Aotearoa that is most remembered and his and other explorers’ experiences with the Indigenous shaped European preconceptions of Māori. One such preconception was a continued presumption of the superiority of the white society over the ‘Polynesian savage’, for many years to follow. In spite of the fact that Cook’s official report to the British King presented a complex and developed Māori culture and also outlined that Māori had far more potential for civilisation than other Polynesian peoples, the stigma of the ‘Wild Savage’ and the ‘Cannibal’, as presented partially in Cook’s reports as well as in a diversity of different reports of the European explorers, persisted.

When the first New Zealand Company settlers set foot in Aotearoa in 1840 they were full of curiosity and eager to meet ‘the savage’ of whom they had heard. Optimistic that the exposure to British civilisation and the work of the missionaries would turn Māori into respectable British subjects, as often proclaimed by the ‘booster literature’ of the New Zealand Company: they hoped to have a safe and settled life in their new home.

---

Boosterism came in different forms and often via different media such as books, pamphlets, newsletters and paintings, had shaped the opinions and expectations of arriving settlers toward the new country as well as Māori. The themes that can be identified show strong contradictions. The utopian idea of a *Land of Milk and Honey*, collided strongly with the reality of a new settlement that needed to be established. Māori, as the indigenous of New Zealand, were mostly shown as *civilised* or capable of such, strongly emphasising British superiority. But from firsthand accounts, like letters and diaries, we know that Māori seemed anything but *civilised* to the first arrivals.

As extensively illustrated by Fraser and Hamer this idea of civilisation was also manifested in the *Urban Frontier* which was represented by picturesque settlements, as shown in paintings, and the total control of Māori, to emphasise that they posed no danger to the newly arriving Europeans or the well-controlled and organised settlement process.\(^7\) This demonstrated the *Urban Frontier*: a remote village and settlement with a particular social micro-climate that stood in strong contrast to the surrounding bush. The wonderful, wild landscape was presented as civilised, shaped, surveyed and divided and the weather of New Zealand was tropically warm but at the same time refreshing and healthy. On the other hand the frontier character of the settlement was underlined by the opportunities and adventures that the new land had to offer. Nothing was certain out in the wild but the settlement was depicted as the stronghold of civilisation against the wilderness and also Māori.

Māori were predominantly labelled as the *Noble Savage*, an idea that was extensively developed during the Enlightenment by Jean Rousseau to illustrate the development of Human development from a *Noble Savage*, which has potential for civilisation.\(^8\) More recently Ellingson gave a fuller overview and critical analysis on the history and use of the concept of the *Noble Savage* by different countries. The British viewed Māori as being on a lower stage of evolution, romanticised, and often talked about them as *‘The children of God’* who needed to be treated with mercy and in a civilising way.\(^9\) In total contrast to this concept stood the

---


\(^9\) Ellingson, *The Myth of the Noble Savage*.  

Savage who frightened settlers and collided with the British civilised world. Māori were seen as wild, unpredictable cannibals, living in the wilderness, a portrayal that was purposely used by the boosters to appeal to the spirit of adventure of investors and British upper class, casting light on the merits of civilisation as the reverse of the barbarian ways of Māori.

To advertise, the New Zealand Company made considerable use of newspapers, as well as an extensive network of different advertising strategies to promote the new venture of settlers in New Zealand. A variety of national UK newspapers, such as The Times, Morning Advertiser, Morning Register, Weekly Chronicle, and The Weekly Dispatcher, reported regularly about the different activities of the Company. All articles were strongly influenced by the New Zealand Company and clearly reflected the organisation’s view of New Zealand and, in particular, Māori. Wakefield, from personal experiences in his youth, knew well about the power and influence of mass media. It was logical to promote the Company and its ideas in the most powerful medium of the time: the newspaper.

Primary sources give an astonishing account of how well the Company made a case for their enterprise and how glowingly they presented themselves. In his reminisces, old Wellington settler Thomas Wilmor McKenzie gives a detailed report about the establishment of the New Zealand Company. He reports about the big event the Company held for their final establishment launch. Not surprisingly, all the wealthy people of London were on the invitation list and the event was reported in The Times, which was mostly read by the financial upper class: the potential investors.

McKenzie reports vibrantly about the large event:

It was a fine day, and the entertainment created a large amount of public interest at the time. A diorama of the Bay of Island [sic] was exhibited in Leicester square and attracted crowed [sic] of people to see it. Various articles of native production were shown, such as Maori Mats, baskets, fishing lines, spears, Mere, green stone ornaments, flax in its raw state and dressed by the natives almost equal to silk ... canvas of various descriptions, soap of different sizes ... a whale line sufficiently strong to hold a first class ship, articles of Maori carvings and so on. 

---

11 During the court hearing in the case of the abduction of Ellen Turner by Wakefield and his brother, the newspapers reported wildly about the case and promoted anti-Wakefield notions later on. Wakefield’s reputation had been damaged by his actions as well as the strong media reporting. For further reading about the Ellen Turner case and some public reactions refer to: Philip Temple, A Sort of Conscience: The Wakefields (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2002), p.90-111
The demand for, and interest in, immigration literature in Britain increased steadily from 1810 onwards. Belich states that the immigration literature was the largest genre of the nineteenth century, with thousands of books published in the Anglo world. Before 1840, the practical beginning of the New Zealand enterprise, the New Zealand Company had already published over 200 books and pamphlets about the new country at the Antipodes. This corroborates Lydia Wever’s suggestion that it was the print record that played the biggest part in shaping European ideas of New Zealand. She stresses that the greatest amount of writing about New Zealand comprised travel books, maps, emigration guides, ethnographies, newspapers, periodicals, shipping brochures, shipboard newspapers, journals and logs. These writings, if accessible, shaped the expectations of the early immigrants to New Zealand.

The immigrants, influenced by what they had learned and read, were keen to take up new opportunities and make new lives. According to scholars such as Charlotte Macdonald and Raewyn Dalziel, this was particularly true for women, who found themselves stepping outside their comfort zone in their new home, to engage with their surroundings as well as with the local Indigenous People.

The settlers of the New Zealand Company overcame their uncertainties and preconceptions and took up the challenge of leaving their home behind them. Personal records, like diaries and letters reveal the curiosity, reservations and hopes of the new arrivals, and illustrate how they settled into the new colony. People wrote about the new world around them and one

---

15 Further investigation in the field of readership and receivership of this advertisement literature could provide further insight. Different scholars have pointed out that the rate of illiteracy in the 19th century was very high. In contrast Minson suggests that approximately 40% of the early immigrants to New Zealand were illiterate or barely literate which shines a different light on the success of the print record and its readership. For further reading: Marian Minson, "Promotional Shots: The New Zealand Company’s Paintings, Drawings and Prints of Wellington in the 1840s and Their Use in Selling a Colony," in *Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial Dream: A Reconsideration* (Wellington: Friends of the Turnbull Library; GP Publications, 1997).
Fraser and eds., *Shifting Centres: Women and Migration in New Zealand History*.
particularly significant part of this new world: Māori. Māori provided assistance and became part of their everyday life. Nevertheless, the British were intruders into Māori society; and in the long term, conflict was probably inevitable. The balance of power and mutual need, as evident in the Middle Ground\(^\text{18}\), began to decay and shifted to one side, as the conflict around land escalated.

Plenty of ‘official writing’, for example from the New Zealand Company and the Crown, reported these conflicts. On the other hand, personal records show that although these conflicts were discussed on an official level, private lives seemed only marginally affected by the negative perception of officials towards Māori. This disjuncture between official attitudes and private perceptions of relationships with Indigenous People has previously been noted in the case of North America. Richard White argues that the personal experiences of the American Indians of the Great Lake Regions in their encounters with the French [1650-1825] created what he calls a Middle Ground, a space of mutual understanding.\(^\text{19}\) Vincent O’Malley, in his New Zealand example, stressed that this Middle Ground was based on mutual benefits but also on other factors such as mutual understanding, trust, respect, trade, knowledge exchange and communication.\(^\text{20}\)

The Middle Ground was constructed at the intersection of indigenous and settler worlds – along the boundary or frontier. Lynette Russell concludes that the European expansion during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries changed the “construction of the Boundary.”\(^\text{21}\) This boundary or ‘frontier’ was the point where new arrivals and Indigenous People met. Russell suggests that:

> The frontier zone is a hybrid space, a place where both indigene and invader come together on land that each one believes to be their own. It is a place where indigenes become incorporated into the European society and perhaps where Europeans are brought into indigenous society.\(^\text{22}\)

Mary Louise Pratt proposes calling this zone not a ‘frontier’, but a ‘contact zone’. “The contact zone should be the space of colonial encounters, the space in which culturally totally separated people come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations.”\(^\text{23}\) This contact zone, or the frontier, as defined by Russell and Pratt, is similar to Richard White’s

---

\(^{17}\) As will be shown in the various examples given in the thesis.

\(^{18}\) Refer to the Methodology, chapter 3 for further discussion on the Middle Ground.


\(^{22}\) Ibid. p.12

concept of the *Middle Ground*. This research will test whether the *Middle Ground*, as described by White, also finds a place in New Zealand settlers’ private writing and how life between Māori and Pākehā in the contact zone was shaped.

Annie E. Coombes identifies resistance, containment, appropriation, assimilation, and miscegenation or the aim of full destruction, as the main aspects of colonisers’ encounters with Indigenous Peoples. As a result, the indigenous struggle with the Coloniser shaped nations’ cultural and political attitudes, and is also part of the shared roots of Aotearoa/New Zealand. According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith, the dominant view of the Colonisers portrays Māori in a rather negative and destructive way. This Coloniser view, grounded in conflict and resistance, is generally not constructive and is informed by a Eurocentric attitude. In contrast, Richard Whites’ concept of the *Middle Ground* and the close examination in the narrow field of personal encounter as presented in private records, offers an opportunity to explore the dealings with ‘the Other’ in the creation of the contact zone. Moreover it will provide new insight as to when the, still so strongly evident, negative perception of Māori emerged.

This negative perception of Māori became increasingly evident in private as well as public opinion from the 1860s onwards. Seeing Māori as ‘savage’ and unable to survive in a new and changing world was evident in 1881, when Alfred K. Newman argued that Māori were a dying race. For many years to follow, Māori have been suppressed, ignored and colonised.

During the twentieth century the idea of total assimilation of Māori, in the face of their increasing urbanisation, was supported by the New Zealand Government. This peaked in the 1960 *Hunn Report*, which recommended a move towards greater assimilation of Māori; making Māori more Pākehā rather than acknowledging a two-nation state. During the 1970s, with the establishment of the *Race Relations Act* in 1971, Māori began to voice their struggle in movements like MOOHR [Māori Organisation on Human Rights], *Nga Tamatoa, Black-and Brown-Power* and the *Māori Liberation Movement*. Finally with *The Great Land March* in 1975 as well as the protests of Māori civil rights during the *Springbok Tour 1981*, race relations

---

Discussed in J. Stenhouse, "’A Disappearing Race before We Came Here’: Doctor Alfred Kingcome Newman, the Dying Maori, and Victorian Scientific Racism,“ *NZIH* 30, no. 2 (1996).
gained a new importance to New Zealand. Merata Mita’s documentary *Patu!*, which provides evidence of an emerging resistance amongst Māori as well as Pākehā New Zealanders to racism, was banned from screening in New Zealand.\(^{28}\) Even so Māori protest was not well received by the conservative Muldoon Government, which suppressed opposition with a strong police force and still followed the dream of assimilation. However, the *Treaty of Waitangi Act* of 1975, created a new space of grievance for Māori and since then the Waitangi Tribunal has worked on reconciliation between Māori, Pākehā and the Crown with the aim of giving agency to Māori to fulfil the ideal of a bicultural society.

Recent scholarship dealing with New Zealand race relations, colonial experiences and indigenous struggle has increasingly interrogated the complexity of Māori–Pākehā interaction. Vincent O’Malley, for example, has shown that encounters in the Northland region of New Zealand before 1840 were built on mutual need, understanding and respect. He emphasises that:

>The meeting of Māori and Pākehā was a dynamic, fluid and evolving process of mutual discovery, reaction, adjustment and reflection. The consequence of that meeting of Māori society involved neither resolute resistance to all change nor complete assimilation into the European way of life, but rather a more selective and creative form of engagement with the new order of things.\(^{29}\)

In short: the creation of the Middle Ground.

Belich also investigates the space of mutual understanding, the ‘Golden Age’ of New Zealand, in which prosperity and peace were based on mutual needs.\(^{30}\) Belich proposes that the 1840s could have provided these conditions but that the constant influxes of white settlers led to the overpowering dominance of Pākehā by 1860s. This interfered with the delicate balance of power in the contact zone, disturbing the ‘Middle Ground’.\(^{31}\) Building on these scholarly works, this thesis shows that the Middle Ground was still in existence when the settlers of the New Zealand Company reached New Zealand in 1840 and did not end with the arrival of larger Pākehā groups e.g. colonisation.

This thesis examines Māori-Pākehā interaction in the Wakefield settlements of Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth from 1840-1860. Chapter 3 will outline the methodology and guiding principles for the project. I will discuss the advantages and limitations of diaries and


\(^{29}\) O’Malley, *The Meeting Place: Māori and Pākehā Encounters, 1642–1840*. p.10


letters as historical sources in the context of this research. This will be followed by a critical reflection on the methodologies of oral history, microhistory and history from below and will outline the idea of the Middle Ground as the theoretical framework for this project.

Chapter 2 will give an overview of the existing scholarship and demonstrate that this research fills a gap in the historiography of Māori-Settler interaction.

The three core chapters dealing with Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth as case studies, follow. Chapter 4, on Wellington, will show how the first settlers of the New Zealand Company engaged with Māori. Common factors such as mutual help, trade, language adoption and knowledge exchange will be examined individually as keys to the establishment of the Middle Ground. As an example of disruption I will also examine why the conflict in the Hutt Valley did not destroy the Middle Ground but only caused some localised disruption.

Nelson [chapter 5], in the South Island, is the second case study, illustrating similar patterns of encounters as well as important connections between Wellington and Nelson. Many of the available sources show connections to the surveyors, who also play a significant part in the events in nearby Wairau in 1843. This chapter will show that even the serious Wairau conflict between Māori and Pākehā shook, but did not destroy, the Middle Ground.

The last case study looks at New Plymouth [chapter 6]. New Plymouth, again in the North Island, was the most isolated of the settlements and found its place in New Zealand history as a region of conflict and war. Here too, the private writings of the New Plymouth settlers will be examined for first settler experiences with Māori, help from Māori, trade, language adoption and mutual knowledge exchange – to establish the existence of the Middle Ground. Connections to the other two case studies will be made. It will be proposed that it was here, in New Plymouth, that the interracial conflict finally had the power to destroy the Middle Ground.

Chapter 7 will present the overall conclusion of the research. This thesis uses personal diaries and letters to test the theory of the Middle Ground in the early years of the European colonisation of New Zealand. By emphasising a micro historical approach the research will break new ground by shedding light on the lived reality and earliest mass encounters between Pākehā and Māori and will emphasise the short period of positive interaction, the Middle Ground, which has been mostly neglected by the scholarship on the Colonial Past of New Zealand.
2. Literature Review

A considerable amount of scholarship has been published in the field of the history of New Zealand, and in particular in the field of the history of immigration and colonisation and its effects on Aotearoa/New Zealand. Therefore, chronologically as well as thematically, this literature review will begin by outlining some of the relevant works examining aspects of 19th century immigration to New Zealand. This will be followed by a short overview of significant works on the New Zealand Company and Edward Gibbon Wakefield to emphasise the framework of this thesis which concentrates on the Wakefield settlements. A short overview of the scholarship on three case study towns, Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth, will highlight the significance of the research. Working with settlers’ experiences as presented in letters, diaries and journals, the review will highlight some of the relevant works in this field and will give emphasis to Māori-Pākehā Interactions as a form of the Middle Ground. This project seeks to be New Zealand-focused, so due to this focus, as well as the limitations in the length of the PhD, I will mainly concentrate on scholarship that centres on New Zealand. However, I would like to acknowledge that there is a vast amount of diversity in different research for other colonised counties, colonisation issues and coloniser – indigenous contact that might be useful to confer with to contextualize New Zealand in a wider scoped research eg. a non microhistorical approach.

2.1 Immigration

When engaging in the topic of immigration and colonisation of New Zealand it is apparent that the field is vast and diverse. Pre-1970s literature often reflects colonial attitudes; nevertheless, works such as W.D. Borrie’s Immigration of New Zealand, first published in 1936, gives a fascinating and detailed account of the chronology of colonisation and immigration.32 Borrie in particular emphasised the different backgrounds and diversity of early settlers, and, in strong opposition to most early works that seem to be narratives rather than critical commentaries, showed some interest in the different settler ‘waves’ and their effects on the country. Keith Sinclair and Raewyn Dalziel’s History of New Zealand laid the foundation for a more critical approach to New Zealand history, which was later adopted by Michael King
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32 W. D. Borrie, Immigration to New Zealand 1854-1938 (Canberra: Demography Program, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, 1991).
and his *Penguin History of New Zealand* in an attempt to write a modern, overall history.\(^{33}\)

While focusing mainly on Pākehā history, King and Dalziel drew on Māori perspectives, acknowledging biculturalism and giving Māori agency, a practice which King developed further in his other works.\(^{34}\)

Belich also acknowledged the two-nation state in his history of early New Zealand, *Making Peoples*\(^{35}\), dedicating a considerable portion of this book to Māori history. Though lacking archaeological evidence, he depicted an Aotearoa in which the ‘Crusaders’ invaded the country to turn it into a Pākehā world. Belich emphasised the differences between Māori and Pākehā culture and demonstrated how these cultures struggled to develop a life together. Throughout his work Belich proposed that there were strong ties between Māori and Pākehā at different times. For the period of the 1840s he emphasised mutual interest, trade and curiosity as important elements that were destroyed by the emergence of the colonial power and the struggle over land. Belich extended his work in his second volume of New Zealand History, *Paradise Reforged*, which covers the years 1880-2000 and gives an outlook beyond the timeframe of this project.\(^{36}\)

In general it is noticeable that over time, the focus of scholarship has shifted from national studies to more regional approaches. I.H. Burnley and his study *German Immigration and Settlement in New Zealand 1842-1914* seems unique for its time and pays particular attention to the German settlers of Nelson\(^{37}\). In regard to Scottish and Irish immigration, particularly in the South Island, Lyndon Fraser’s extensive work provides interesting insights. He gives a detailed analysis of the push and pull factors of immigration as well as indicating how the ‘lived reality’ of these particular immigrant groups has shaped New Zealand.\(^{38}\) In the same
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field, Tom Brooking’s and Maureen Molloy’s publications, using a social historical approach, provide useful information and help reflect settler identity and methodological problems.39

Focusing on a comparison of migrants from England, Scotland and Ireland, Jock Phillips and Terry Hearn used the country of origin based on death registers as a regional parameter when exploring the questions of New Zealand settlers as a geographically and socially mobile society.40 Rollo Arnold’s The Farthest Promised Land built on the social diversity of settlers and emphasised the differences in immigration after 1850 contrasted with the first wave of settlers in 1840.41 Arnold concentrated on the South Island as the ‘farthest promised land’ for labouring classes from Ireland. Nevertheless, this well-researched work did not examine how these second and third wave settlers arranged their living alongside Māori. Instead, Arnold focused on providing a detailed portrait of the immigrant community, for sure a thought that also finds reflection in the world of the first wave settlers on 1840s.

In accordance with the general immigration and colonisation scholarship, Raewyn Dalziel, as well as Janine Graham, also entirely neglected Māori-Settler interaction and influence, emphasising the expectations and class distinctions of early settlers, an aspect also developed by Fairburn, Fraser and others, to illustrate differences not only in class but also in region of origin.42 Dalziel and Graham argue that the selected immigration process led to a chosen

Fraser, A Distant Shore: Irish Migration & New Zealand Settlement.
———, Castles of Gold: A History of New Zealand’s West Coast Irish; ———, To Tara Via Holyhead: Irish Catholic Immigrants in Nineteenth-Century Christchurch.
upper class which provided the county’s leaders. The lower class was also selected, resulting in an artificial social pattern. These works laid the foundation for some themes that this thesis will touch. In accordance with the scholarship it will be shown that the social patterns of each case study settlement were unique and, for example in Nelson as well as New Plymouth, caused considerable problems for the Company officials.

While these regional studies about New Zealand became more contextualised in comparison to other countries, the economic aspects of immigration found more and more representation within scholarship. Dudley Baines and his Emigration from Europe 1815-1930 focused on immigration in general, with particular emphasis on economic causes. He stressed the different reasons for immigration and showed the influence of economic development in the immigration context. He used 12 European countries as comparisons to reflect on New Zealand and explained why people considered the Antipodes as a possible destination. Tony Simpson, in his book The Immigrants - the Great Migration from Britain to New Zealand 1830-1890, gives a complex overview of the migration from Europe, beginning with motivating factors in the homeland [such as poverty and unemployment], followed by the journeys to the new country, the role of the New Zealand Company, life in the new colony and how immigrants created their new societies. Simpson contrasted the economic, social and political effects experienced in both countries and highlighted the lived reality for settlers. In regards to the Wakefield Company he seems to be one of the rare scholars who considered the Wakefield scheme to not be a complete failure. Simpson concluded that early settlers of the first wave were responsible for the formation of New Zealand as a Crown colony and therefore responsible, at that point of history, for New Zealand as we now know it.

Erich Richards in Britannia’s Children also sought to identify the diverse patterns of migration from the British Isles. Richards cited the impressive figure of 187,000 people who emigrated from Britain in the high times of migration. Focusing mainly on immigration to America, Richards’ conclusions in regards to push and pull factors, and his emphasis on economic instability in the home country and the hope of a better life in the New World, applies equally
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to New Zealand. As with the more regional histories of New Zealand by Fraser, Hearn, Brooking and others, Richards reinforced the point that emigration was based on personal effort rather than a national mission.

Putting New Zealand into an international context, David Hamer’s *New Towns in the New World* gave an interesting view on how settlements in the New World of Canada, America, Australia and New Zealand, developed their own identity, and the important role played by ‘boosterism’.47 Hamer focused mainly on the USA and Canada but also made comparisons with Australia, and in some instances, New Zealand. In addition to his other research, Hamer’s idea and definition of the ‘Urban Frontier’, later adapted by Miles Fairburn, formed an important part in the discourse.48 However, his views about the role of Indigenous People in town development at the frontier are questionable. He argued that Indigenous People in general “continued trying to use the land as they had traditionally used it”49, which resulted in incompatibility with the new white settlers and pushed them out of the towns, perhaps, as further research might elaborate, a far too simplistic statement that does not seem applicable for Māori. As this thesis will show, within the *Middle Ground*, Māori played a vital role in the townships. Only with the destruction of the ‘common space’ did the Indigenous People, as correctly observed by Hammer, no longer belong to the town’s community; they represented the ‘savage’ and everything that was in opposition to civilisation.50

James Belich extended his approach to colonial and immigration movements to include countries other than New Zealand. In *Replenishing the Earth* Belich explored immigration as a global movement.51 Most interesting for this thesis is Belich’s comparison of the effects of these movements on Indigenous Peoples. He pointed out that some aspects of immigration seem to be universal, but lived reality in each new land was quite diverse, a point that other experts and I reinforce. Most importantly, and rather new in the scholarship, Belich stressed the idea of a period of positive interaction between colonisers and indigenous groups, which he particularly saw evident in New Zealand up until the 1860s when the settler population began to outnumber Māori.52 This observation will be supported in the thesis by the various
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settlers’ letters and diaries, which, from 1858 and finally by 1860, show a change in relationships with Māori.

In a more general and less scholarly way than, for example Belich, John Andrews in No Other Home Than This presented how Europeans came to New Zealand and the impact this had on themselves and especially on the new country. Among other ideas, Andrews portrayed how Europeans turned into Pākehā: how they adapted to their new country, learned, engaged, changed things and influenced the space and people around them. Drawing from Belich and the newer ideas of Environmental History, Andrews created a sense of place that provides an opportunity to evaluate the actions of Pākehā settlers and also Māori in a different light. Andrews emphasised how important knowledge about the land was for settlers. This knowledge, as this thesis will show, was often acquired from Māori.

On a more academic note Lorenzo Veracini gives an overview of theoretical constructs around ‘Settler Colonialism’, which he connects to Belich’s idea of a global movement. Veracini made a strong case for a precise definition of immigrants, settlers, and Settler Colonialism, which is missing from most studies around this topic. Nevertheless, his concept of ‘Settler Colonialism’, in the context of this research, seems too theoretical, and neglects the ‘lived reality’ as well as the positive interaction between settler and Indigenous which is the main focus of this thesis. Nevertheless, Veracini’s work offers an interesting approach for theorising the long-term effects of colonisation and immigration on a society like New Zealand.

Somewhat connected to Veracini’s ideas of nation building and national identities, a recent study by Angela McCarthy explored the different national identities that participated in the 19th century immigration process to New Zealand. Building on Arnold and Macdonald, McCarthy emphasised immigrants’ strong ties to the Mother Country and explored how immigrants created their own piece of home in New Zealand. Extending this focus, I will propose that settler letters were important in maintaining the connection with home but also in distributing knowledge and attracting further immigration.

57 Arnold, The Farthest Promised Land: English Villagers, New Zealand Immigrants of the 1870s.
The field of the history of immigration as such is dominated by Pākehā researchers. However, from the 1970s, with its emphasis on Treaty of Waitangi issues, as discussed by Claudia Orange\textsuperscript{58} for example, the effects of colonisation and immigration began to appear in Indigenous scholarship. Like Orange, Hugh Kawharu acknowledged the different views on the Treaty and gave agency to Māori.\textsuperscript{59} Ranginui Walker’s \textit{Struggle Without End}, first published in 1990 and again in an extended version in 2004, presented, for the first time, a written overview of New Zealand history from a Māori perspective.\textsuperscript{60} To date, Walker’s attempt to write a New Zealand History from the Māori perspective is unique. However, in 2012 Danny Keenan edited a collection of essays for the \textit{Huia Histories of Maori} which also focuses on Māori history and worldview.\textsuperscript{61} Next to these more general works, various local histories and iwi-based literature have found increasing popularity, for example the works by Hillary and John Mitchell about Māori in Nelson.\textsuperscript{62} Walker emphasised the impact that New Zealand’s colonisation had on Māori. Once independent, with a functioning society, Māori were suppressed, betrayed and robbed of their culture by the Colonisers. Walker also demonstrated how Māori have fought for recognition and political influence, providing a thorough overview of the long-term effect on relations between Māori and Pākehā. As now widely recognised in most scholarship, Walker argued that land loss, caused by settlers, Crown and the New Zealand Government, was central to the struggles that Māori endured, and that recognition of these unlawful actions will be essential for the future of Māori-Pākehā relations. In accord with Walker and other scholars, this project also regards the ‘land question’ as central for all Māori-Pākehā interactions and, as a consequence, an important factor in the establishment or destruction of the \textit{Middle Ground}.\textsuperscript{63}

Overall, there are diverse studies on the immigration and colonisation of New Zealand. Most of it is written in a narrative style and lacks critical reflection. Nevertheless, this literature builds the broad framework of colonial experiences and it is clear that there is a gap in the knowledge, particularly in providing critical reflections on the field of personal interactions.


\textsuperscript{63} The Waitangi Tribunal shows most evidently the importance of the land questions and a variety of scholars engage with this topic. Due to the limited nature of this project, which only engages with settler diaries and letters to establish the personal field of interaction between settler and Maori, this aspect of the scholarship will not be presented in detail.
between the Māori and settlers and how these have been different from ‘official views’ and their influences on early New Zealand.

2.2 New Zealand Company

It seems almost impossible to separate the New Zealand Company and its members, and the Wakefield family, from the history of early New Zealand immigration and colonisation. As shown by several Waitangi Tribunal reports, Wakefield and the Company were a vital factor in shaping settler expectations, experiences and encounters with Māori in 19th century New Zealand.

The New Zealand Company, as a specific part of New Zealand’s immigration history, receives differing emphases in the scholarship. Specifically, in the early works, we can find the history of the New Zealand Company as an important part of the content. For example, William Pember Reeves in 1898 attempted to give the first overview of New Zealand history in his *Long White Cloud*.

Reeves portrayed Wakefield as a hero and man of action: “the founder of the Dominion now comes on the scene.” Richard Garnett also held a similar view. Since then, the studies around Wakefield and the Company have undergone many different emphases. By 1957 Douglas Pike began limiting Wakefield’s significance for New Zealand history and in 1966 Foster denied Wakefield’s theory of colonisation any significance at all within the history of immigration, in particular in Australia and New Zealand. Conversely in 1970 Bernhard Semmel presented Wakefield as the “chief theorist of empire building” and argued that Wakefield’s theory of systematic colonisation was the ingenious answer to objections about earlier programmes of colonisation.

Similar to the discussion on importance of colonisation, there is also diverse scholarship about the impacts of the New Zealand Company and Wakefield on New Zealand. Next to a landmark demolition job on Wakefield, John Miller’s 1958 *Early Victorian New Zealand* maintained that the actions of the New Zealand Company, which were solely driven by the desire of economic
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gain, significantly damaged race relations in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{69} Miller used a vast amount of primary material, mostly official documents that opened a discussion about how Māori were treated by the New Zealand Company as well as by Government and individual settlers. Miller demonstrated a strong understanding of the vital role played by Māori in the settlement process, which will also find reflection in this thesis.

Michael Turnbull in his \textit{New Zealand Bubble} of 1959 also highlighted the New Zealand Company’s responsibility for the damaged race relations in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{70} Turnbull offered an entirely new interpretation about the New Zealand settlement and the Wakefield Company as an economic enterprise. He argued that the hectic rush of the \textit{Tory}, after rumours of Crown sovereignty over the land, indicated the Company’s interest in money and economic success. Without the acquisition of cheap land, the system of land orders, free passage and free land would have not been successful and investments would not see profitable returns.\textsuperscript{71} Strongly emphasising that the New Zealand Company members were merchants and successful traders and therefore had a vested interest in the economic success of the company, Turnbull pointed to the strong economic driving forces upon which the whole enterprise was built.\textsuperscript{72} This entirely new perspective on the Company as an economic enterprise rather than a heroic association was an important step towards a more critical reflection on the actions of the Company. Next to a critical reflection and attitude towards the Company as an organisation, Turnbull’s work also provided crucial background for a better understanding of Company officials’ actions.

Turnbull’s argument influenced a 1969 article by A.G.L. Shaw, \textit{British attitudes to the Colonies}, in the \textit{Journal of British Studies}.\textsuperscript{73} Shaw depicted a British society that was strongly influenced by economic success and argued that these attitudes were essential to explaining how the Wakefield Company came into being. He concluded that financial gain from the colonies was of major importance for the Empire, with emphasis on cheap free trade and economic success.

More recently Jim McAloon broadened the idea of economic success in the new colonies by showing the importance of trade and economic success for the settlements and New Zealand
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as a whole. He based his argument not only on Pākehā success but, like Parsonson, on the significant part played by Māori in the economic success of New Zealand. McAloon’s argument of a very strong Māori economic position of in the 1840s, which weakened over time with the loss of land and the imbalance between produce and demand, is also reflected in the here presented case studies of Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth. Others, such as Hazel Petrie, also showed how successful Māori were as traders. These economic driving forces, presented from the settlers’ side by Turnbull and Shaw, and from the Māori side by McAloon, Parsonson and Petrie, explain the strong interest in trade between both sides.

This idea of the Company Board members’ personal economic interest, as presented, for example, by Turnbull, was picked up in the 1990s by Paul Hudson in his PhD thesis English Emigration to New Zealand, 1839 to 1850: an Analysis of the Work of the New Zealand Company, which pointed out that, in contrast to the earlier New Zealand Association, the New Zealand Company directors had been willing to risk their own money for the colonisation project. Hudson highlighted the preparations of emigrants to New Zealand by exploring the work of the New Zealand Company and its boosters. He provided statistics for the different British regions to investigate in detail how successful the different immigration agents were. He concluded that each individual agent had his own way of attracting people, more or less successfully. He extended this argument in English Emigration to New Zealand in the Economic History Review in 2001, which reinforced the idea of the British Empire’s, and the Company’s, interest in economic gain in regards to the new colonies. Hudson provided a convincing analysis of the New Zealand Company advertising and marketing. Furthermore, he maintained that most of the immigrants had been well informed about the new lands, however, they often obtained false information from the Company and boosters. From his understanding, no one was immigrating to the new country blind. This is an interesting observation in regards to the expectations of the settlers. It is questionable if, in reality, the first immigrants, especially the working classes, really had such expected access to
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information about the new country. Many of the available booster literature was highly idealised and did not provide accurate information.  

Robert D. Grant’s *Imagining Empire*, connects to Hudson’s viewpoint by discussing further ideas about promotion of the new colonies. As well as giving an overall view of the different colonising powers and colonised countries, Grant emphasised, in accord with Hudson, that the reading of travel literature was “of the general habit of nineteenth-century British life” and that, furthermore, the visits of Indigenous People to the Mother Country were incorporated into promotional activity. Grant was convinced that prospective settlers saw indigenous populations as a curiosity rather than an obstacle for emigrants. Certainly, as I will show, the private records of early immigrants show that simple settlers were fascinated by Māori and, that some had gained knowledge about the new country from travel literature. However, Grant’s general conclusion seems less applicable to New Zealand where Māori, according to the official viewpoint of the New Zealand Company, were clearly in the way. Moreover, Grant’s approach seems too general as he did not distinguish between different settler groups.

Building an overall theoretical framework of colonisation is Juergen Osterhammel’s work *Kolonialismus* in which he gave an overview of different European colonial powers from 1500 onwards. Criticising the general Impact–Response–Scheme of colonial encounters, he emphasised that coloniser and colonised reacted in a never-ending struggle comprising different ways of action, and concluded that the final instalment of absolute colonial power was shaped by resistance and fight. Nevertheless, he highlighted that collaboration among the colonised was central to establish a functioning colony. While not particularly naming Māori and Pākehā, Osterhammel’s framework seems applicable to New Zealand. Applying his work to the idea of the Middle Ground, he defined the positive space as a space of collaboration, which was emphasised by struggle and resistance and eventually ended in a shift of power resulting in the creation a strong colonial power; a description that seems very similar to Richard White’s idea of the Middle Ground.
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Most notable in regards to the history of the New Zealand Company is Patricia Burns’ *Fatal Success*. Influenced by the historic debate about the Treaty of Waitangi and therefore building strongly on Claudia Orange, Burns offered one of the most coherent accounts of the New Zealand Company as a whole. Like Turnbull, she emphasised Wakefield’s ability to convince people and questioned the whole enterprise. Supported by accounts of the Company’s dealings, Burns reinforced the Company’s condemnation of Māori already raised by Miller in 1958. In accordance with the proposed positive interactions between Māori and settler presented in this thesis, Burns also highlighted the help from Māori and their initial willingness that matters of conflict should be resolved through mutual understanding.

As an addition to the history of the New Zealand Company, Richard Wolfe attempted in 2007 to open a reinterpretation of the history of the Company and the establishment of Pākehā New Zealand in *A Society of Gentlemen*. Wolfe offered insight into an area neglected by most scholars, the first settlement expedition of the mid 1820s. The author gave an account of the first attempt at colonisation by the New Zealand Company in 1826, painting a picture of a company focused on success. Wolfe based his argument on official Company records but also gave a vibrant depiction of the first unsuccessful settlers and how their ideas, hopes and dreams about New Zealand clashed with the reality. A similar pattern can be identified with the settlers of the 1840s and Wolfe’s work provides insight into why the New Zealand Company acted in particular ways during its second, successful attempt to colonise New Zealand.

Together with this very diverse discussion about the New Zealand Company and its effects, New Zealand has produced a significant number of publications on Edward Gibbon Wakefield and his family as the driving forces of New Zealand’s early colonisation. These works often provide very interesting insight into the personality of the man himself. Peter Stuart in his early work from 1971, seemed to be the first scholar to pay closer attention to Wakefield’s rather unsuccessful political attempt. Stuart’s approach is interesting because it provided an insight into Wakefield through the eyes of others. Instead of using material that had been published by Wakefield himself, he focused on the reports of fellow politicians and friends. Stuart noted that Wakefield only associated himself with good accounts of the New Zealand
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Company. He dissociated himself from all the negative publicity, suffering and bad outcomes the Company produced.

A varied and interesting collection of papers from a seminar series on Wakefield, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial Dream: A Reconsideration*, published by the Friends of the Alexander Turnbull Library in 1997, gives a good overview of the multiple effects Wakefield had on New Zealand. The different articles revealed different approaches, length and depth of topics in regards to Edward Gibbon Wakefield: topics covering his life, thoughts, historical influences, differing views on land, and finally, Wakefield’s cultural legacy. Ngatata Love gave the reader a Māori perspective on, as he cynically puts it, the “great Colonizer”. Love maintained that Wakefield was mainly responsible for the problems Māori face nowadays and that, as a person, he never found what he was looking for: the creation of a new homeland. Ged Martin underlined Wakefield’s fantasy and passion in all he did. For him, Wakefield remained a visionary despite all the problems associated with his ideas. Erik Olsson’s article about *Wakefield and the Scottish Enlightenment* put Wakefield’s ideas into the theoretical context of Adam Smith and the movement of the Scottish Enlightenment. Olsson concluded that Wakefield’s plans and ideas “grew out of his ongoing dialog” with Smith. Olsson extended this work later in the *NZJH* were he sought to shed light on Wakefield within the context of his upbringing and the times in which he acted. Olsson argued even more strongly here that we need to see Wakefield, as well as the establishment of the New Zealand Company, as part of the post-Enlightenment process. According to Olsson, Wakefield was influenced by the theories of Jeremy Bentham and other Enlightenment thinkers, based on an understanding of humanitarian ideals, in opposition to the often emphasised economic motives of the New Zealand Company discussed by Turnbull, Grant, Miller and Hudson.

Eric Richards gave an account of the Wakefield settlements in Australia. Richards contrasted the Australian development with that of New Zealand, and emphasised Wakefield’s Australian achievement in the form of thousands of people who left Britain. Richards also emphasised
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the unsuccessful outcomes of Wakefield’s campaign.\textsuperscript{93} John E. Martin superficially described Wakefield’s colonisation theory and its effects on the State and Labour.\textsuperscript{94} Tom Brooking’s article about \textit{The Great Escape} presented an interesting view of Wakefield’s late phase with the Otago settlement. Although outside of the scope of this project, according to Brooking, the Otago settlement was a successful Presbyterian Scottish settlement that was relatively close to Wakefield’s theoretical attempts.\textsuperscript{95} Brooking’s article underlined that there are significant differences among the New Zealand Settlements. Graham Anderson’s furthered the discussion with a colourful account of the different Wakefield towns and their layout and planning. This seems to be one of the rare attempts to provide an overall view on the Company’s town planning in regards to the colonisation process.\textsuperscript{96} Anderson hinted at the planning problems early surveyors were facing, which leads indirectly back to the debate about the Company’s land purchases. On the topic of Settler-Māori relations, Marian Minson, gave an enlightening insight into the New Zealand Company propaganda.\textsuperscript{97} She analysed different art works and how they influenced the perception of the new land.

In the same year, 1997, Ged Martin extended his work on Wakefield. In \textit{Edward Gibbon Wakefield: Abductor and Mystagogue}, he engaged with Wakefield’s character in more depth.\textsuperscript{98} In contrast to most of the early works on New Zealand history, he argued that Wakefield was not an inspiring character for the British Empire. For Martin, Wakefield “inhabited an egocentric world of fantasy, which intrudes upon reality”.\textsuperscript{99} Martin maintained that Wakefield did not have a large influence on colonial theory, but that we can find some traces of him in the ‘colonial field.’

Philip Temple’s \textit{A Sort of Conscience-The Wakefields} apparently ignored Martin’s work but created one of the most detailed works ever attempted on the Wakefields.\textsuperscript{100} Temple provided new detail about the different family members, but his work lacked critical reflection and did not necessarily offer new perspectives on Wakefield. Nevertheless, the perceptive
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insight into the Wakefield family relations and detailed accounts of primary materials present an interesting base for further research.

In conclusion, there is a strong interconnectedness amongst the scholarship on the New Zealand Company and Edward Gibbon Wakefield. Particularly the older scholarship seems to glorify, whereas more critical approaches began to appear in the 1960s. Although the history of the New Zealand Company and Wakefield is not the focal point of this thesis, nevertheless, the scholarship provides valuable insight into different events as well as the mindset of the early settlers of which letters and diaries are used as the main sources for this PhD.

2.3 Case Studies

The core of this PhD thesis are the three case study towns, Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth which find plenty of discussion in the general immigration literature of the 19th century. However, for this thesis, each case study will be treated as a micro-world which should be imminent to the study. Hence I will attempt to illustrate the major aspects of the scholarship around the settlements Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth separately.

In general, it seems that the history of the specific early settlements was of major interest in the period between 1930-1950. These early works, similar to the early overall histories of New Zealand, mostly glorify the Company and its settlers by focusing on their pioneering achievements. The historical aspects of the earliest days of the Wellington settlement seemed of little scholarly interest. Louis Ward and his compendium of Early Wellington, first published in the 1920s as well as Alan Mulgan and his City of the Strait, as some of the first attempts to present an overview of Wellington history, are rather general and narratives. Nevertheless, Mulgan gave a detailed account of the colonisation of New Zealand, the Wakefield Company, local tribal history and the first years of Wellington as a city. Norman McLeod, in the style of a general travel guide, shows Wellington from a more survey-orientated perspective, although he devoted a whole chapter to Māori settlement. John Struthers’ Miramar Peninsula, in the same way as Mulgan, adopted a rather narrative style but still provided good understanding of the earliest Māori settlement days and the separations between Māori and
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settler, as well as different opinions amongst settlers that led to differences inside the 1840 settlement. David McGill’s *The Pioneers of Port Nicholson* contained interesting visual material but was also rather general and lacked critical reflection on the presented material and in particular in regards to Māori-Settler contact zones. McGill appeared to be influenced by Mulgan in his strong emphasis on narratives, with a detailed introduction to the Māori settlement as well as different indigenous historical accounts of the Wellington Harbour region. Focusing on the settler influx to the Wellington region, rather than Māori occupation, Latiffa Khan outlined the different immigration movements specific to the region. However, in marked contrast to this thesis, Khan focused solely on official documentation and New Zealand Company materials.

Local historians like Susan Butterworth and her *Petone - A History* provided insight into the first days of the Wellington Wakefield settlement and its shift to the permanent location at Thorndon. Johnston Warwick’s well researched booklet, *Port Nicholson’s First Town*, gave a brief overview of the early settlement and was helpful in terms of detailing all the settler names, ships and maps. Equally thorough, and highly valuable in its critical reflection on the New Zealand Company purchases in Wellington is the Waitangi Tribunal report on Wellington, which outlines the initial good relations between Māori and settlers of the New Zealand Company: A point that will be strongly emphasised in this thesis.

*The Making of Wellington*, published in 1990, is one of the most recent works on the Wellington settlement. In this anthology, Angela Ballara examined the earliest Māori settlement at Whanganui ā Tara, providing insight into Māori landownership around the harbour. Balara’s comments on the land problems experienced by the New Zealand Company settlers, built strongly on the Waitangi Tribunal Report. Rosemarie Tonk explored those land problems further by presenting aspects of the Spain investigations, which had a long-lasting effect on Māori-Settler relations, which in consequence might play an integral part in the
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destruction of the Middle Ground as proposed by this thesis. Giving a more vivid picture of the lived reality of these 19th century early settlers, David Hamer’s essay revealed aspects of Wellington as a town of the ‘Urban Frontier’. He argued that settlers needed to engage with the world around them but, on the other hand, also created a very urban space that was seen to protect civilisation and Britishness.112 Gavin McLean in Wellington, The First Years of European Settlement, followed on from Angela Ballara and Rosemarie Tonk by giving a very detailed overview of the Wellington settlement from 1840-1850.113 McLean, like so many others, concluded that some major issues for the settlement arose from questionable dealings by the New Zealand Company and picking up on the ideas of Burns and Richardson in Fatal Success that Māori were constantly underestimated and badly treated.114 Interestingly, McLean also explored the various conflicts that occurred between Pākehā and Māori, showing that there also was an initial positive interaction.

Working more within the field of the Middle Ground and lived reality within the settlement itself, Richard Hill presented a fascinating insight into how settlers established law and order and created a police force in Wellington that engaged with both Māori and Pākehā.115 Here we can find further ideas for a discussion on the fluidity of the Middle Ground as well as its defining and later destructive powers.

In contrast to Wellington the local history of the Nelson settlement seems to have been of lesser interest for earlier scholarship, with rather general material in a narrative style. For example, Nelson Province 1642-1842 by A.N. Field represents an adventurer tale more than critical reflection on the history of the settlement, as does J.N.W.Newport’s A Short History of the Nelson Province.116 Less recent but very valuable is the Jubilee History of Nelson published in 1892 for the city’s fiftieth anniversary.117 As a primary source, published near to the time of interest for this project, it gave an astonishing amount of detail about the establishment of the settlement, its politics and events.

As with Wellington, Nelson also shows scholarly regional work, focusing on particular aspects or events. Ruth Allan’s History of the Port Nelson, for example, focused on the history of the
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shipping situation in Nelson. The Footprints Series by Jeff Newport, although also narrative in style, focused on particular people, buildings and local history rather than providing an overview of the settlement. In addition, clearly defined settler groups in Nelson, for example the German immigrants, led to specific publications, such as a chapter in James N. Bade’s Eine Welt Fuer Sich. Bade used rare primary materials to show the experiences of a particular settler group outside of the British Empire that, however, was still part of the Wakefield scheme. He traced the historical fragments of German influence in Nelson but did not examine how the settlers interacted with Māori. In addition to Bade’s work, this thesis will give an insight into how rapidly German settlers assimilated into the new cultures around them. Letters and diaries show how they changed their names and adopted English as their dominant language. Even though settlers identified themselves as German, it has proved impossible to trace any personal notes written in German. Further research into the different groups might further illuminate how dominant the British culture became.

On a more general level, and often cited, is Ruth Allan’s never by herself finalised but very detailed work, Nelson: History of Early Settlement, which gave an overview of Māori history, immigration to New Zealand and a detailed history of the Nelson settlement. Allan, in the same way as Ged Martin, argued that the New Zealand Company’s land politics were critical in leading to major problems in the settlements. Nelson is presented as the colony that wanted to achieve high goals but never succeeded. In regards to Māori settler interaction Allan pointed out how important these interactions were. However, she also emphasised strong racist tendencies among the settlers. In contrast, this research will challenge Allan’s very general observation of racial tendencies amongst Nelson settlers by illustrating how diverse the reactions to Māori were.

Engaging with the interrupting factors for the interactions between Māori and settlers C.J. Colbert, in his PhD thesis on the early working man of Nelson, emphasised the rather explosive mix of settlers in Nelson. He presented the problems of the settlement with
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particular focus on the situations of the working men and their revolt after Wairau in 1843 against the New Zealand Company. Drawing on Colbert, Richard Hill devoted a large proportion of his first volume of the *History of Policing* to Nelson and the Wairau Incident and subsequent events.\(^1\)\(^2\) Focusing on the events of conflict with emphasis on aspects of policing, Hill shows the wide-reaching effects of Wairau in colonial policy. However, Hill, like most other scholars, focuses mostly on official sources and gives a strong picture of the Eurocentric upper class in Nelson. Building on Hill’s work also, Patricia Burns engages in the topic of Wairau.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^5\) By focusing strongly on the New Zealand Company actions she presents the events of 1843 as inevitable and a considerable shock for immigration to New Zealand. However this thesis will contribute a new view on the effects of Wairau and will argue that these events did not have the power to destroy the *Middle Ground*.

From a more practical viewpoint the publication by the Nelson Historical Society from 1992 by Max D. Lash, *Nelson Notables* was of particular interest for this thesis.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^6\) The dictionary of regional biography gave interesting information about the settlers of Nelson, which was especially useful in conjunction with the primary sources of the study. Unfortunately no such works seem to exist for Wellington or New Plymouth.

Building on the foundation work of Ruth Allan, Jim McAloon’s *Nelson: A Regional History* gave an insight into the whole history of the Nelson region with strong emphasis on the economic aspects.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^7\) He argued that, although Nelson was isolated and factors such as the different soils and rugged landscape led to constant problems, the settlers turned these disadvantages into positive outcomes. From the perspective of this thesis, these points, especially Nelson’s isolation, are questionable. The personal records examined suggest that the connection to Wellington was strong and that Nelson settlers, at least, never felt really isolated.

The newest and most valuable scholarship about Nelson, and especially Māori, is the three volume work by Hilary and John Mitchell, *Te Tau Ihu o te Waka - A History of Māori of Nelson and Marlborough*.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^8\) Volumes one and two in particular deal with different aspects of the Māori-Settler encounter. Mitchell and Mitchell highlighted the strength of the relationship between Pākehā and Māori and the fact that Indigenous People had an interest in good
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relations. Volume two, particularly, showed the different patterns of encounter, such as trade, language adoption, cultural understanding, learning and engagement. Mitchell and Mitchell’s work supported the existence of the Middle Ground in New Zealand by drawing extensively on primary sources and showing a far more diverse field of interactions. Furthermore their work also reflected critically on the New Zealand Company and New Zealand politics in regards to Māori. Mitchell and Mitchell, like Ged Martin, portrayed the Wakefields as mostly very thoughtless, and in some aspects even careless, giving them considerable responsibility for the state of the colony. Overall Mitchell and Mitchell’s ground-breaking work shed a totally new light on Nelson as an interesting and diverse community, a perspective neglected by most other scholarship.

Similar to the other case studies, publications on the settlement history of New Plymouth seem rather limited. In 1959 R.G. Wood published From Plymouth to New Plymouth, in which he gave a general outline of the establishment of the settlement.\(^{129}\) He outlined specific difficulties, such as the lack of harbour and the land question, which provided a good understanding of the challenges New Plymouth was facing. Wood based much of his argumentation on the diaries of the surveyor, Henry Weeks, which resulted in a rather one-sided view of the settlement. However, Woods’ approach attempted to go beyond official sources, even though it was not successful on all levels. Woods, as one of the earliest scholars on New Plymouth, emphasised the initial positive relations between settlers and Māori. He recognised the significance of the land question in the settlement and proposed that this was one of the major contributors to the disruption of good relations between Māori and Pākehā, a point that has nowadays wide support by the scholarship of the Taranaki Wars.\(^{130}\)

B. Wells’ The History of Taranaki can be regarded as a primary source.\(^{131}\) Written in a narrative style, it quotes primary material such as letters, reports and news articles, which Wells, as local newspaper editor at the time, had collected, to give a detailed picture of the establishment of the settlement. In the same way J. Rutherford’s The Establishment of the New Plymouth Settlement in New Zealand, 1841-1843, contains original records from New
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Plymouth Company officials, as well as from settlers, offering a good understanding of the settlement’s difficult first years.\textsuperscript{132}

Charles Hursthouse Junior’s \textit{An Account of the Settlement of New Plymouth}, first published in 1849, provides a valuable primary source on the establishment of the settlement and reflects critically on its problems from a contemporary perspective.\textsuperscript{133} Hursthouse, who speaks mostly very favourably of the settlement, strongly critiqued the actions of the authorities in regards to the so-called land question which, as we now generally accept, became the reason for the war of 1860s onwards. However, Hursthouse also pointed to very positive contact between settlers and Māori. Despite the value of Hursthouse’s work, its tendency towards boosting New Zealand as a colony, as typified by writers closely linked to the New Zealand Company, needs to be viewed with a critical historical analysis.

\textit{The Industrial Heart} by J.S. Tullett presented an overview of Taranaki’s history from the earliest days to the 1980s with emphasis on economic and industrial development.\textsuperscript{134} Supported by the general works of New Zealand history from 1960 onwards Tullett pointed out that Māori and Pākehā had different understandings of land, politics and settlement, and that the arrival of settlers changed the Taranaki region significantly. Critiquing the New Zealand Company actions, he referred to the constant struggle of settlers and how their individual entrepreneurship had made significant changes to this situation. Nevertheless, Tullett did not explore interactions between settlers and Māori and his use of primary material is rather limited. In contrast, Brian Scanlan’s \textit{Taranaki, People and Places}, even if less scholarly, presented a broad variety of primary quotes, which unfortunately were not sufficiently well-referenced to be followed up.\textsuperscript{135} Nevertheless, this work’s basic overview of New Plymouth’s and Taranaki’s history and its presentation of first-hand accounts helps develop an understanding of the time, which has been essential for this research project. Rather general but with interesting and plentiful visual material is Gale and Ron Lambert’s \textit{Taranaki, an Illustrated History}, which provides an overview from prehistoric New Zealand to the industrial challenges of modern-day Taranaki.\textsuperscript{136} Even on a general level, this author tried to present Māori perspectives too. Like Tullett, Lambert and Lambert critically depicted the
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impact of settlers on the Māori world and pointed to the difficult nature of the Plymouth and New Zealand Company. Even if not naming it as such, Lambert and Lambert’s study described a *Middle Ground* for Taranaki and emphasised, that the Land Wars of 1860 constituted a changing point in the relationship between Māori and Pākehā.

A recent series of publications by Murray Moorhead centres on the events and people of early New Plymouth.137 Most valuable for this project is the first book, *Pioneer Tales of Old New Plymouth*, which presents well-researched stories of the settlement period with plenty of support for the primary material used in this research.138

Most importantly the final report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Taranaki claims was a useful resource because the presented well researched evidence, provided an overview on the dealings of the New Zealand Company with the different iwi and hapū in the Taranaki region and also shed some light on the initial welcoming of the settlers by Māori.139 The report provided detailed evidence on the loss of Māori power in the region and showed how Pākehā and Māori relations changed from 1858 onwards. Compiled as a base for the WAI 143 Report Ann Parsonson’s *Land and Conflict in Taranaki* offered an even more detailed picture of the land problems.140 As with Belich, later Parsonson also illustrated how Pākehā refused to acknowledge Māori land claims and how the Crown tried to force Māori into land sales which also resulted in intertribal disagreements. Parsonson’s work was particularly valuable for understanding the complex nature of the different powers in the region and illustrated the shift of power from the Indigenous to Pākehā side.

Well known and ground-breaking at the time, James Belich’s *The New Zealand Wars, and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* gave a thorough overview of the events of the war.141 Belich provided valuable background for the interpretation of the emerging conflicts between settlers and Māori. Similarly, *Contested Ground*, edited by Kelvin Day, proved a valuable source, presenting the latest research on aspects of the wars of 1860s onwards.142

For this project in particular, the chapter by Ruth Harvey about the pictorial representation of the Taranaki Wars emphasised the idea of the destruction of the *Middle Ground* by arguing
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about the absence of Māori and the representation of power. Furthermore Peter Adds’ work about the aftermath, *Te Muru me Te Raupatu*, served to emphasise the significance of Raupatu, the Taranaki Wars, Māori-Settler/Crown interactions and, consequently, this thesis in the wider field of New Zealand History. Adds argued that the events in the 19th century colonial history of Taranaki, in particular, have been erased from the national consciousness. Similar to Ranginui Walker, Anne Salmond, Aroha Mead, Linda Tuhiwai Smith and others, Adds pointed out that most of the scholarship only reflects colonial and Pākehā views and that only in recent years have Māori of Taranaki found their voice in the public discourse. Adds’ work connects to the research in the field of the *Middle Ground*, by raising the question about the change in the interaction between the two peoples.

In conclusion, the histories of the settlements Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth seem to have attracted limited scholarly interest. Most of the works are rather dated or smaller, local publications. However, Mitchell and Mitchell’s works are unique in their quality and offer an overarching approach to the history of the Nelson region in astonishing detail that would also be desirable for the other settlement regions. Nevertheless, even the limited scholarship around the three case studies, Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth, in conjunction with the literature on immigration and the Wakefield Company, offers insight into the particular challenges and unique situations of each case study town, which is vital to understand the settlers’ actions and interpret their dealings with each other and most importantly with Māori.

### 2.4 Settler Experiences

Narrowing down from the presented wider field of the research the experiences of settlers in the three case study towns, Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth, between 1840-1860 are the central part of this PhD thesis. As becomes evident, most of these experiences are contained in primary material such as letters, diaries, journals and notes, however, some
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scholars have compiled intriguing collections of settler experiences by applying different themes and criteria. For example Sarah Ell’s extensive work gives interesting examples of women’s experiences in early New Zealand.\(^{146}\) Similar to this project, Ellen used the diaries and letters of early pioneer women to illustrate their hardships and how they arranged their new lives.\(^{147}\) In her works she presented a vast amount of primary material but failed to offer critical reflection on the presented ‘stories’. A far more critical approach on how women’s experiences of pioneering life changed them into far more independent women is given by Raewyn Dalziel in *The Colonial Helpmeet, Women’s Role and the Vote in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand.*\(^ {148}\)

Charlotte Macdonald has also written extensively about the experiences of women, mainly focusing on the period after 1855.\(^ {149}\) *My Hand Writes What my Heart Dictates* is particularly valuable because it discusses the Māori-Settler interaction as presented in letters.\(^ {150}\) Macdonald’s work, though focussing on the interactions of women in general, shows also a study of Wakefieldian settlers, for whom the diaries and letters of women make up a considerable proportion. McDonald emphasised that “… migration or contact with another culture was not necessarily destructive. (Cultural encounters are more complex than simple ‘fatal impacts’).”\(^ {151}\) Furthermore she strengthened the idea that New Zealand in the 1850s had become a mixed society. She argued that there was a shared space that was used by Pākehā as well as Māori.\(^ {152}\)

Scholarly reflections have also focussed on the experiences of settlers from different ethnic backgrounds. For example, Angela McCarthy reflected, in particular, on female Irish immigrants and also used letters and diaries as sources.\(^ {153}\) She, as well as Macdonald,
underlined the importance of settler writings as historical sources, which endorses the microhistorical approach for this project. McCarthy argued, like Raewyn Dalziel, that women were initially shocked about New Zealand but then made it their own and embraced new opportunities. Furthermore, she highlighted the ‘chain migration’ that attracted settlers’ next-of-kin to make their way to New Zealand. Likewise, Angela Caughey’s *Pioneer Families, the Settlers of the Nineteenth-Century in New Zealand*, even though less scholarly, provided insight into the lives of different settler families.\(^{154}\) Sarah and Gordon Ell also engaged in the specific topic of women’s experience and used a variety of letters, notes and diaries to examine early settler life, while Rollo Arnold presented real life experiences of these pioneers of New Zealand but focused more on the period after 1850.\(^{155}\) He, along with Macdonald, McCarthy and others, emphasised that settlers’ lives were hard and full of unexpected surprises. Settler experiences vary and are subject to individual account. It is noticeable, as evident in these examples, that there has been a strong emphasis on the experiences of pioneer women in New Zealand, although their experience with Māori seems to have found less scholarly interest and is barely noticeable in the literature.

As indicated, alongside the scholarly discussion there is a wealth of primary material in published form that provides an interesting insight into the real experiences of early settlers as well as how these experiences have been manipulated. Colonial handbooks such as *Brett’s Colonists’ Guide* indicated the hardships in the settlements and also outlined what arriving settlers could expect.\(^ {156}\) Interesting examples of experiences are contained in Jerningham Wakefield’s *Adventures in New Zealand*\(^ {157}\) and Charles Heaphy’s work about his residency in New Zealand.\(^ {158}\) The New Zealand Company publications by Ward\(^ {159}\), Petrie,\(^ {160}\) and Fox\(^ {161}\) gave a good idea about the Company’s advertisements and the expectations of settlers arriving in New Zealand. The representation of Māori seems particularly interesting, emphasising the civilised nature of ‘the natives’ who were ‘on friendly terms with the British.’ For sure here
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shown to attract new immigrants but this thesis will show not too far off for the first years of settlement.

As seen, a significant amount of scholarship has developed out of the field of women’s and gender studies, which became popular in the discussion around women’s suffrage in New Zealand. Furthermore, we can find a more local approach in regards to countries of origin or destination. However, there seems to be a lack of studies on different kinds of settler experiences.

2.5 Interactions and Relationships

Although the history of Pākehā-Māori interaction on a personal level seems under-researched, there are numerous publications on the interactions between the Crown and Māori, the Crown and the New Zealand Company, and the Company and Māori, which show how inter-racial relations have been influenced and developed.

Alan Ward’s Show of Justice is one of the most comprehensive studies of 19th century racial politics. Building on Ward, Peters Adams in Fatal Necessity outlined the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications from a range of perspectives. Adams showed the different influences in terms of power, economy, politics, humanitarian ideals and strategic constraints that forced the Crown to intervene in New Zealand. Furthermore, Adams argued that a strong racial prejudice shown by settlers was supported by the feeling of superiority, which stood in strong contrast to the ideals of racial equality as outlined in the Treaty. The Shadow of the Land by Ian Wards also addressed the racial tensions that developed amongst the Crown, New Zealand Governor, New Zealand Company and Māori. Making a strong case for miscommunication towards, and betrayal of Māori, Wards outlined how the actions of the Crown as well as the New Zealand Company brought conflict and war to New Zealand. Wards provided clear evidence that the initial conflicts, as for example, Wairau and in the Hutt Valley, were caused by a chain of actions by settlers and Governor, which, as I will show, resulted in potential damage to, and even destruction of, the Middle Ground.

The Māori voice is rarely heard in early publications about New Zealand race relations. In his article *New Zealand, 1820-1870: an Essay in Re-Interpretation* written in 1953, J.W. Davison pointed out the inherent limitations of historical study, acknowledging that history is limited by the scope set out by the sources available, as well as by the preconceived notions of those records. He suggested, in the same way as Linda Tuhiwai Smith, that historians have tended to focus on the European settler narrative as the totality of the country’s history, ignoring Māori narratives. This seems to be evident particularly up until the 1980s, when Māori started gaining more agency within the context of New Zealand’s colonial past.

For example, Keith Sinclair in his *History of New Zealand* portrayed the years of immigration to the Antipodes from a very European perspective. Nevertheless, he also acknowledged the important role played by Māori in the daily survival of settlers. However, this thesis will dispute his claim that settlers were not aware of this dependency. As revealed by their letters and diaries, settlers knew very well how dependent they were on Māori, and appreciated their help.

Harrison Wight, mostly concentrating on the Northland regions and pre-Treaty times, also revealed close interactions between Pākehā and Māori. He emphasised Europeans’ harmful effect on Māori society and changes due to the colonial contact. Wight’s conclusion about the 1840s’ ‘mass invasion’ of settlers was that settlers and Māori initially had a very positive interaction, which became destroyed due to settlers taking more land and not respecting Māori values, land, stock or boundaries. He further pointed out that settlers became disillusioned about the settlement and, with growing independence from Māori, relations worsened. A point that was new and important to make.

In contrast, Angela Ballara in, *Proud to Be White? A Survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand* described racial prejudice towards Māori from the European side. In her work she made little distinction among places, times and people, and took a very radical approach, which needs to be seen in the context of the Māori protests of the 1970-1980s when it was published.

Ballara seems to have based her argumentation mainly on official dealings with Māori, arguing

---

166 Sinclair and Raewyn, *A History of New Zealand*.
167 Ibid. p.75
169 Ibid. p.197
that most Pākehā saw Māori in their own way and were unwilling to learn or interact with Māori. From her understanding, Pākehā misconceptions led to false interpretations of Māori.

The first specific attempt to underline the impact of white colonisation on Māori appeared in Ann Parsonson’s contribution to the old Oxford History of New Zealand. Parsonson argued that, with the arrival of the Pākehā, Māori found new ways to increase their mana and tribal instability and internal warfare were increased by the desire to acquire European goods, sell land and become part of the changing world. Parsonson outlined how much interest Māori had in Europeans and what they brought to their world. Parsonson’s suggestion seems convincing as one of the influencing aspects that made Māori engage with Pākehā, which eventually led to the development of the Middle Ground.

M.P.K Sorrenson’s contribution to the Oxford History, Maori and Pakeha, built on Parsonson’s research, by showing particular patterns in Māori-Pākehā interaction. Sorrenson argued that trade, help, intermarriage, and land questions were defining factors in the relationship. Although not naming it a Middle Ground, Sorrenson is still describing the same positive interactions that changed over time to negative perceptions, even war. He also indicated that exactly these experiences, loss of power, and, as I suggest, destruction of the Middle Ground have been major contributors to present-day race relations in New Zealand.

Anne Salmond’s brilliant research on the earliest encounter between Māori and Pākehā in the 17th century also extends Parsonson’s view. Salmond’s book Between Worlds from 1997 laid the foundation for a new view of Māori-Pākehā interaction. Engaged with the issue of cultural exchange among the earliest encounters in New Zealand, she argued that there were fundamental differences between the Māori and western perceptions of the world, and one must understand both to understand the interaction between the two peoples. Salmond took into consideration that both sides had different perceptions of each encounter and that they could be differently interrelated. She also emphasised that most historical writing is from the Coloniser perspective, well knowing that, especially for early encounters, the written sources from an indigenous perspective are very rare.

Michael King, in the similar way to Salmond, endeavoured to present a less Pākehā, or Eurocentric, perspective. In Nga Iwi o te Motu, 1000 Years of Maori History he gave an
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overview of New Zealand history with an emphasis on Māori. Like Parsonson and Sorrenson, King also pointed out that Māori welcomed the settlers but that the sheer number of white people coming into the land changed the power relationships. He stressed, in line with Claudia Orange, the huge impact of the different cultural understandings, arguing Māori having a significantly different interpretation of the land sales from the New Zealand Company as well as the Crown, which ultimately resulted in conflict and war. A point that has been made since regularly by many scholars.

Looking to the effects of the 1860 Taranaki Wars the scholarship shows that this episode of New Zealand history holds a prominent position as one of the major events illustrating Māori-Pākehā interactions in New Zealand. An interesting new emphasis was presented by Edmund Bohan in his *Climates of War*. Despite giving a detailed account of the wars and associated politics, Bohan was highly critical of Belich’s work on the New Zealand Wars. By looking at different materials and perhaps in more depth, he proposed making comparisons to other international events of conflict between Empire and Indigenous, for example in the Scottish Highlands, in order to understand the broader impacts of Crown actions. Strongly contrasted with Anne Salmond’s Māori-centred view, Bohan explored the different worlds that collided from 1840 onward. Also working with the concept of a colliding world is *Colonial Frontiers* edited by Lynette Russell, which reflected on the outcomes of the Settler Societies, the Urban Frontier, with a strong emphasis on Australia, and how these encounters influenced ways of thinking and acting. Russell argued that the frontier was a place of ‘hybridity’ that can be only understood if we have “some appreciation of the interaction.” This hybrid situation is also partially reflected in Richards White’s work about the *Middle Ground*, which is part of the theoretical framework of this thesis.

Just recently Penelope Edmonds published about the ‘Urbanising Frontier’ at the Pacific Rim. Drawing on Hammer and Russell, she emphasised, by examining early Canada and Australia, that the urban frontier was not just the Bush versus Town, but that we can find the frontier in the town itself. Edmonds argued, firstly, that the town was a colonial construct that enabled the Colonisers to establish power, and, secondly, even more importantly, also the

---

175 King, Nga Iwi O Te Motu: 1000 Years of Maori History.
176 Orange, The Treaty of Waitangi.
178 Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*.
180 Ibid. p.13
space where indigenous and Coloniser met: where two worlds collided. Nevertheless, Edmonds’ observations about Canada and Australia differ from the experience of the New Zealand Company settlements. Her observations built on experiences where the land was forcibly taken by the Coloniser and the Indigenous violently protested. In the case of the Wakefield settlements, I would argue that this seems less applicable for the beginning of the settlement but changes with the expansion of settler land. Edmonds pointed out how the indigenous of Australia have been forced out of the town and displaced from their land while the Colonisers took over and inflicted their power. All three, Bohan, Russell and Edmond looking through the European lens, argued that conflict and action between colonial power and the Indigenous also happened on an international level.

Taking frontier experiences and the collision of two worlds into account, Paul Monin built on Parsonson and Howe, when he explored the concept of ‘dual agency’, showing what happened to the Indigenous world under the influences of European forces. Monin explored how Māori economies were influenced by the colonial encounters in depth by also applying Richard White’s theoretical framework of the *Middle Ground*. Monin’s central point is that from 1840-1880 Māori lost significant power in terms of trade, which affected the whole of Māori society. This thesis will explore, by emphasising the Māori-Settler encounter itself, how Māori held most of the resources in the early contact zone, and how this power declined over time. Monin pointed out that the contact zone was possible due to the variety of interest from both sides: “sometimes disparate, contradictory and contested” but always beneficial to the group or the individual. However, with the introduction of British systems and lifestyle, Māori lost their power, and with this the space of positive interaction, was destroyed.

### 2.6 The Middle Ground

The scholarship on Indigenous and Coloniser contact seems vast and very specific for each Country. The specification as well as the micro historical approach, limits this thesis to New Zealand, hence the emphasis in the discussion on literature is limited too. As shown, many
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185 Ibid. p.128
international scholars have written about a ‘fluid space of interaction’ between two peoples. This thesis tries to define this space as the *Middle Ground* a concept of interactions between Coloniser and Indigenous for New Zealand. This concept finds detailed examination in the Methodology chapter of this thesis.

Other New Zealand scholars have also applied this framework to their research. Judith Binney in her overview of the settlement of Te Kerikeri emphasised positive interaction between Māori and Pākehā. More recently we can see the suggestion of a space of positive interactions between Pākehā and Māori in Brad Patterson’s paper about Scots and Māori in Turakina which also alluded to the existence of the *Middle Ground*. Using a micro-historical approach, his descriptions, suggestions and findings provided evidence of the space of positive interaction in regards to time and geography proposed by this thesis. Most intriguingly, and giving room for further thought, Patterson suggested that Turakina was able to delay the destruction of the *Middle Ground* until the late 1880s and was even able to preserve a positive relationship between the races during the war of the 1860s. Patterson proposed that this was possible due to a different land situation than, for example, in Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth. Patterson’s study indicates that further research on the existence of positive relations between settler and Māori might reveal significant differences in different regions and that the micro approach could help make these visible.

Most recently, and highly valued by many reviewers, Vincent O’Malley explored the *Middle Ground* within the Northland region of New Zealand in pre-Treaty times. His work seems, so far, to be the only overall attempt to apply the *Middle Ground* to New Zealand explicitly. Building on his report to the Waitangi Tribunal, O’Malley argued in *The Meeting Place: Māori and Pākehā Encounters, 1642–1840* that the earliest contacts in the north of Aotearoa/New Zealand fostered the existence of the *Middle Ground* because settlers relied heavily on Māori and that Indigenous did not feel threatened by the small number of ‘whites’. O’Malley suggested that with the signing of the Treaty mutual need, as one of the contributing factors to the *Middle Ground* decreased, and Pākehā began to take over the country and establish a strong colonial power. O’Malley also proposed the possibility that the *Middle Ground* existed longer in different places in New Zealand but that by 1860 its destruction was inevitable. O’Malley’s works has been welcomed by many scholars has a new way of seeing the early

---
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encounters in New Zealand. However, Bain Attwood in his Book Review in the NZJH in 2013 pointed out that O’Malley might have missed an important part of Whites Middle Ground concept: the idea of the effects of cultural misunderstandings. For sure Attwood makes an interesting point however, his attack on O’Malley’s academic credibility when defining him as a “public rather than an academic historian” seems overstated. O’Malley engages clearly with the concepts of cultural misunderstandings and showcases that these led to an exchange of knowledge about each other and ultimately a new way of interaction.

Drawing the Middle Ground more in an indigenous viewpoint John Sutton Lutz’s work about Myth and Memory draws on Whites concept and places the ‘indigenous contact story’ for different peoples within a wider context. Lutz’s collection of essays gave agency to the Indigenous voice which is often missing in the context of colonisation and the so-called first contact. This missing voice is also noted by Linda Tuhiwai Smith in her ground-breaking work, Decolonizing Methodologies which reminded researchers that a great deal of history has been written ‘about Māori’ but much less has been written ‘with Māori’. Smith criticised the fact that the Coloniser view is evident in most of the scholarship but the voice of Māori is mostly forgotten, whereas the real encounter with Māori was different from the adventurous tales that were modified back home in the ‘empire’; a point that has also been made, for example, by Salmond. This research seeks to address this situation of misinterpretation through critical reflection on settlers’ interaction and encounter with Māori by identifying colonising perspectives and ideologies and using Smith’s decolonising methodologies.

2.7 Conclusion

To conclude, a significant amount of literature has been published in the fields of immigration and colonisation of New Zealand, but most seems either dated or lacks critical reflection. The field of personal encounter between the two peoples, Pākehā and Māori, or even other indigenous encounters, seems to be a field of emerging scholarship. Large gaps in the research on New Zealand and its colonial past are becoming increasingly filled and situated within the general context of worldwide colonial practice.
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Using a micro historical approach, in contrast to a macro approach of standard works like Belich, this thesis focuses in particular on aspects of Māori–Settler encounters between 1840-1860 in Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth by using private records rather than the official reports of the New Zealand Company and Crown. By only focusing on the private record, in contrast to the wider literature, I will shine a new light on the experiences of early settlers and Māori in New Zealand. Much has been published about settlers’ voyages to New Zealand and also about issues associated with the hard pioneer life. However, specific experiences about Indigenous or specific groups seem less represented or covered far too generally. This project seeks to address this gap by using a micro approach, focusing on particular groups of settlers of the 19th century as well as to distinguish between time, place and source to reveal a far more diverse field of Māori-Pākehā interactions as for example anticipated by Ballara.

Extending the works of Salmond, O’Malley and Hamer graphically as well as in regards to time to frame this research I will engage in a discussion on positive interaction between settlers and Indigenous; a concept that has been largely ignored by many studies. By using the concept of the Middle Ground this study creates an international connection, which provides insight into the wider Settler-Indigenous experiences.

Parsonson, Petrie and McAloon for example had clearly shown that there was considerable interest in each other during the contact phase. Often good trading relationships have been established quickly, as shown by O’Malley. Knowledge exchange and the creation of a new place of encounter helped to create what I will call the Middle Ground. Hamer’s argument of the ‘Urban Frontier’, the place where Settler and Indigenous met finds further support in the letters and diaries that are examined for this thesis. This new space, the Middle Ground was a fluid concept which has been majorly ignored for a long time. As evident in the here examined scholarship, which mainly focused on the negative forces of conflict and war, shows that there is a significant gap in the literature. Both Pākehā and Māori had a significant effect on Aotearoa/New Zealand and through their interaction created something new which will be further examined in this PhD thesis.
3. Theory and Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodological approaches for this thesis. First, I will examine diaries and letters as historical sources as used in this project. Furthermore, the practical problems of retrieving material and the challenges of working with settler private records for Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth early settlement periods will be discussed. This will be followed by critical reflection on the methodologies of *Oral History, Microhistory and History from Below*, to establish their place in the theoretical framework of this project. Finally, I will explicate Richard White’s *Middle Ground*, to provide a better understanding of the main conceptualization of this thesis as part of Māori-Settler encounter.

Overall this research was guided by the ideals of Kaupapa Māori and Cultural Responsive Methodologies [as much as this was possible by a non-Indigenous researcher]. Kaupapa Māori clearly states that it is a methodology that is ‘by Māori, for Māori’, hence exclusive to Māori. However, over recent years an emerging scholarship has shown how non-Indigenous researchers can engage in a Culturally Responsive Methodology. By engaging in these theoretical frameworks it was important to develop a stronger awareness of my own research and writing process and how to centre this thesis in Māori Studies, but also being aware of the limitations of this research in the Indigenous context. I aimed to achieve this by constantly challenging my own ideas and gathering extensive feedback from Indigenous people and my Supervisors, presenting research findings at Conferences and to my school, Te Kawa ā Maui, listing, learning and observing, and engaging in the life in and around my school as for example the marae.

Jen Margaret speaks of ‘becoming an ally to Māori’ by acknowledging that, as Pākehā, you can only speak for your own people, but, following the ideas of whanau engagement, feedback from Māori and constantly testing research findings provides the basis for a decolonizing view.

It is central that the Pākehā researcher understands the dominant white colonial mind-set and the need for allies to engage in specific and separate work amongst their own people as well

192 For further reading:
as supporting the struggles of those they have in alliance with.\textsuperscript{193} Mary Berryman and others argue that western ideas about Māori should be challenged to encourage culturally responsive researchers.\textsuperscript{194} In addition, Rachael Fabish has worked on the difficulties Pākehā encounter by engaging with Kaupapa Māori and becoming an ally to Māori as has Danny Butt who is consistently working on questioning research processes in the field of ‘colonial studies’. \textsuperscript{195}

Due to the limited scope of this thesis, Kaupapa Māori Methodologies and the implications for this thesis can only marginally explored. However as follows I will present some research ideas and Methodologies that seem to bridge the challenges that arise when attempting to keep Kaupapa Māori in mind as a Pākehā. Especially the ideas for 	extit{History of Below} and 	extit{Micro History} seem to be eminent in the Indigenous frameworks and compliment the ideas of Kaupapa Māori in a new and interesting way. \textsuperscript{196}

\section*{3.1 Diaries and Letters as sources}

Keeping a diary and writing letters has a long history, developing as a form of self-accounting during the Reformation. In earlier times, keeping a record was analogous to a spiritual balance sheet that contained good and bad deeds and whose main motive was a closer union with God.\textsuperscript{197} Over time, the motive for keeping a diary has changed towards more self-reflective writing or simply for preserving information, as is the case in the information sources in this thesis.


\textsuperscript{194} Mere Berryman, Suzanne SooHoo, and Ann Nevin, “Culturally Responsive Methodologies from the Margins,” ibid. P. 9f


\textsuperscript{196} Raechel Fabish, ”Kaupapa Pakeha? - Overcoming ‘Paralysis’ through Engagement,” unpublished Anthropology (Victoria University Wellington, 2014). This paper developed out of Fabish’s PhD Thesis which is currently under examination.

\textsuperscript{197} Danny Butt, ”The Opposite of Whiteness,” in Whitene$$\textit{s}$$/Whiteness: creative Disorders and Hope (Wellington, \url{http://dannybutt.net/the-opposite-of-whiteness/}). 2010. accessed 21/04/2014

\textsuperscript{198} ———, ”On ” New Zealand “ "Studies",” in Imagining New Zealand/ Aotearoa, 11th Annual day conference of the New Zealand Studies Association (New Zealand House, London, \url{http://dannybutt.net/on-new-zealand-studies/}) 2004. accessed 21/04/2014

\textsuperscript{196} As part of the examination of my thesis a discussion about Kaupapa Māori but also the concept or Whiteness emerged. Due to the historical events of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, and being of German decent, I felt very uneasy to engage in a discussion on Whiteness. Looking further into the topic I discovered that, so far, no German researchers have engaged into the discussion on Whiteness as such. It seems to be a rather large field of study in the Anglo speaking countries.

\textsuperscript{197} Fairburn, \textit{Nearly out of Heart and Hope: The Puzzle of a Colonial Labourer’s Diary}, p.4f
Angela McCarthy suggests that personal records like letters and diaries are an invaluable source for discovering records of the experiences of people immigrating to new worlds. In the case of New Zealand, the immigration experience is not simply limited to a long journey into a new life in the form of a ship's diary. It is also a comprehensive record, sometimes over many years, of the lives of men and women who, between 1840 and 1860, settled in a new country and encountered an indigenous population: Māori. This research will examine letters and diaries of a number of settlers, providing us with an insight into their lives from the 1840s onwards. The objective is to use these personal records to investigate settlers' interactions with the world they met, and more especially, the indigenous people they encountered.

Patrick O'Farrell has pointed out that these personal recordings of immigrants and settlers provide “an intimate insight into what the migrant actually thought and felt, expressed without constraint, and with the honesty and candour appropriate to close family situations.” Personal records, therefore, are the most significant source through which we can investigate personal opinions, explore relationships, and discuss lived reality in the early settlement period of New Zealand.

For instance, in his book on the Cox records [1888-1925], Miles Fairburn gives a good example of how much information can be found in diaries. Fairburn offers an insight into the life of a simple labourer and tells the story of New Zealand in times of change, War and the Depression. More than 80 percent of the diary that he draws on as his main source of enquiry survived over the years from 1888. As Fairburn points out, this is “like a Lotto jackpot”: rarely do historians find such early and plentiful personal records from an individual of the lower classes. In general it seems more common that official records and those from the higher survived, an observation that also applies for this project. However, personal records, in contrast to official publications, are very subjective reports and significant numbers of these single interpretations can guide us into a direction of general feeling toward certain topics discussed in the sources and give us an interesting insight into the live and thoughts of people.

The amount of raw data from settlers' diaries and letters for Nelson, Wellington, and New Plymouth from 1840 up to the Taranaki Wars of 1860 that survived in Archives is immense.
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201 A good example of very interesting and detailed sources of the upper class which find continued use in the scholarship are the Richmond Atkinson papers, as for example: Guy Hardy Scholefield ed., The Richmond-Atkinson Papers (Wellington: R.E. Owen, Govt. Printer, 1960).
Not all of these records contain specific recollections of encounters with, or opinions about, the indigenous population. This fact is fascinating and important to acknowledge. It raises the question: how is this possible? Did these writers really have no contact with Māori? Or perhaps some material has simply not been passed down. Perhaps some settlers regarded Māori as unimportant and saw no need to record anything about them. Alternatively, they may have considered other aspects of their lives more central. A settler in New Plymouth, for example, wrote in his diary year after year about raising potatoes. He produced daily entries which contain almost no information about his social activities but deliver an excellent overview about the hardship of growing potatoes and the weather in early New Plymouth. Building on this example it seems logical to agree with Miles Fairburn that more research in the field of ‘non mentioning of daily things’ provides an inviting avenue for further research.

The present project, however, will confine its focus to the topics which were recorded by early settlers, especially their encounters with, and feelings about Māori. In the case of Wellington, approximately fifty personal sources from 1840-1860, mostly from the Alexander Turnbull Library [ATL], tell us something about Māori. For Nelson, more than forty separate documents, mostly located in the Nelson Provincial Museum Archive, but also in ATL, bear on the Māori-Settler encounters. And in the case of New Plymouth, a surprising number of high quality sources, around 35, from the Taranaki Research Centre, Puke Ariki, cast light on Māori-Settler relations. This amount of raw material gives us a great deal of evidence of encounters with, and thoughts about, Māori, but the data must be seen in conjunction with the entire availability of personal records in the time frame. Especially in the case of New Plymouth, it must be acknowledged that over 80 per cent of the records examined proved useful, while in Wellington, the process of discovering the valuable material was much more laborious.

The main archive for the material about the Wellington settlement seemed to be the ATL. During the research, it became clear that the records needed could be scattered under diverse keywords: Wellington, Port Nicholson, Petone, Pitone, Pi-Te-Oni, Hutt, Hutt Valley and Brittania, and Te Aro. The Wellington settlement, with its history of location change, name change, and diverse small-scale settlements, posed a much more difficult field for study than is the case for the other case study settlements. Furthermore, it became apparent that a considerable number of settlers only used Wellington as a temporary base from which to move on to other parts of the country. The records of those people are mostly linked to their

---

203 Fairburn, Nearly out of Heart and Hope: The Puzzle of a Colonial Labourer’s Diary. p.17
permanent places of residence elsewhere in the country, even if, for example, they talk about the Wellington region at some point. To address the particular research challenge of settlers who passed through Wellington, ships' records were used. The ATL catalogue was searched for every passenger of the Wakefield Company ships that anchored in Wellington Harbour between 1840 and 1860. This method uncovered more than 200 sources, of which around 50 were found to be significant. At this point, it should be noted that not all of the 200 sources fitted the category of ‘personal record’ which explains the apparently low number of sources used. However, the 50 sources that hold relevance for the project represent a relatively high proportion of the total number of personal records discovered – a rather unexpected finding.

It is also important to discuss the different qualities of sources. Different levels of education and the differing ages of writers are clearly reflected in the quality of a source, which does not mean that better educated writers provide more useful accounts, but that the style of writing and content differ significantly. Some farmers give interesting and detailed accounts of their encounters with the indigenous population, perhaps because they are more curious and free of social class stereotypes. For the average settler, it was all new, exciting, scary, interesting, fascinating, and lastly very important. These lower class individuals knew that there was no way back, they needed to succeed in the new county. In contrast, the upper class, and first-class passengers in particular, had other options if this ‘adventure’ did not pay off. However, the sources of the upper class also provide an interesting insight into their reactions and interaction with Māori. Mostly guided by a clearer understanding of ‘the savage’, as well as the wider political and economic effects of actions in the contact zone, the wealthier classes complemented the observations of the steerage passengers by often providing a ‘bigger picture’.

To return to the main question of good quality sources, it is important to recall the research focus. This thesis examines the relationship between Pākehā settlers and Māori between 1840 and 1860 on the level of personal experience. Was there a change over time? Is there any kind of pattern? And lastly, can we find the Middle Ground, as defined by Richard White in his study of Native Americas, within the contexts New Zealand of the early New Zealand Company settlements?205
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204 It is interesting to note that during times of conflict the upper class were very willing to immigrate to other places or even to leave New Zealand fully. Diaries and letters of the upper class also tell stories of extensive travel in New Zealand and the Pacific, and contemplating temporary return to Britain. In contrast, the lower classes always emphasise that they will never be able to see their homeland again.

To examine changes, it is ideal to have sources from one individual over a longer time frame. For this purpose, the diaries of John W. Barnicoat or the records of the Kempton family were exemplary.\(^\text{206}\) One-off sources that are rather short are not as useful. Nonetheless, they can still illuminate a particular event or location when placed in the context of many other accounts. Two letters sometimes talked about the same event, such as the Wairau incident at Nelson in 1843 for example, but showed different aspects or interpretations. Single sources were also interesting in regard to special events and in some cases for the thoughts they convey. For instance, in a letter from New Plymouth, a young girl reported back home that her friend would marry a “handsome Māori guy”.\(^\text{207}\) This statement provides a basis for interpreting the actions of other people and other events in the settlement, as well as allowing some reflection on Māori-Settler interaction.

We need to acknowledge that the conclusions we can draw from diaries and letters are limited by the fact that we do not know how many records have actually been lost over the years. Angela McCarthy points out that a quantitative approach, therefore, is always limited by the number of sources that have survived. “Given the mechanisms by which private correspondence has endured, those letters that have survived are exceptional and therefore unlikely to be representative of all letters…”\(^\text{208}\); they simply need to be seen as an example. Contrary to the argument put forward by McCarthy, for this thesis there was found to be an abundance of material that clearly points in a certain direction. Certainly it is impossible to say that what is presented in private letters is the exact truth; however, some valuable information can still be extracted that bears on the wider historical context.

Charlotte Macdonald, in her ground-breaking work on early New Zealand women’s writing, pointed out the extent to which, as 21\(^\text{th}\) century historians, researchers have become aware of the modern perspectives that we bring to the interpretation of earlier writing. When Historians synthesise private records, they are ‘shaping’ and ‘creating’ a narrative rather than simply unveiling a pre-existing story that has an objective reality independent of its teller. The


\(^{208}\) McCarthy, Irish Migrants in New Zealand, 1840-1937: 'The Desired Haven’. p.3
narratives contained in writings help the reader connect with the past. Furthermore, letters and diaries are places of comfort and intimacy. They are places to “store information safely as well as give information, tell stories, talk about experiences and feelings.” As Macdonald and Frances Porter point out regarding this type of research, these sources especially store forgotten information about Pākehā and Māori experiences, as well as feelings and thoughts about each other. The sources offer a way into close, little, subjective worlds: micro-worlds are presented in this material, revealing the history of Māori-Pākehā interaction from a new and far more subjective viewpoint.

Working with diaries and letters requires reflection on the sources themselves and on the stance of the interpreter. It requires one to read between the lines and get a feeling for the state of mind of the writer and his environment. Diaries and letters, what are they? Oral sources? Memories or narratives? In the context of this research, what do they show us about the encounters between Māori and the early settlers of the New Zealand Company? Are these sources, with their lived realities of individuals, a suitable base for drawing wider conclusions? Or are they some social micro-worlds, in which case they might be unique? Whose voice do we hear in these sources? Reflecting on these questions shapes the methodological approach of this research.

3.2 Methodology of ‘Oral History’

At first glance, Oral History seems the perfect choice as a methodological approach for this research if diaries or letters are seen as nothing other than a written form of oral communication in the form of self-Interviews. But Oral History is far more than, and different from, what this rather rough thought suggests. As one of the methods of the so called ‘New Historians’ of the 1970s and 1980s it emphasises the interview process as such. The interview is shaped through the ongoing dialogue which is different in pure autobiographies where everything is left to the narrator. Michael Angrasino points out that oral histories are “above all the systematic collection of living people’s testimony about their own experiences or the experiences of those who have passed along remembrances to them.” Oral History is a
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specific methodological approach, which centres on the interviewee and his or her expression of personality. It is a two-way approach.

At first glance, we might think Agrasino’s definition, “the systematic collection of ... testimony about ... experiences” could also apply to some extent to written sources like diaries and letters. However, according to Tamara Hareven, written records like diaries and letters centre on a different origin of subjectivity. She points out that “a diary reflects a person’s individual experience or observation, whereas an oral history is an individual’s experience as evoked by an interviewer that had an intentional or unintentional influence on what is remembered.”

It is the interview process itself that makes *Oral History*. Thoughts, written down, or inner monologues are simple self-reflections with no stimulation from the outside in the form of, for example, an interviewer – and are therefore not applicable to *Oral History*. Furthermore, Hareven reminds us that letters and diaries are written from a different perspective in time compared with an interview or an autobiography, which are past experiences presented from perspective of the present.

Nevertheless, some aspects of oral history hold relevance for this research and should be considered.

Oral history does much more than document new information. It provides all those who use it a window to the past and, in doing so, makes history come alive. It reminds us that the actors are real people, each with a unique perspective on the past and present ... Exploring the many sides of an issue through multiple first-hand individual accounts offers the opportunity to uncover layers of meaning embedded in the stories and insights into how people understand and interpret the past and their place in it.

Having said this, it is suggested that this also applies to diaries and letters. Even written down with no interview process, letters and diaries do far more than just document information. They are individual accounts with an insight into people’s lives and thoughts and centre on individuality.

### 3.3 Methodology of ‘Microhistory’

A significantly different approach can be found by reflecting once more on the initial questions.
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of this research. What do diaries and letters show us? The frame of the project is a rather narrow window in three aspects: time, from 1840-1860; location, Nelson, Wellington, and New Plymouth; and social grouping, early New Zealand Company settlers and Māori. Taking this narrow frame into account, it is valuable to explore the methodology of Microhistory which is a method of close investigation of a rather constricted field; the scale of focus is often narrow and has a connection to personal and intimate material. Microhistory focuses more commonly on everyday life than the great World History. Michael Fairburn points out that its characteristics are its close-grained investigations of the symbolic system of small groups or marginal ‘voiceless’ people; its reliance of self-descriptive literature as source material … most important of all, its self-conscious attempt to see things from the ‘natives’ point of view, to grasp their alien patterns of perception, and to discern the ruptures and irregularities within these patterns.

Microhistory, like Oral History, developed initially in Europe in the 1970-1980s taking a stand against the movements of great social trends and in favour of a society with a face. It is now seen as “the flagship of contemporary social historians”. Widely used in Italy and Germany, but less in the USA and British Commonwealth, and quite recently finding more scholars in Iceland, it found increasing popularity in the context of the connection of Social Science, Anthropology and History. Giovanni Levi, as one of the ‘founding figures’ of the movement, points out that Microhistory has its roots in Marxism and the political orientation to the left. Single first attempts at writing history in the new format were made in the circles of Surrealists and developed further with the new way of thinking about society and the re-emerging idea of ‘Gemeinschaft’ [Community]. Influential thinkers in this direction of personal freedom and the fragmentation of the human existence in the process of the new capitalist societies include the likes of George Lukas and Walter Benjamin, as well as Michael de Certeau of the Situationist International Movement. It is even more exciting to note a refreshing
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modern approach to Microhistory and a developing world network in a time that engages with ideas other than those of Communism.\(^{222}\)

As already indicated, Microhistory is an approach that is difficult to define especially because it is more about a particular attitude than an exact way of doing things. István Szijártó has tried to define the main elements of a micro-historical approach. Firstly Szijártó emphasises the new perspective on historical events that the micro approach offers. As a result of the micro approach, he argues, history could become far more interesting because it should be readable by the public and not just by a group of historians.\(^{223}\) Secondly the so called ‘little facts’ given in the narrow field of study create a ‘reality effect’ which according to Siegfried Kracauer gives a more authentic history in the context of Microhistory.\(^{224}\) Levi insists that Microhistory has the power to reveal outcomes and effects previously unknown and hidden from others. Historians like Hans Medick seem to agree.\(^{225}\) Thirdly Microhistory can “convey the lived experience to the reader directly on the micro-level of everyday life.”\(^{226}\) With the change of perspective, things initially assumed unimportant, suddenly become objects of observation and can be understood differently. The possible new results can be used to draw generalisations.\(^{227}\) Juergen Kocka, in contrast to Levi, warns about the ‘Klein-Klein’ [small – small] approach of Microhistory.\(^{228}\) However, Levi says that it is about investigating on a small scale not just about looking at something that seems small and likely unimportant.

The advantages of this approach varied, but most importantly Microhistory, with its narrow focus is always expandable and “never isolated from the level of general, and will always have a bearing to that.”\(^{229}\) Practical Microhistory needs to be seen as a reduction of the field of

\(^{222}\) New Internet platforms for Microhistory have recently developed and enable scholars around the world to exchange ideas. For example: "Microhistory," The Center for Microhistorical Research, Reykjavik Academy, \url{http://www.microhistory.org} accessed 15/05/12.


"Microhistory Network," Eötvös University, Budapest, \url{http://microhistory.eu/home.html} accessed 15/05/2012.
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observation with a microscopic analysis and, according to Levi, “an intensive study of the documentary material.”

Taking all these thoughts into consideration, Microhistory as a methodological approach seems beneficial for this project. For this study it seems that the consideration of the lived reality of Microhistory is a most important tool. The letters and diaries of settlers tell us about the lived reality with Māori from a settler perspective. It is the history of everyday life, the ‘Alttaggeschichten’, as pointed out by Norbert Elias, that makes history even more interesting, and that forms the core field of examination of this project. The detailed stories told by settlers will give the reader the ‘little facts’ which are so central according to Kracauer. Given the nature and geographical situation of this research, readers in New Zealand and the Pacific will be able to connect with the new findings and knowledge that are presented in this research. The change in perspective, to a micro level that is easily accessible and outside of academia, this project seeks be shared with the community [beyond academia]. This aspect of sharing and accessibility, as a central point of indigenous research methodologies, centres this research in the indigenous context and in the context of Linda Smith’s Decolonisation Theories.

Microhistory is very suitable if looking at topics like minorities, ethnicity, race, and gender and these will be partially addressed in this project. Alison Holland also pointed out that the use of Microhistory is not widely developed by historians in the field of colonial studies, but it would be beneficial to discover whether small scale stories can easily “confirm conclusions on a bigger scale.” Furthermore, Microhistory seems to be the right framework for this research project because a micro-historical approach is now possible due to the transformation in the operations of archives during the last few years. Projects like this are mainly built on archive material which previously was unknown or untraceable but can, due to new technologies, now be found. Settlers’ letters and diaries, particularly in the ATL, are well documented and have links and keywords to connect to other material which enables the research to sweep a broader field of material. For this project material has been retrieved that
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was ignored by previous scholars, enabling deeper and different insights into the lives of settlers and their interactions with Māori.

3.4 Methodology of ‘History from Below’

Along with Microhistory, History from Below first emerged from the New Historians of the 1970s and 1980s emerged as a separate methodological approach. Microhistory and History from Below, also referred to as the ‘Alttaggeschichten’ or History of Everyday Life, are closely connected and some scholars even think they are the same. John Brewer points out that “social and cultural history unites in the micro-processes of everyday life,” and he emphasises the idea of an interconnectedness of these methodologies. But Gregory is convinced that there is a slight difference:

Historians of everyday life seek above all to recapture the lived experience of ordinary men and woman, situated in concrete webs of social relations, whereas systematic micro historians strive first and foremost to reconstruct the social relationships themselves as a basis for explaining historical changes.

Ginzburg, as one of experts in the field of Microhistory, shows convincingly the connection between Microhistory and History from Below. In his micro historical work about a miller, during the time of the Inquisition, in ‘The Cheese and the Worms’, he shows how important non-objective sources can be. He used very subjective accounts, such as letters and diaries, to show the miller’s thoughts and feelings about the Inquisition. Clearly this is a micro-historical approach, considering Gizburg’s narrow field of study, centred in the field of History from Below, as evident in his focus on the life of a simple miller. As a result of the interconnectedness of these approaches Alttaggeschichten and History from Below in the context of a micro approach should be explored further.
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Coming back to the initial question of whose voice is represented in the diaries, it becomes clear that, in this case, Microhistory is also History from Below and Alttagsgeschichten. This research explicitly uses letters and diaries of New Zealand Company settlers whose socio-cultural background is mostly working class. Simply, this is implied in the definition of the New Zealand Company scheme, with its focus on free passage for labourers. Nevertheless, this does not exclude the cabin-class passengers from the context of this research. Simple settlers, as well as cabin passengers can tell stories that represent the History from Below, each from their specific view point.

History from Below, as a methodology was mostly influenced by E.P. Thomson and his scholarship of the working class. Thomson recognised how important it is to see the historical subject in its context of subjective experiences and reactions to it. Jim Sharpe reflects on the limitations caused by the small number of available sources; he further points out that these sources tell us a History from Below and points out diaries and letters are most valuable in this context. Furthermore he raises the question of how to create a conceptualisation; how to define ‘below’ and where is it situated. If historians are talking of ‘below’ it should be automatically assume that there must also be an ‘above’. To reflect on these two qualities of above and below is probably the most challenging part of this framework. In order to accept the ideas put forward by Jim Sharpe, one needs to be clear about the two functions: “firstly, history of everyday life can work as a corrective, for example the content of an official documentation of a war or battle [above] will differ significantly from that of a subjective letter or report of a soldier in that battle [below]. And secondly History from Below opens the possibility of a richer synthesis of historical understanding, of a fusion of the history of the everyday experience of people with the subject-matter of more traditional types of history.”

For this research, settler experiences should be regarded as History from Below and Alttagsgeschichten, in contrast to the more formal documentation and publications of the New Zealand Company and official government material which represents the ‘history from above.’

In summation, this research aims to work with a wide methodological approach. Oral History provides guidance in regards to the framework or reflection of life. Microhistory applies, given the narrow field of the research and its thesis that the history of Māori–Settler interactions
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was different from what official voices of the time tell us. And *Altagsgeschichten* and *History from Below*, in close connection with *Microhistory*, provides further guidance in regard to the sources themselves. The research in this thesis will explore only personal records of those involved, in contrast to the official material of the Crown, New Zealand Government, New Zealand Company and other official voices.

### 3.5 The 'Middle Ground' as Thesis

In addition to using the methodologies mentioned above, this research seeks to use the framework of Richard White’s *Middle Ground*. By proposing that, in the early settlement period of 1840-1860, New Zealand shows a development similar to that of the Great Lakes Regions 1650-1815 of North America, this project will be placed in an international, multicultural context.

Richard White describes, in his book *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, an example of the patterns of ‘new encounter’ for the American Indians and the French. White shows that the two different peoples created an arrangement of coexistence, a new ‘living together’. Out of this new contact situation, a new cultural process took place which White describes as a demonstrating accommodation of common interest and mutual needs. This newly established cultural space was defined within a specific geographical space, and embraced curiosity, trust, trade, cultural understanding and acceptance. As a result, these two different peoples with common interests and mutual needs, created a new cultural common space which offered safety, help and protection in several ways, and emphasised trust rather than suspicion. White calls this state the *Middle Ground*. White argues that this newly created space is “the place in between: in between cultures, peoples, and in between empires and the no state world of villages” Daniel J. Herman agrees and emphasises that this space at the frontier “became a place of mutual concession, adaptation and cultural borrowing.”

White argues further that in the moment of a shift of power to one side, the *Middle Ground* will be conclusively destroyed. This destruction should also be seen as part of the *Middle Ground* framework. An unequal situation destroys trust and cultural acceptance and leads to a
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major imbalance and tensions. Interestingly White concludes that the stronger group [mostly the white settlers] suppresses the weaker group [the Indigenous People] and denies that the Middle Ground ever existed. These changes in the relationship are characterised by feelings of superiority, suppression, tension and distrust. As already indicated by O’Malley, who also uses the Middle Ground for New Zealand in pre-Treaty times, this research will also suggest the Taranaki Wars could have been the act that finally destroyed the Middle Ground in New Zealand.246

The Middle Ground as such, in particular for North America, has also been explored by other scholars including Calloway, Elliott West, John Mack Faragher and Stephen Aron.247 However, White, as Daniel J. Herman points out, “was the first to articulate clearly the middle ground as an analytical paradigm.”248 White’s Middle Ground had a long-lasting effect on scholarship, especially in America. He raised questions of identity, colonisation, and proposed new concepts outside of race, gender, class stereotypes. The main point of critique is that the Middle Ground suddenly worked as an all-purpose tool to describe all white-Indian interactions. Philip J. Deloria even admitted that he at first followed this ‘unconscious simplification’ and that it was disappointing to see that every social or political interaction turned into a Middle Ground.249

Historians like Catherine Desbarats critique White on a more contextual level but still admire his work.250 On the one hand, White himself argues that the Middle Ground has been misused and too many scholars have labelled things as a Middle Ground. On the other hand, he agrees with Darcee McLaren’s observation and reflects on his own theory that, although the concept has been used too generally, there are maybe other places and times that could show
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circumstances best described by the concept of the *Middle Ground*.²⁵¹ Darcee McLaren states that:

Although White’s analysis is restricted to seventeenth-century native-white contact in the Great Lakes region, it seems likely that the process of the *Middle Ground* could operate anywhere and anytime where the members of one culture are motivated to communicate with members of another culture.²⁵²

Most of the critiques argue that White misinterprets sources and they give a different picture of the history of the Great Lake region; nevertheless the *Middle Ground* concept in itself seems plausible.²⁵³

White’s theoretical framework for the interaction of American Indians and French is intriguing because interactions between Māori and settlers in some parts of New Zealand show situations analogous to White’s *Middle Ground*. Recently Vincent O’Malley has used the concept of a *Middle Ground*, for situations in the Northland region of New Zealand during the pre-Treaty-times (i.e. pre-1840).²⁵⁴ Brad Patterson, in his paper about Scots and Māori in Turakina, alludes to the existence of the *Middle Ground*. Although not using the specific concepts, his descriptions, suggestions and findings propose that his case study settlement, Turakina, extends the evidence of the space of positive interaction in regards to time and geography proposed by O’Malley and in this thesis.²⁵⁵

In examining more closely the specifics of the concept, it becomes apparent how it might fit into a New Zealand context. White proposed specific parameters that must be present for the definition of a *Middle Ground* to apply: “a rough balance of power, mutual need or a desire for what the other possesses, and an inability by either side to commandeering enough force to compel the other to change”.²⁵⁶ These parameters appear to be met at different times and spaces in New Zealand history. A new ‘living space’ and an ‘integration’ of indigenous population with Western adventurers and European settlers was the challenge at the time of colonisation in New Zealand, North America, Canada, India, Africa and other colonised countries. As White states: “whites could neither dictate to Indians nor ignore them”,²⁵⁷
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statement which could easily be transferred to the contact zone of the British with Māori and which finds already reflection of Vincent O’Malley, Salmond and Judith Binney’s research. 

Early settlers could not dictate to Māori, especially at the beginning of the settlement process. Initially Māori had the power over land, resources, and knowledge while settlers only had a vague idea of what their new home would be like and, as this research will show, even months after landing, help from Māori sustained the settlement significantly. As time moved on this relationship changed and was constantly transforming. As I will suggest for Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth, there was a short moment of the Middle Ground where positive interaction was possible – where mutual interest defined the contact zone before the delicate balance of power became unstable and shifted to the colonial entity.

This project will show that the circumstances of Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth from 1840-1860 were an instance of the Middle Ground in regard to Māori-Settler interaction; evidence will be sought from private settler records in the times before the Taranaki Wars, in order to establish the very personal field of interaction between the two peoples by following the guiding principles of Microhistory, History from Below and acknowledging the memories contained in the personal sources as partially evident of the ideas of Oral History.
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4. Wellington Settler and Māori

The expectations of settlers when arriving in the new country were significantly influenced by the boosters, and Aotearoa/New Zealand was no exception. A case study of Wellington, as the first settlement of the New Zealand Company in New Zealand, plays a significant role in exploring how settlers adapted to the new life with and around Māori, and how their expectations clashed with reality.

This chapter will illustrate how reality collided with Wellington settlers’ expectations, hopes, and dreams, and how they interacted and arranged their living with Māori. Firstly, the historical context of the Wellington settlement will be discussed, to provide an understanding of the situation under which settlers and Māori first met. This will be followed by the presentation and reflection of the main themes of the encounter: first experiences, help from Māori, trade, language adoption, and knowledge exchange. These themes will be used to explore whether a Middle Ground existed in Wellington between 1840—1860, and, if so, what factors contributed to its subsequent weakening.

4.1 Historical Background

Long before 1840, Whanganui ā Tara, Wellington Harbour, had been populated by different hapū and iwi and experienced a constant change of land ownership and boundaries. Tribal warfare had dominated the lower North Island of New Zealand/Aotearoa for many years and did not stop with the arrival of the Pākehā. The Musket Wars pre-1840 created a situation in which land ownership was in constant flux, and this clearly showed its effect in the difficult circumstances surrounding New Zealand Company land purchases from 1839 onwards. Rosemarie Tonk, exploring the Port Nicholson claim under Spain, shows convincingly that many different parties claimed ownership over the land. William Spain became the land Claims Commissioner of New Zealand in 1841 to regulate land purchases but also to evaluate the past transactions made by the New Zealand Company in 1839. The Waitangi Tribunal Report for Wellington also indicates that this complex situation was not anticipated by
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Wakefield and his men, when they arrived in Aotearoa/New Zealand on the Tory on the 5th of May 1839, to prepare for the immigrants that were shortly due to arrive.\footnote{Waitangi Tribunal, "Wai 145 Report on the Wellington District- Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ono Takiwa."}

At this point, the Company’s representative, Colonel William Wakefield, brother of Edward Gibbon Wakefield and creator of the idea of systematic colonisation, who was sent by the New Zealand Company to purchase sufficient land for the proposed settlement, was mainly engaged in dealings with Te Rauparaha, one of the most influential chiefs of the lower North Island. Scholarship indicates that Wakefield either ignored or was misled about the powers and ownership rights of other hapū and iwi which led to long-lasting effects in terms of questionable land purchases.\footnote{Patricia Burns, \textit{Te Rauparaha: A New Perspective} (Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1980). p.188 and p.199} Only three months after the Wakefieldian delegation set foot in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the Tory anchored for the first time in Pito-one[Petone]. By the end of that month, William Wakefield thought he had purchased vast amounts of land from Māori, with disregard for the difficult ownership situation. This land was meant to be promptly surveyed and cleared of bush to establish the first New Zealand Company settlement: Britannia [later named Port Nicholson, and finally Wellington].\footnote{Turnbull, \textit{The New Zealand Bubble: The Wakefield Theory in Practice}. p.13} However, the situation became far more complex.

The first New Zealand Company settlement was situated on the shore at Pito-one.\footnote{Pito-one is the old Māori spelling.} Susan Butterworth has explored the records of these first attempts in detail.\footnote{Butterworth, \textit{Petone: A History}.} The settlers landed in 1840 at the foreshore of Pito-one and established the first Pākehā community near the pā. Thousands of settlers arrived in a short period of time: the Aurora on 22nd January; the Oriental on 31st January and the Duke of Roxburgh on 8th February, the Bengal Merchant on 20th February, and the Adelaide and Glenbervie on 7th March 1840.\footnote{Burns and eds., \textit{Fatal Success: A History of the New Zealand Company}. p.128} By June 1840 over 1500 new immigrants had landed on shore and were competing to establish their new life.\footnote{Tonk, "'A Difficult and Complicated Question': The New Zealand Company’s Wellington, Port Nicholson Claim." p.45}

The new arrivals, full of hope and excitement, as shown in their diaries, soon realised that life was not as easy and plentiful as had been promoted by the Company. While they had wished for a \textit{Land of Milk and Honey}, what welcomed them was cold and rainy weather, thick bush and no preparations whatsoever for settlement. There was no shelter, and most of the food comprised either insignificant leftovers from the sea journey, or needed to be bought from Māori. There was no sign of the promised surveyed land sections, and no visible organisation
of law and order; this was a most challenging start, with no sign of the promised Land of Plenty. To make things worse, and to their dismay, the settlers of the first wave found out the hard way that the selected region near the Hutt River mouth was not ideal for settlement. Butterworth and others have discussed how the Petone region was prone to serious flooding, which had consequences for the planning and establishment of the settlement, forcing the surveyors to look for other solutions, away from the fertile and flat river banks. Pressure from settlers resulted in the move of the settlement to the side of the harbour, Thorndon Flat, a place slightly above sea level, with no large river nearby. As will be shown later, this shift led to the emergence of tension between the first colonists and tangata whenua, because this new land had not been allocated by Māori for white settlement.

In general, at first, local Māori in and around Pito-one and Wellington Harbour welcomed the settlers warmly and were more than willing to share their land. Māori hoped for trading opportunities and protection from other rival iwi in the politically unstable times at the end of the Musket Wars, and hoped to create alliances. Māori had been trading with the Pākehā at different places around Aotearoa for a considerable time before the arrival of settlers, and knew what goods they had to offer and how this could benefit Māori.

Consequently, relations between the first colonists and local Māori, led by the local Pito-one chief Te Puni, were very good, even though he and Te Wharepouri, living at Ngauranga at that time, were shocked by the number of white people ‘invading’ the land. Jerningham Wakefield tells us about Māori reaction on the Pākehā ‘invasion’:

Wharepouri came to Colonel Wakefield’s Hutt in the morning, and showed him the war canoes hauled down the water’s edge ready for launching, in front of Pito-one. Upon being asked his meanings, he said he was come to bid farewell. ‘We are going’, he said ‘to our old habitation at Taranaki. I know that we sold you the land, and that no more white people have come to take it than you told me. But I thought you were telling lies, and that you had not so many followers’.

Although curious about the settlers and the new things they brought to Aotearoa, Māori felt overrun by the number of people entering the country; they felt ill-prepared for what was
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happening to their land, culture, and way of living. Michael King has pointed out that Māori oratory of this time contained significant use of a proverb that describes the contamination of fresh water by salty water that, in a metaphoric way, expressed the feeling of loss and infiltration by another culture.\textsuperscript{274} Also, Ranginui Walker argues that Māori felt overwhelmed by the ‘Pākehā invasion’ and were bewildered by the long-term effects on their culture.\textsuperscript{275}

Nevertheless, frequent descriptions in the settlers’ diaries show Māori as helpful to the poorly-equipped immigrants. Initially, Māori supplied settlers with food and helped to build shelters and unload their ships. Butterworth suggests that Māori did this because they saw the settlers as a buffer between Te Ātiawa, to which Te Puni and Te Wharepouri belonged, and the rival tribes.\textsuperscript{276} Tonk also argues that local Māori around Whanganui ā Tara were hoping to find protection against Ngati Raukawa of Otaki, who were under the leadership of Te Rauparaha. Tonk also emphasises the aforementioned interest in the trade and wealth Pākehā could bring to the tribes near the settlement.\textsuperscript{277}

Initially Māori were willing to sell land to Pākehā. However, this apparent willingness resulted from a different understanding of land ownership. This understanding has become a strong focus in historiographical literature in recent years.\textsuperscript{278} Several Waitangi Tribunal claims and reports, in particular Anne Parsonson’s work on Taranaki,\textsuperscript{279} note that indigenous understanding of land was different to that of the British colonists: for Māori, land could not be given away indefinitely. Patricia Berwick’s report on the different concepts of land ownership of Māori and Pākehā outlines clearly that land was given to live on and was under communal ownership: boundaries could change, and the concept of tapu secured resources even on land allotted for occupation. Land built connection to the ancestors and was of spiritual importance, a concept totally foreign to the British.\textsuperscript{280}

\textsuperscript{274} King, Nga Iwi O Te Motu: 1000 Years of Maori History. p.36
\textsuperscript{275} Walker, Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without End. pp.99-116
\textsuperscript{276} Butterworth, Petone: A History. p.21ff.
\textsuperscript{277} Tonk, "A Difficult and Complicated Question": The New Zealand Company’s Wellington, Port Nicholson Claim."
\textsuperscript{278} Orange, The Treaty of Waitangi.
\textsuperscript{279} Waitangi Tribunal, "Wai 145 Report on the Wellington District- Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ono Takiwa."
\textsuperscript{279} Parsonson, "Wai 143 A1 Land and Conflict in Taranaki, 1839-1859- Nga Whenua Tautohetohe O Taranaki; Revision of Report No.1 to the Waitangi Tribunal: 'The Purchase of Maori Land in Taranaki, 1839-59'."
The idea of manaakitanga as part of Māori tikanga may partly explain the positive interactions with Pākehā and the help offered from the Māori side. However, as it will become apparent in the upcoming discourse, the emergence of a difficult situation between settlers and Māori surrounding the question of land ownership, contributed to the weakening and destruction of the positive space of interaction, the *Middle Ground*.

As indicated previously, initial problems and increasingly tense interactions started the moment Wellington settlers left the space allocated to them by Māori in order create the new settlement at Thorndon Flat. From the outset there was heated debate about land that led to uneasiness amongst settlers, who had been promised an unrealistic concept of settlement. Conflict intensified, the land acquisition expanded and both Māori and settlers felt the effects of the limited availability of flat and fertile land.

Not all settlers shifted away from Petone, but with the move of many to the new location, what had been a very close settler community was now divided and spread over a wider area. Moreover, Māori of the local pā, Te Aro, Pipitea, Kumutoto and Tiakiwai, insisted that Thorndon Flat, the flat and fertile land around Lambton, had never been sold and that the settlers should go back to their allocated land, i.e. to Petone. To make the situation more delicate, Māori pulled out the survey stakes with which British settlers had marked their territory in order to make a stronger statement. Hence, the initially positive Māori-Settler relations became increasingly disrupted. Due to the New Zealand Company activities, Māori land diminished from an original 600 acres in the Wellington region to only 100 acres within a couple of years of the establishment of the settlement. This was a significant loss for tangata whenua, but a huge gain for the New Zealand Company.

In order to finally enable the settlement of Wellington and the commencement of building on the new site, Tonk notes that Colonel Wakefield was approached directly by local chiefs and required to make extra payments, in the form of blankets, and also countless good words.

From the very start, the New Zealand Company officials, particularly Wakefield, knew they were breaching the agreement and occupying land that had not been allocated to them.
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Consequently, conflicts about land and land ownership arose and persisted, lying like a shadow over the settlers and settlements. These conflicts were to have a significant impact on New Zealand Company policies and on race relations for the following 120 years.

Port Nicholson or Wellington, as it is we now called, was not only the first New Zealand Company settlement under the scheme of ‘systematic colonisation’ but also the first fully planned settlement in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{284} Intended to be a role model for the new method of colonisation, it aimed to realise Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s dream of a better society in the Antipodes. The New Zealand Company anticipated that Port Nicholson, with such a central location, would become the new Capital. It did not. Wellington, an independent colony for the first five months of 1840, was absorbed into British sovereignty and stood under the ‘protection’ of William Hobson when New Zealand was annexed.\textsuperscript{285} The Governor declared Auckland as the Capital for the new colony where it remained from 1840—1865. And even with the move of the Capital to Wellington in 1865 the dream of an independent, Company-owned ‘Paradise of the South Seas’ was never realised, and settlers never found what they had been promised.

The colonists of Port Nicholson/Wellington faced a variety of challenges. As with all pioneers, they started their settlement with only the supplies they had brought with them. In the case of New Zealand, this point is of significance, because the settlers arrived here under the assistance scheme of the New Zealand Company, which promised them preparation and support. However, for most settlers this assistance fell short and initial housing and food was very limited. In particular, the settlers of the first wave were devastated by the reality: those settling around Wanganui ā Tara were undermined by the flooding of the Hutt River, and having to shift the settlement ruined all they had already worked for.

Overall, settlers were very disappointed in the Wellington region and its lack of agricultural opportunities. The delays in the survey process as well as the scarcity of the promised fertile and flat land were gravely unsatisfactory. Those who started clearing the bush on the steep hills quickly realised that their seeds would be washed away by the heavy rain; with them went their hopes and dreams. Given the geography of the harbour region, it was no wonder that only a few agricultural labourers settled permanently. Wellington was mainly dominated by upper-class settlers, trades people, and servants, rather than farmers, producing a different social structure from the other early settlements. Chris Cochran argues that most farmers
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tried their luck in the Hutt Valley and later in the Wairarapa, which was a long way from the port at a time when transport was mostly by foot or ox, and eventually by horse. However, people were willing to take this risk. Nevertheless, moving away from the main settlement resulted in an imbalance in the social mix of people eg. between working class and upper class the sexes and families verses singles; this fact was completely underestimated by the Company and one that contradicted the whole idea of ‘systematic colonisation’. This mobility of the early settlers provides a possible answer as to why the number of private settler records in the 1840s and 1850s varied so widely across sources from the later settlements of Nelson and New Plymouth. Settlers simply moved to other destinations and did not stay at their arrival destination.

Serious conflicts shocked the young settlement early on. In 1843, the effects of the Wairau incident in Nelson resulted in great uneasiness amongst the British, as will be illustrated in more depth further in this discussion. They feared that Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata, sitting on their doorstep, would attack the Wellington settlement in revenge for losses in the Wairau. Settlers prepared with military drills, and some even left their homes and moved to places they deemed safer, such as Australia or Auckland. Unease was further fuelled by conflicts over local land purchases, in Taita, Boulcott’s Farm, Pauatahunui, and the Hutt Valley.

Following the conflict in Wairau in 1843, the settlers of Wellington talked themselves into a state of war that, in reality, never really happened. In a state of panic, they armed the whole settlement and made allies with Te Ātiawa and some Ngati Toa to find further protection. However, good relations became more and more strained and the interaction between Māori and Pākehā became less convivial from 1847 onwards. The number of settlers steadily increased, while Māori lost their home grounds. Whereas the Māori population remained fairly constant during the first ten years of Pākehā settlement, from around 800 in 1840 to 745 in 1850, the settler population increased from 1200 to over 5000 by 1850, which had a considerable impact on the balance of power in the region.

Race relations became increasingly tense with years of suppression of Māori land claims, destruction of Māori gardens, and trespassing onto Māori urupa. In 1846, the already
troublesome question about rightful landownership, and the pushing out of Māori from their ancestral lands, exploded into a violent outbreak in the Hutt Valley, called the ‘Hutt Wars’. Governor Grey and his army fought against Māori about the taken land, and, following the British victory at Boulcott’s Farm, Māori finally retreated,\textsuperscript{291} an interesting episode in Māori-Settler interaction that will be explored in more depth later on.

With the arrival of the New Zealand Company, the Wellington region underwent major changes. While Māori were still in a dominant position in 1840, and although they had lost ground over the years as the settler population increased, the strong presence of Pākehā created space for long-term cultural interactions. Pākehā settled in a land that was new to them. There was a lot to learn, explore and understand. A new society needed to be built. Māori, as the Indigenous People of Aotearoa/New Zealand, played a significant part in this phase, which inevitably led to the creation of a Middle Ground.

4.2 Settler - Māori Interactions

As mentioned earlier in this discourse, Wellington was the first New Zealand Company settlement in New Zealand. Booster strategies were successful, and shipload after shipload of settlers arrived. The expectation of a \textit{Land of Milk and Honey} was great and the disappointment was even greater. One of the most prominent early settlers of Wellington, John Plimmer, commented on his disillusionment:

\begin{quote}
But, alas how grievously were we disappointed on our arrival. There were beautiful trees descending to the water’s edge, the hills were green, the climate delightful, and the bay a splendid sheet of water. But the hills and valleys were covered with primeval forest. What little level land there was, was overgrown with fern and flax, except here and there where the Maories [sic] had cleared a spot to plant their corn and potatoes. Instead of the Eden of our immigration the wild and stern reality lay before us, and we were here to do the best we could with it.\textsuperscript{292}
\end{quote}

It was a time of hardship but also of a new start. The feeling of betrayal by the New Zealand Company ran deep. Thomas Parkinson commented in his journal that “the advantages of New Zealand have been highly exaggerated.”\textsuperscript{293} In addition, Lieutenant John Wood recalled: “The passengers were all on deck straining their eyes to catch a glimpse of civilisation. Little was said, though disappointment was visible on the countenance of everyone.”\textsuperscript{294}
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On the other hand, some settlers, like Donald Gollan, were willing to take the challenge, and reflected during the voyage on how difficult the new world would be:

I felt that I was about being transferred from one world to another, that my life was now entirely at the mercy of the wind & waves, that the past part of my life was a mere dream, that I was part departing from my fatherland to begin the world anew among strangers and wild savage tribes.

Gollan clearly knew that hardship awaited him and everything would be new and strange. He also knew about Māori, ‘the wild savage tribes’ as he called them. However, using the language of superior power, he also expressed fear and uncertainty about the wilderness and savages, a feeling that that most settlers probably shared.

### 4.3 First experiences

Unlike Gollan, most of his fellow cabin passengers were full of excitement about encountering the ‘frontier’ and the ‘savage’ that had been described so many times in the booster literature. Women in particular showed strong interest in, and curiosity about, the new world and Māori. Mary Ann Eleanor Petre, wife of one of the New Zealand Company officials, Henry William Petre, wrote in her diary in 1842 after her arrival on shore about her anxiety to see a Māori:

I was anxious at once to see a native. However I would willingly have dispensed with the manner in which my curiosity was gratified...I heard a strange noise at the window which came from a sort of man old and hideous. He wore two hats full of streamers of coloured ribbons and feathers, he was much tattooed and also had his face stuck with red and yellow wafers and large shark teeth in his ears. His dress was only a blanket looped over one shoulder. I went up to the open window and spoke kindly to him. He was pleased and held forth his hands chirping to me as if I were a bird.

The new settlement was a place of exploration, and what better way to explore than with a good friend? Mary Ann Petre and ‘Mrs Wakefield’, Emily Sidney, became close friends and shared their curiosity about the new country as well as about Māori. Almost immediately after their arrival, both women wearied of the little settlement, already well established by 1842, and made their way into the surroundings of Karori. Mary Ann Petre wrote:

I also saw Mr. Wills, my native friend of yesterday who I find a little mad. Appeared at luncheon to show us a paper some one [sic] in the town had pinned on his back saying he was for sale. We
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were anxious for him to go always but he was not so inclined and squatting down quietly went to
sleep for an hour.\textsuperscript{297}

Picturing the situation of two ladies of the British upper class, their bodies pressed into shape
by corsets, wearing wide skirts and dresses, wandering around in the bush all alone: For them,
this was indeed a strange encounter, and it shows how worlds collided. This was a situation
entirely impossible in the Mother Country, but here in their new home, these ladies felt
comfortable on their own without male companionship and doing something adventurous, to
the extent of talking to ‘a savage’. The words that Mary Ann Petre uses indicate a positive
perception of Māori. She entitles her Māori acquaintance “Mr,” and uses the word ‘friend’
rather than talking about a ‘savage’. Nevertheless, she was anxious and wanted him to go
away, regarding him as “a little mad”. Her description vouches for her curiosity and willingness
to engage with ‘the other’ but also reflects her uncertainty.

Mary Ann Petre’s description of going for walks, alone or with her friend, echoes the new
possibilities for women of the upper and middle classes to act independently in the New
World. Alongside the private sphere, in which Mary Ann Petre was accustomed to act, it was
now possible for her, for example, to visit a pā without male companionship, and explore the
new country on her own.\textsuperscript{298} These adventures were so significant for her that she carefully
noted them all down. Her diary gives us significant insight into the role of these early women
of the upper class, the earliest days of Wellington, and interactions with Māori.

Raewyn Dalziel pointed out that the traditional Victorian roles of women needed to adapt to
the New Zealand conditions at the ‘frontier’. She concluded that “the colonial environment
opened new doors.”\textsuperscript{299} These settler women, like Mary Ann Petre, embraced the new
opportunities and became the ‘helpmeets’ of settler men. Living at the ‘frontier’ pushed
women out of their traditional roles. It becomes evident in plenty of the private records, that
some started their own businesses and contributed to the family income. Others, even those
from the middle classes and unaccustomed to physical work, embraced their roles as
housewives and started actively cooking, washing and farming, while others realised that what
knowledge they had could be used to improve their living conditions or enhance their income
by sewing, reading and writing for people.
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All these female immigrants had in common that their support was essential for successful immigration. Mary Ann Petre can be seen as a representative of these ‘new women,’ who acted independently and showed interest in the new world around them. She seemed entirely fearless of Māori when she visited the pā. Her writings, from Karori in 1842, the year before Wairau, give evidence of positive interactions between Māori and Pākehā.

However, not all new colonists embraced these new opportunities. The first days and months on shore, and the initial encounters with Māori, left a range of impressions on the colonists. Some settlers reported very positively, while others expressed uncertainty. Thomas Wilmot McKenzie wrote in his reminiscences, for example, that Māori welcomed the settlers of the Adelaide with “the wildest demonstration of joy and delight”.

Also full of excitement and pride was John Murray, one of the first settlers to set foot on Pito-one shore. He wrote that he was invited by the son of a chief to leave the Bengal Merchant and join Māori on their canoe to spend some time on shore with them: “They requested me to go ashore with them in their canoe, not having landed I accepted their offer, pleased with the idea of sleeping ashore in New Zealand by native invitation, in the native style, and in the unexceptionable company of the native Aristocracy.”

Murray’s repeated use of the word ‘native’ shows his interest and excitement about the new culture. Seen in the context of British imperialism and colonial attitudes, one could argue that Murray is after the ‘adventure in the wild.’ In the context of decolonisation, Homi Bhabha has argued that racial and sometime racist attitudes and stereotypes provided the dominant culture with a pleasurable experience of the ‘native’. Similar to the previously described female adventures, the Native, the Cannibal, normally seen as threatening, became for Murray an interesting and enjoyable encounter, which sets him apart from his fellow settlers.

F.G. Moore, arriving on the same ship as Murray, recalled about the assistance of Māori:

I noticed the Maories [sic] treated us most kindly giving freely of such provisions as they had and ever ready to assist in the removing of our luggage – and other friendly acts. Their hospitality and aid to the stranger was more remarkable than any I had before seen during my constant travels
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to strange countries and occasional interviews with Aboriginals from my boyhood to 1840, to this
esteem the Maori character and have a friendly feeling.  

As late as 1842, when John Saxton went ashore, he encountered friendly, welcoming Māori. He noted that some Māori, who were fishing, nodded to him and his group in “the most friendly way.”

However, not everyone on the immigrant ships had such positive encounters upon arrival. John Howard Wallace, a passenger on the Aurora, reported in his journal: “Our imagination was excited and we were not certain whether it was not a war canoe full of cannibals, and many of the passengers were contemplating the chance of who should be the first to be cooked.” Playing with stereotypes of Māori as cannibals who might eat the ‘white man’, this statement shows some concern and uncertainty amongst the British about what to expect. Nonetheless, Wallace notes that “friendly relations between the two races were soon established.” These friendly relations, however, did not preclude a certain aversion and shock at the appearance of Māori. For example, William Todd wrote home in 1840: “I must confess I was not much taken with their appearance, the men are tattooed [sic] over the whole face, and the women round the mouth, and some of them a little in the nose also.” The feeling of shock did not end after their arrival. Colonists soon realised that there was still tribal warfare amongst Māori and that they had settled in very unsafe territory with different tribal groups nearby. For most this was unexpected, as none of the earliest booster literature had mentioned this unstable situation. Harriet Langford, one of the settler women who went on adventures in the surrounds of the settlement [similar to Mrs Wakefield and Mrs Petre], appears to have been affected by the fear of Māori warfare amongst the colonists. Nevertheless, she was not worried by the warnings from authorities and kept up with her explorations of the new home country. When she decided to accompany some men to stay overnight away from the settlement in the bush, she was told that “if you see natives, put yourself out of sight and never mind the muskets!” Uneasy, the men armed themselves and patrolled around the tents to prepare for any attack and to protect the women. But they confessed in the end that “there was [not] any danger to be apprehended from the
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natives.” This suggests that settlers often exaggerated their reactions toward the indigenous, likely triggered by stories of horror and cannibalism. The material shows that the threat was felt more strongly than actually found expression.

Māori in and around Wellington had a particular interest in keeping settlers safe in these first months of the settlement. The British brought new trading opportunities to Māori and the mana of the chiefs could be strengthened. It is well-established that Māori were curious about the settlers and had been hoping to participate in the wealth they appeared to bring. With their knowledge of resources and the land, Māori were naturally in a very strong position relative to the settlers, who had just arrived and needed support to sustain themselves. This initially strong position of the Indigenous People and their friendly encounters with Colonisers, was part of the initial contact when the Coloniser enters the common space or Middle Ground.

4.4 Help of Māori

As the Waitangi Tribunal report for Wellington pointed out, it would have been impossible for the New Zealand Company to establish a settlement at Wanganui ā Tara so quickly and so successfully if Māori had not helped the badly-equipped settlers.

Diaries and letters tell how Wakefield used Māori as messengers to direct the arriving ships to Wellington. Upon arrival at their destination, help was required to unload the ships, organise shelter and provide food. John Miller argues that in the 1840s Māori helped the settlers in their first confusion on shore. Settlers frequently report that Māori offered assistance and emphasise how essential that help was in learning about and adapting to the new land, climate and nature.

James Dent Greenwood was one of the few immigrants who was happy with the New Zealand Company preparations and, after some days ashore, reported in his diary how Māori had helped to establish the settlement: “I may here mention that the natives build very good houses at a very trifling cost.” Like Greenwood, a significant number of settlers reported that Māori had constructed whares for the colonists. Rarely discussed was the cost of these
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buildings or the time spent building them. Nevertheless, indirect references suggest that in the 1840s Māori desired payment in goods rather than in money. This changed over time. By the late 1850s Māori desire to obtain European products had been satisfied and money offered the opportunity to buy what was needed rather than searching for someone willing to trade the right goods. Thomas Kempton, for example, informed his family back home that when he paid Māori, he “gave them each a shirt for payment which they call hoot [sic] they were very pleased at the price for at this time there were many of them went naked and very Savage in their appearance.”

William Bertram White also recalled in his reminiscences how he paid a whole Māori group working for him in tobacco for the men and assorted presents for the women and that he “was declared to be a real Rangi tīrā [sic].” Different patterns in regards to payment will become apparent in the other case studies.

One of the priorities in establishing the town was building houses. It was a shock for most of the settlers that the New Zealand Company had not prepared even the most basic accommodation. Mary Ann Kempton recalled her first thoughts upon arrival: “Where on earth do people live? … that trip remains only as blur in my memory but I do remember how hard the men worked to build us a ti-tree [sic] whare there amongst the ferns and trees.” Some settlers employed Māori to put up a whare for them and their families, and some, like Thomas Kempton, welcomed help from Māori to learn about new building materials. Thomas Kempton reports in full confidence: “On our arrival here we met the greatest friendship from the natives …. We were comfortable [sic] settled in our house which I build [sic] of clay and wood and long grass for thatch with the help of 2 natives.” Shelter was essential during the first months on shore, since winter was approaching by the time the last settlers arrived in June. Men, women and children needed a safe place to live, and their belongings needed secure storage. This pressing need made the assistance of Māori even more welcome and helped to establish a friendly relationship from the settlers’ side. During the building process, bonds were forged, and ‘the other’, whether settler or Māori, could be observed from a safe distance. Friendly and helpful encounters were possible, and exchanges of goods and knowledge began to form the substance of the Middle Ground.

Harriet Langford gave a very special example of the assistance of Māori in the early days of the Petone settlement. She reported that Māori men, and especially women, came to the aid of a
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boat that was in distress and tried to rescue some men from the waves. Māori joined Pākehā at the burial of the victims and grieved at the loss of life, even though only settlers died in this tragic accident. Here we can see the two peoples joined together in the Middle Ground; sharing respect, feelings, and help, and further establishing a strong base for trust.

As already outlined, the settlers were unhappy about the lack of support from the New Zealand Company. Edward Betts Hopper, like most of the other settlers in these early days, expressed his disappointment about the New Zealand Company’s lack of preparation and his concerns about the ‘Natives’ who “would probably plunder if not murder us.” However, he went on to explain: “The cannibal natives, the very mentioning of whom create such terror to many of our friends in England are a fine race of beings but so far from being forced to kill and eat us they do everything they can to insure our safety...”

Hopper provides testament to how thankful settlers were for the help of Māori and the way in which the new settlers gained the trust of specific tribal people around them. Hopper spoke highly of Māori and how trustworthy he found them. He reported that once, when in need of food, he had given a Māori his musket and asked him to bring him a bird. Never really believing to see his gun ever again, he was proven wrong when the man came back with the gun and two fat birds for dinner. Hopper concluded in full confidence that: “I had never seen this Native before but I had so strong the confidence that if you threw off all suspicion of them the confidence would not be abused.”

Trust, as illustrated in the previous examples, needed to be established, and for most settlers there was no choice but to rely on Māori. Māori could have taken goods from the ill-equipped and over-extended settlers, but, as the wife of William Blandford, Ann Elizabeth, remembers about the goods landed on shore: “the Maories tabooed them and not anything was touched by them, such was their feeling of honesty.” The sources indicate that such experiences were essential for the first wave of Wellington settlers to build their trust in Māori and to enter into the Middle Ground.
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320 Langford, “Our Early Days in New Zealand.” p.4
322 Ibid. p.3
323 Ibid. p.4
In contrast, by 1843 the settler perception of Māori seems to have changed. John Seals Bird, informing his sister back home about his progress, notes: “It is by no means safe to leave anything in the unprotected state during the day, of which I had an unfortunate proof by their [sic Māori] carry[ing] away all bread one week, while I was at work at a little distance...”\(^{325}\)

Further, he outlines the developing tensions over the land problem in the Hutt Valley and Wairau Valley near Nelson and the consequent need for more military in town. According to his assessment there was more and more trouble and uncertainty regarding Māori. As will be outline in more depth later, a weakening of the *Middle Ground* in Wellington appeared as a result of the conflict in the Hutt Valley and, most prominently, Wairau.

During the mid-1840s, a more tense relationship had begun to develop between the two peoples. This was potentially the beginning of the destruction of the *Middle Ground* in Wellington. The same impression is apparent in the writings of Charles Johnson Pharazyn in 1846 who wrote in his diary: “... and here we are after a period of more than five years since we left England actually in the situation of immigrants arriving in a new settlement but far more secluded, having no society whatever and much annoyed by natives.” In the following month he continued: “busily employed in bringing up goods from the beach, unpacking goods, paying Maories for the ware [sic] and receiving visits from them to our great annoyance and inconvenience as well as hindrance.”\(^{326}\) Ann Parsonson states that the Wairau affair led to fear and distrust amongst settlers towards Māori and that the settlements were in a state of alarm from 1843 onward.\(^{327}\) Parsonson’s statement is supported by the primary material consulted. Nevertheless, multi-causal influences and events, as soon will be evident, contributed to the establishment as well as the weakening and conclusive destruction of the *Middle Ground* in Wellington. Trust and help from Māori, as shown, contributed significantly to initial establishment of positive relationships and the *Middle Ground*, which ultimately resulted in a mutual trade relationship, another important factor of contact in the zone of interaction.

### 4.5 Trade with Māori

From the Pākehā perspective, it was trade, in particular, that made it possible to establish the Petone and Port Nicholson settlements and enable them to survive the first years in the new
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country. For Māori, trade with Pākehā provided increased mana, protection from potentially hostile hapū and iwi, and, possibly, a better lifestyle." This mutually beneficial trading relationship started even before the settlers landed. With the arrival of the first ships, Thomas Kempton reported: “The natives came on board with Pigs and Potatoes and sold them very cheap ...” Nearly every privately written settler record examined for this project mentions trade with Māori. Trade also is a common theme throughout historical New Zealand literature, which emphasises the importance of this aspect of encounter.

Trade was essential to enable Pākehā to establish a viable settlement. Susannah Wall, for instance, wrote to her sister in 1842 about the difficult nature of the business of farming. She and her husband bought all their potatoes from Māori, a necessary arrangement in order to have a sufficient food supply. The Walls lived on Porirua Road, and Susannah Walls’ description to her sister gives a fascinating impression of the scale of trade between colonists and Māori. She wrote:

I keep beds and refreshment for travellers there is a good deal of passing at the seasons of the year the natives are daily passing and repassing they bring their pigs and potatoes from different parts of the country a distance of two or three hundred miles that native men and women carry their potatoes for the purpose they are very naked and frightful looking but they are quiet and inoffensive.

Jim McAloon has pointed out that trade between Māori and settlers happened on a large scale, over long distances and in large quantities. From the description above, it becomes apparent that a stream of goods flowed to Wellington along the main road from the fertile and sunny Māori vegetable grounds on the Kapiti Coast to be traded with the British. Paul Monin argued that Māori became the main suppliers of food and fish in the Wellington region of the 1840s. He notes that in exchange Māori acquired a variety of goods and that “in the 1840s and 1850s Maori were large-scale consumers of European manufactures.”

Trade with Māori changed over time. It was not always consistent and in some instances the situations of exchange might seem confusing. John Hemery, the Captain of the Bengal
Merchant that landed in 1840, wrote a journal for his children. He recorded not only his thoughts but also very detailed descriptions of the new land and its customs. In regard to resources and trade he reported that he had shot some pigeons and a pig, unaware that these resources belonged to Māori. Māori, when they found out about this hunt, made him pay for the shoot and even took the pig from him, since they regarded it as their resource, and forbidden to Pākehā.

It is not clear whether this was an isolated incident or whether resources were reclaimed or ‘stolen’ from Pākehā more frequently. Nevertheless, this example provides an insight into how Māori understood their rights about land and food sources. Particularly during the initial years of Pākehā settlement, Māori were in charge, and to Māori understanding it was their land from which settlers were robbing resources. Over 100 years later, Māori ownership of resources was finally recognised in the WAI 262 Waitangi Tribunal claim, which outlined clearly the strong cultural beliefs about land and resources that form part of Māori identity, and land and resources that have been used so many times without consent.

Trade was not always without complications. William Bertram White recorded in great detail his reminiscences of trade which, in some form or another, must have reflected the experiences of various other settlers as well. Already well equipped with pigs, White was offered a pig by a Māori woman. He refused to buy it but she insisted on selling, because she had her eye on a blanket. In the end, White gave in, and the trade was concluded. One week later, the woman and her husband returned, complaining that the blanket she had received was not new. Since, “according to the current price, the blanket was worth about three pigs,” White declined to return the pig. The Māori man insisted on taking the pig back and ended up wrestling with White, while the Māori woman made her way into White’s house and ran out with her arms full of new blankets. White then ran after the woman, who fell down tangled up in the blankets. In the end, everybody was laughing. White kept his blankets but gave the couple some tobacco and a pipe. He relates: “When I went out thinking I’d give them a good scolding, I found them so genial and half sorry and half jolly, that we made friends, I gave them each a fig of tobacco and a pipe and away they went. I never saw them again.”
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He concludes: “It was one of the little tricks the natives were found of practising in those days, trying to get the better of you.”\footnote{Ibid. p.23} This example illustrates how each party’s understanding of trade differed and how different cultural worlds impacted on each other. Walking into someone’s house without an invitation was unthinkable in Pākehā society but seems to have been acceptable in a Māori world of communal living. Also, the phrase ‘little tricks’ indicates different cultural understandings of trade and perhaps miscommunication between the trading partners. Further research into the ‘lived reality’ of trade could provide a deeper understanding of such misunderstandings and differences; however, this cannot be explored in this thesis which aims to focus on the \textit{Middle Ground}.

The prices for trade items varied considerably in those early days of settlement. In most available records, there is only a measurable price for trading within the Pākehā community and it can only be speculated how much was given to Māori for their supplies. The difficulties lie, on the one hand, in the different value of things held by different people and, on the other hand, simply in the non-recording of the exact exchange. Some people may have been better negotiators than others, or they may simply have possessed more desirable products, which would have influenced the price significantly. Māori did not necessarily operate on a cash economy, especially in the initial stages when settlers arrived. Thus, Mary Frederica Marshall records in her diary: “I heard today that the natives always ask for food; ki ki \footnote{Mary Frederica Marshall, “Journal of a Voyage to New Zealand in the Barque Jane,” (Port Nicholson: ATL, qms-1336, 1840-1841), p.49} [sic kai?], in exchange for everything even in preference to money.”\footnote{Ibid. p.23} Goods had a much higher value for Māori in those early days. Later, the demand changed and settlers could not bargain as easily. Money became the desired payment. Māori had gained enough experience with British society to understand the different values of things and how to negotiate to make a bargain.

From a Pākehā perspective, we can see that over time the settlers became better equipped with European products and with the influx of more ships and settlers became more self-sufficient. In Wellington we can see that trade with Māori declined in importance whereas in other areas, particularly New Plymouth, settlers relied on Māori much longer. The growing independence of settlers from relying on Māori produce resulted, as observed by Monin, in most of the economic power shifting to Pākehā.\footnote{Monin, “Maori Economies and Colonial Capitalism.”} In consequence, this transfer of power destabilised the contact zone over time.
4.6 Language adoption

Trading between Māori and the British settlers required a basic language. To be successful as a trader, an understanding of language was essential, and this applied to both settlers and Māori. From a settler perspective, there would have been an advantage in speaking the indigenous language, te reo Māori, since Wellington settlers relied entirely on Māori for the first year of settlement. From an Indigenous People’s viewpoint, the motivation to learn the other language lay in the vast opportunity such knowledge provided: a way of gaining new products and increased mana. Māori had been engaging in trade with whalers, sealers, and flax traders long before the settlers arrived in 1840. Thus, for some, English was a language previously encountered, and successful trade practices had already been experienced. This prior knowledge of language and British culture probably accelerated trade between the peoples from the 1840s onwards in the Wellington region, and also increased the usage of both te reo Māori and English.

The diaries and letters of Wellington settlers show that British women adapted very quickly to the Māori language. Susannah Wall had plenty of Māori visitors and traders stopping at her house. She wrote in a letter to her sister how well she had already accustomed to Māori:

\[\text{I can talk the native language pretty well so as I can be able to understand them and make a bargain with them I have a good deal of trade with them at times I get blankits [sic] and different articles of clothing and bartur [sic] with them for pigs and some times [sic] I make pretty good bargains but they are getting every day more knowing.}\]

Beyond simply informing us that Māori had adjusted to the new market and quickly learned the value of products, Susannah Wall presents us with an example of the new type of self-confident woman, the woman of the urban frontier. In nineteen months on shore, she adapted to her new life and learned the new language well enough to be able to trade and engage on a regular basis with Māori. She seems to have been the contact point for people travelling to or from the Kapiti Coast, and her house turned into a space for the lived Middle Ground, as a place for language and cultural exchange defined by mutual interest and need.

Settler testimony provides conflicting evidence about the use of English by Māori in Wellington. In Sarah Stephens’ first letter home to her sister in 1842, she describes her landing in Wellington and her curiosity about Māori. She notes that many Māori men “say and
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understand many English words and are fond of having a chat in their way.\textsuperscript{344} In contrast, Donald Gollan commented in his letter in 1841: “They [Māori] have in this part acquired but a very little of the English language. Many of the white people however speak their language [which refers to te reo]...”\textsuperscript{345} It is difficult to say to what extent Māori adopted the English language, but, as previously pointed out, contact with the missionaries and a long history of trade and whaling stations around Wellington must have led to some language adoption. Moon and O’Malley show that, especially in the north of New Zealand, visits in pre-Treaty times by traders and missionaries introduced Māori to the English language.\textsuperscript{346} The Wellington region had fewer missionaries than the north, but whaling and seal hunting provided early opportunities for contact between Māori and Pākehā. Starting in 1840, the sudden influx of thousands of settlers in a relatively short time created an even stronger presence of the English language around Whanganui ā Tara.

Most settler records show the frequent use of the word \textit{whare} [which could be spelled in different ways] as a word for all sorts of shelter. \textit{Whare} is used in a Pākehā context as well in the context of a Māori pā. Grahame Todd, for example, writes home in 1840 of settling “further off the beach where we have now got a warry [sic]...” And he concludes: “…the warry [sic] is divided into three apartments, with a small window in each, it is not very comfortable at present, this being winter here and the morning and evening rather cold.”\textsuperscript{347}

Housing, as already discussed in regard to the help from Māori, was essential for the new arrivals. Consequently, the word for house, \textit{whare}, was very useful and easy to learn since it was Māori who provided help in building shelter. Considering the evidence, shelter was one of the first opportunities for personal contact between settlers and Indigenous People. In most cases, building houses was left to the settlers themselves and the New Zealand Company took only very limited responsibility. Therefore settlers needed to engage personally with Māori to find suitable builders, negotiate prices and make sure of an agreement and understanding, for which language was essential.

In addition to \textit{whare}, the word \textit{kai} [food, also with a variety of spellings] was common in settler language. Like shelter, food was essential. As previously shown, in their initial encounter with the ships in Wellington Harbour, Māori brought food on board and were very
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keen to welcome and trade with the new people. After months at sea and running low on nutritional supplies, the British had a serious interest in fresh products, and everyone was keen to trade. Kai, the Māori word for food, was very worthwhile and could be learned easily.

As well as words that needed to be learned quickly to communicate basic needs, the sources show that, upon landing, the new settlers were fascinated by the new flora and fauna around them. The personal records show a frequent use of Māori names for birds and plants: riroriro, Huia, Tui and Kereru to name just a few.348 This interest in nature was especially noticeable amongst the more educated and wealthier cabin passengers who used the time on board to familiarise themselves with the new flora and fauna by reading James Cook’s reports about the South Pacific and, later, for example, the publications by Dieffenbach.349 Also the booster literature referred to nature and geography in great detail and gave Māori as well as English names for species and places. Some publications had pictures, making it easier to recognise the species upon arrival. In other cases, Māori directly introduced the first-wave settlers to birds and plants as soon as they arrived. In addition, during their stays on the pā, settlers quickly acquired even more new words for the things around them – a finding that becomes particularly apparent in sources that developed over a considerable time frame. Next to nature-related and essential terms, words expressing the positive interaction also found their way into settler writing. Ka pai, which translates as ‘good’ [in the sense of ‘well done’, having done something good’] is well represented in the consulted material. In her 1840/1841 journal, Mary Frederica Marshall noted the importance of using ka pai when interacting with Māori: “… it is always thought necessary to admire anything they have on which may be new, say O kapi [sic] (car- pie pronounced) when you want them to make haste you say, Wapi Nap [sic]…. “350 Mary Marshall appears reasonably confident in her language skills given that she even hints at the correct pronunciation. Her understanding about how to interact with Māori also implies that she had close and regular contact, which further supports the existence of a Middle Ground.

As time progressed, the use of te reo Māori increased throughout letters and diaries of the settlers in Wellington. For some colonists ‘native language’, te reo Māori, was integrated into everyday language. The diary of Mary Ann Eleanor Petre, wife of New Zealand Company officer Henry Petre, offers an intriguing view of its use. In her detailed diary, covering the years 1841-1844, Mary Ann Petre shows the adoption of language and over time uses
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progressively more Māori words. These words substitute simple English terms, as in the examples given above, and this presumably reflected strong usage in daily language.351

Similarly, Rhonda Carleton Coote, a woman who had extensive contact with Māori, wrote in the 1850s in her diary: “At every village we passed we were joined by other canoes all going to the hui or meeting for which we were bound…”352 Hui; the word for meeting or gathering sits totally naturally in this example. Rhonda Coote could have used the English term but she decided not to do so. Was hui the term that came naturally to her mind when she was writing this? If so, this indicates that the word must have been part of her daily language, which would further illustrates how the two cultures influenced each other. However, presuming she had chosen this term carefully, her writing illustrates a deeper understanding Māori language and tikanga; using te reo when acting in a Māori framework demonstrates her understanding of cultural differences to which she has adjusted: a part of the lived Middle Ground.

In conclusion, the evidence presented here shows that the ability to understand and communicate with each other contributed to the establishment of the Middle Ground in Wellington between Māori and Pākehā. The examples given suggest also that language was an essential part of the creation of positive spaces of interaction. Comparisons with the pattern of the Middle Ground in pre-Treaty times in the Northland regions, as shown by O’Malley and Hutton, emphasise this to an even greater extent.353 As discussed above, in Wellington the necessity to engage with Māori forced settlers to find ways of communicating. Communication was essential to enable the British to secure help and undoubtedly there was a strong intertwining connection between the acquisition of language and the exchange of knowledge.

4.7 Knowledge exchange

Knowledge about the natural and cultural environment of Aotearoa was no less a requirement for settling into the new country than that of shelter and food. To establish their settlement, and even to survive, settlers needed to acquire knowledge. Pursuing that knowledge meant substantial interaction with Māori and language acquisition.

351 For further research refer to Petre, “Diary/ Typescript Photocopy of Ms-1772.” She uses te reo, for example, on pages 33, 36, 44, 61, 62, 63pp., 71, 72, 7, 81, 84, 85
Examining what settlers wrote in their letters and diaries provides an insight into what Māori knew about the “white society” and shows how knowledge exchange between the two peoples helped to establish an understanding about each ‘other’. As already shown, there was a strong curiosity on the part of settlers to learn about and from Māori, whilst Māori were also interested in Pākehā products and culture.

The knowledge exchange began while Pākehā were still on the ships, with Māori delivering the message from Wakefield about where to find the settlement. John Howard Wallace reported in his diary on 18 January 1840:

Captain Heale received from the natives who came on board, a note from Colonel Wakefield, the principal agent of the New Zealand Company. He had left Port Hardy about a fortnight on the Tory and the note was not distinctly understood, and the native made signs for some one [sic] to go down what we call the lake – and that they could point out something.  

Māori knowledge and willingness to help were required to find the new settlement, Port Nicholson. As Wallace describes, Māori were not always good English speakers. Nevertheless, the Māori visitors to the Aurora used sign language to help the captain find his way. They shared their knowledge about the Tory and complied with Wakefield’s request to help the arriving ships. Without Māori help, the first settler ships would have had problems finding their destination. No real maps had been distributed at this time, and, at departure, it had been uncertain exactly where the new settlement would be. Māori were essential to overcome these hurdles by passing on information.

In this context it is also interesting to note that Wakefield himself trusted these Māori of Northland to pass on his message. In consequence, the settlers and Captain of the ship believed what they had been told. The strong prejudices towards the indigenous as not being trustworthy and the fear of the unknown were superceded by the determination to find the new home of their dreams.

Shortly after landing, Sarah Stephens had her own encounter with Māori. Sitting with two other ladies in an Inn in Wellington, she reports how Māori showed interest:

Mrs. D. with Mrs. Pointer and myself sitting on chairs and on the floor close by us one of the chiefs with his wife and her sister squatting with their blankets round them .... One of the servants standing by could understand them. We learnt they enquired about our husbands and were much pleased when told where they were. On seeing Mrs. D. with a black dress on they pointed to her and enquired if she had lost her husband and when they were told not they were so pleasant.  

---
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We see the illustration of two worlds colliding: one sitting in chairs in a black dress and the other sitting on the floor wrapped in blankets and cloaks. This example gives evidence about how much Māori had already learned about the ‘English way’. Black, the colour of mourning, and the idea that it would signify the loss of her husband for a British woman, had found its way into the daily knowledge of Māori. Particularly in Wellington, rather than in Nelson and New Plymouth, Māori were part of town life and daily encounters. Here, due to the limited space and the prior occupation of land by Māori, Māori and settlers shared the physical space. Te Aro pā was situated near where we now find Taranaki Street. Paintings, like Charles Heaphy’s 1841 View of a Part of the Town of Wellington, New Zealand, Looking Towards the South East, show how closely the Pākehā settlement surrounded the Māori pā, with Te Aro pā fully integrated into the town space.356

David Hamer pointed out that the people of Wellington were not as welcoming to Māori, as Māori had been to the earliest settlers. He argued that, with the more complex establishment of the settlement, Wellington became seen more and more as an “urban frontier”: a place of progress, modernity and a distinctive kind of European community, in which indigenous people, according to the settlers, did not belong.357 As the settlement expanded, and the initial shock of arrival faded, allowing settlers to regain their confidence in British superiority, they perceived Māori more and more as “in the way” and hindering progress. This perception emerges in the language of some settlers, who called Māori “cannibal-natives” and other phrases that expressed the stereotypes of the lazy Māori and savage.358

Nevertheless, Māori, as shown in the example above, were a huge part of the town life at least until the mid-1840s: firstly, because of the sale of their land and the construction of houses and, secondly, their provision of trade for food and the help they were constantly offering. Furthermore, Māori provided protection for the new settlement in the times of distress and feared attacks.359

As already outlined, the Company took land that belonged to Māori and was occupied by different pā; therefore, it was natural that tangata whenua were present in the newly established settlement. Māori felt attracted by what Europeans had to offer and engaged with

---
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the town for their own needs. Various first-hand accounts tell of Indigenous People being in the streets and belonging to daily life. These towns and houses and pā were the common places where language was needed.

Just as Māori needed to acquire English to navigate the shared space, the settlers needed to learn te reo Māori. Along with the language, they acquired cultural insight. Letters and diaries show that Pākehā developed a complex understanding of the Māori world and its concepts. Charles Johnson Pharazyn reports in his diary about his negotiations with a Māori owner over a dead dog: “I refused to give him any utu but told him to take what he liked which he refused to do.” In this passage, Pharazyn demonstrates that he has grasped the concept of utu – reciprocity or compensation – a concept often misunderstood by Pākehā as simple revenge. Similarly, in 1845 John Seale Bird wrote to his sister about utu as a compensatory payment. The settlers’ use of utu, an abstract and complex concept, indicates close cultural contact and some cultural understanding.

We can only speculate as to how well settlers really understood Māori concepts and tikanga, but it is noticeable that they developed a familiarity with terms, processes, and reactions. For example, the haka, at the beginning of settlement a frightening experience for settlers and an expression of “savage ways,” soon became an accepted and familiar practice. Thus, Thomas Wilmot McKenzie retrospectively describes a haka in great detail and with strong appreciation for the art. When he recollects the haka, using knowledge acquired over the intervening years, he can recognise what has been happening during the performance. This would almost certainly have been impossible for him at the actual moment of the encounter. John Hemery in contrast notes in his diary the most impressive description of a haka at a tangihanga. He reports:

I witnessed a curious scene in a native village the other day. It was a kind of wake for the Chief who was killed, the whole tribe was assembled making the most dreadful noise I ever heard, such as making the most horrid faces, sticking their tongues out of their mouths and barking and growling like wolves. The most awful performance were the women who kept cutting their faces and bodies with shrieks, some of them were one mass of blood all over the body, and I don’t
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think they were four inches of them without a deep gap which they had inflicted with a sharp part of a shell. The sight was most dreadful.  

Hemery’s statement from the 1840s clearly shows that he had no idea of the reasons behind what was, for him, a ‘dreadful’ performance.

More than ten years later, Mary Homeyer visited Wellington and described a tangihanga. Contrasted to Hemery, she shows more acceptance of, and respect for, what she encounters, giving only a rather brief description with some more detailed exceptions. She restrains herself from any interpretation or emotional wording. It is only her curiosity that comes through in the writings about the ‘tangi’ when she notes:

...a curious sight presented itself – they were dressed in their best garb, some had a wreath of green leaves round the head – some flowers – some feathers, as some hanging into their eyes – these are their emblems of mourning they wear them some time after their relation is dead they had lots of color'd [sic] wool or green leaves in their ears – many of them had a hole in their ears along large enough to admit my little finger. They were making their wail in front of the house where the corps was lying...  

After giving a detailed description she concludes: “I think it has altogether a good deal of an eastern character about it.” Once again, this description reveals how quickly Pākehā learned about Māori customs and furnishes another example of an inquisitive woman who engaged with the indigenous culture. Mary Homeyer, as a participant of the Middle Ground, engaged with the nearby pā. She wrote about her experiences and the new things she encountered in a non-judgmental way. Like many others, her curiosity made her willing to engage with ‘the other’, creating a new positive space of interaction.

Māori knowledge and help as part of this positive and supportive space was also vital in regards to the dangers of the new country. As shown by Butterworth, the settlers learned the hard way that Pito-one was prone to flooding, although, as Thomas Wilmor McKenzie recalls in his reminiscences, Māori had warned the settlers beforehand about extensive flooding:

The Maoris had previously told them that they would have to Kau Kau (swim for it) when the flood came; and that the Surveyors were porangi (foolish) for surveying the Hutt for a town, as all the houses would be swept into the sea when the flood came, and the people drowned.

McKenzie, in a fascinating example of how well some settlers adopted the Māori language, was able to give translations to the te reo he uses. Furthermore, his account shows the
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amount of important knowledge Māori shared with the new arrivals. Interestingly, the same warning from Māori about flooding can also be found in a letter from Dr. Grahame Todds to his brother in 1840, where he notes: “…we were told by the natives that the river would soon inundate us – we therefore found ourselves, at the end of three weeks worse off than when we first landed.”

Earthquakes, another shocking discovery for the new arrivals in Aotearoa, were occurrences with which Māori had become familiar. In 1842, George Jones wrote to his parents about Wellington:

This is a bad place for wind and is always blowing harsh either from the northwest or southeast and we frequently feel slight earthquakes but nothing to be offensive of as the natives have told us they have felt them ever since they can remember.

This example shows that the frightening experience of an earthquake had been discussed between settlers and Māori. Māori told settlers that there was nothing to worry about. It brings to mind an image of a distressed colonist community after a jolt that rocked the earth, and the Indigenous People nearby telling them, probably in broken language or signage, not to worry. Close interaction, trust and familiarity must have been well established for this reassurance to take place, which again suggests the existence of a Middle Ground.

As already indicated, settlers knew nothing about the country. Yet their curiosity and desire to make this new land, Aotearoa/New Zealand, their home led people out into the bush, often on extensive travels. A great deal of knowledge was acquired during those journeys. Through such travels, Māori and settlers experienced each other very closely and there was the opportunity for mutual cultural exploration, as well as an explanation of customs from diverse backgrounds. Māori and Pākehā, as shown in the experience of house-building during the earliest days on shore, had the chance to observe each other. Numerous sources show that settlers enjoyed Māori hospitality and often stayed overnight on the pā. For instance, Thomas Parkinson reports that he even stayed in “a hut built by the Chief for the accommodation of visitors.”

In general, travel was possible only with the help of Māori. Māori knew the land, the paths, where accommodation could be found and had canoes to use to cross the waterways. Rhonda Carleton Coote travelled extensively around New Zealand and would have been lost several

---
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times if Māori had not pointed the way. She paints a most romantic picture of travel in a
 canoe and a night on the pā:

Nothing could exceed the enjoyment or interest of this mode of travelling. Weather exquisite,
scenery perfectly beautiful and varied and sitting at perfect ease in the canoe with Mr. Taylor
joking with the natives and telling us legends or true stories of every turn of the river. We
stopped in the middle of the day, and again towards evening for the night, in one of the
numerous Pahs [sic] on this river, most of them having classical names such as Athens, Zion,
London, only much changed by the native spelling and pronouncing. In all the later Pahs [sic]
there are churches and we found that whatever the natives were doing they would cease and go
to the church for service when there was any Missionary of Catchiest to ‘conduct’ it. At night we
pitched our tents inside one of the Maori huts or Wahries [sic] and gladly turned in after our
evening meal which we had to get entirely ourselves, for the natives did not wait on us at all.
Mary Medly and I shared our bed of fern covered with rugs and blankets in our tent, and Mr.
Taylor and Henry in the other – but sleep was quite impossible, for a rat kept us company, and
the Maoris [sic] outside kept up conversation in their usual loud voices; they always talk over
business matters at night, till 4 o’clock when the cocks took it up, and we gave up sleep as a bad
job were quite ready to 6 o’clock to prepare for breakfast and an early start. 374

How fluent was Rhonda Carleton in te reo Māori, sitting in a canoe listening to the stories of
the river? Did Māori made the effort to tell the stories in English if she could not understand?
Obviously she understood Māori when, during the night, she overheard the talk of trade and
business. Rhonda’s entire diary shows use of Māori names and words and clearly shows close
contact with Māori. Also it seems she had considerable interest in Māori since she made the
effort to write about her experiences. It is certain that Rhonda was one of the British who
learned from, and understood, Māori and took an active role in the establishment of the
Middle Ground.

John Hemery, the captain of the Bengal Merchant, makes some fascinating but very different
notes in his journal about his experience on a native pā when he recalls:

I was away a week, living all the time in the bush among the natives. I slept in their huts and
generally partook of their fare which consists mostly of potatoes, fish and some roots indigenous
to the country. They are the most filthy savages I ever was among being covered with vermin
which they pick out of their clothes and eat with great gorge. I have observed a great deal of
disease among them which must have been introduced lately by the settlers as Captain Cook says
when he was here there was not a single entaneous [sic] disease among them.

And he concludes with some pity:

Poor brutes when they get the smallpox, measles, introduced they will, in short time, be swept
away from the face of the earth. They differ as much in character as we do and many of them are
very intelligent. Their laws are very interesting and they give very philosophical reasons for some
of their customs which we are apt to look upon as very absurd. 375
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Hemery displays a colonial attitude and had strong ideas about the ‘savages’. Nevertheless, he had also explored Māori law and observed the problem of communicable diseases they were facing. Hemery’s comments on Māori customs suggest that he does not share the attitude of some settlers that Māori ways are “absurd.” Even as he denigrates the Māori lifestyle, he asserts that many Māori “are very intelligent.” Hemery had acquired a considerable amount of knowledge about the country as well as the indigenous customs or tikanga. Nevertheless, he reveals his feeling of superiority over the indigenous culture.

Detailed descriptions of experiences with Māori and encounters on a pā often found their way home to Europe and transformed the knowledge overseas about the strange country in the Antipodes. Thus, Anne Elizabeth Burgess, the widow of William Blandford, reported her experiences of early Wellington in a letter: “Mr. Burgess had not been long in Wellington when he went on a trip round the coast with about 70 Maoris [sic]. Persons wondered how he could do so, as they could speak very little English and he but little Maori. They treated him very kindly...”

She explained further that Māori were welcome at the house and were always around, which explains her understanding of Māori language and customs. The welcoming of Māori into a settler’s home testifies to the existence of a Middle Ground on a very personal level.

Mary Ann Eleanor Petre, as mentioned earlier, reported several times in her diary about going to a pā. She noted: “Walked in the afternoon with Col and Miss Wakefield to a Pah [sic] and made the acquaintance with a native and his wife Mr. and Mrs Abatto who have a small wood house instead of a hut.” She became closer with the ‘Abattos’, who visited the Petres at their home, where they “liked the piano the best.” Interactions like these, and particularly the invitation to visit, built an exchange of knowledge and understanding. They engendered a feeling of trust, which enabled both cultures to come together and create the Middle Ground.

There is no doubt that settlers changed the Māori world. Most visible was the change in clothing for Māori. Many settler records report this. Similarly, much of the equipment, which colonists brought with them, was quite alien to Māori and sparked curiosity and the desire to possess it. From the records of the Kempton family, we can see that horses were a previously un-encountered animal for Wellington Māori: “Schooners are arriving from SW and London bringing with them quite an air of excitement, especially if horses landed... their fractious
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behaviour would introduce an element of apprehension onto the curiosity exhibited by the natives and the neighbourhood.”379 Mrs Kempton elaborates:

The landing is always an event of some importance in the settlement, so much that a large number of natives, men, women and children would assemble and squat down on some rising ground to witness the proceedings as they had been before seen such queer looking creatures.380 Kempton describes the whole landing process of the horses and gives a good picture of how the settlers had fun scaring the spectators a little. She concludes as follows:

The man who is in charge of one the animals would jump on its back riding vigorously toward the natives. They, taken by surprise, jump up and fly off in directions .... A rush of men, women and children, some screaming others laughing and falling over each other in their fear amused excitement. The rider does not wish to alarm them, he brings his steed to a standstill when he considers he has given the onlookers and fugitives a sufficient idea of what [the]horse is capable of performing.

Knowledge was exchanged, driven by curiosity, observation and close encounters. Once again, note that settlers and Māori shared the same space: the town, the harbour and land around it. Close interaction happened not only on the broad level of the town but also on a very personal and intimate level, in direct contact within the private sphere.

Edward Betts Hopper reported on the interaction in the private sphere, revealing how close Māori and Pākehā became. Hopper notes that Māori “attach themselves to a settler” and “make themselves useful in collecting fire wood & other little jobs and in addition to keeping themself while often bring potatoes & other vegetables for their ‘Pakeha’ as they title the white people.”382 It is not clear if this exchange and close connections were engaged in for the purposes of payment but, in any instance, it reflects the close daily encounter of each other’s culture that enabled knowledge and cultural exchange. Māori and settlers are shown here in very close contact where they benefited from each other and meet their respective needs. Richard White points out that this need to establish a “mutual comprehensible world” led to the creation of the Middle Ground.383
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4.8 A Middle Ground?

After having outlined the main themes of encounters between Pākehā and Māori in Wellington it becomes apparent that there is a convincing pattern. It needs to be acknowledged that there was a close contact between Māori and settlers, especially in the first two to three years after arrival, when Māori supplied settlers with the essentials for survival, which indeed made the settlement possible. Settlers relied heavily on Māori for food, shelter and information about the country. In exchange, Māori engaged with settlers to gain new products, mana and knowledge. Both peoples learned the other’s language and engaged in terms of cultural understanding and acceptance. These patterns, which can be clearly identified in settler diaries, journals and letters until the mid-1840s, are in accord with Richard White’s concept of Middle Ground.

From the mid-1840s, a shift in the relationships gradually occurs. After several crop cycles and further distribution of land, settlers relied less and less upon Māori for their daily survival, while intrusion into Māori territory increased. Accelerated by the Spain Investigation of 1842, as well as the Wairau incident, stronger mistreatment, disregard and disrespect of Māori, as well as the growing ‘independence’ of settlers, led to an evolving tension between the two peoples. FitzRoy, on a visit to Wellington in 1844, also noted the tense atmosphere in the settlement and that the settlers “expressed great hostility toward Māori as a result of the ‘land question’.”

The Wairau incident and the death of 22 people made news all over the country, as well as back home in the British Isles. Wellington, located close to Nelson, feared that the on-going land problem with Māori might lead to a similar tragic event for the main settlement and that Māori all over New Zealand would declare war on the settlers. In September 1843 John Seale Bird wrote to his sister:

I have also sent you a newspaper which gives the full particulars for the unfortunate affair that had thrown such a gloom over this Colony – indeed such was the effect for 3 weeks no one would have the smallest job done or buy anything more than absolutely necessaries – not know one day from another that the native might come down upon us an if they had I think we should have cut but a poor figure during this time no one would pay any money and all seemed desirous of leaving and those who had the means left for various places ... since our residence not less than two hundred persons have left.  

John Plimmer also recalled the Wairau incident and its long-lasting effects upon the settlement: “It stunned us; but immediately the first scare was over we pulled ourselves together, got what arms we had, and prepared to go and take summary vengeance on the traitorous Maories [sic].” Further he reported about the Government intervention that prevented settlers from taking action, causing Māori flee up the North Island. “After this all of us who were able to bear arms were called out to drill and this lasted for a long while...”

The Kemptons record the years 1834-1847 rather briefly, which makes the account seem more like reminiscence than an actual diary. Nevertheless, the records reflect on the settlers’ emotional state and the wide-reaching effects of Wairau and the later wars. We read that:

The so-called Wairau Massacre (in June) created the greatest consternation and fear throughout the whole Colony while apparently its effects were even felt abroad as immigration was restricted, many people in Australia who had contemplated taking up their residency here, not doing so. ..... Whanganui, Nelson and New Plymouth people are in trouble and some of the settlers have sent to Wellington .... These wars and rumours of wars are keeping us in a constant state of alarm and the bugle call ‘to arms’ is frequently heard. A guard of Militia mounted daily at Thorndon Front..... Two stockades have been erected here in the event of a native attack...

The news about Wairau had a stronger and longer-lasting effect on the Wellington settlers than on the people of Nelson. Wellington was paralysed and was then thrown into a state of panic, which caused many people leave in haste. Those who stayed often felt betrayed and abandoned by the officials:

As I was going along old Jenkins told me the governor had given Rangihati & Robula [sic] a sovereign each & told them they had done perfectly right at Wiaou [sic] massacre. & he said the governor was damned vagabond and a hipocrite & said he hoped he would come in a stiff one so they might get him shoulder high to bring him & many people seems to have a bad opinion against the governor but I cannot help thinking that he is perfectly right.

War in the far north, conflict in Nelson and the constant land debate in Wellington made settlers more conscious of the land problems, particularly in 1846 with the emerging of the ‘War in the Hutt’. Ian Wards has shown how Māori were no longer willing to tolerate the ‘land hungry’ behaviour of the British. Conflict between Māori, between settler and Māori, and between settler and the Crown became more frequent. Many sources discuss these emerging problems of land ownership and usage.

---
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As early as 1842, in the context of the Spain investigations, we can see the first indication of the pressing problems. Spain was ordered by the Crown to investigate the land purchases of the New Zealand Company from 1839. Along with the so-called Port Nicholson Deed he also investigated the Kapiti Deed, which signed over 20 million acres of the North and South Islands from Te Rauparaha of Ngati Toa over to the Company. Spain’s investigations clearly stated that the purchases of the New Zealand Company were questionable and it was not clear who was the lawful chief, with the power to sell land. In consequence, Crown and Company argued about Māori compensation, the land and the tenth allocations for Māori. Not only Pākehā argued about land. As clearly shown by the Waitangi Tribunal Report for Wellington, Māori also argued amongst themselves about who had rights to sell, gain compensation and remain on the land. 392

This politically unstable and nervous situation found first expression in Porirua, when Ngati Toa destroyed a settler residence to express their right of utu and the Crown refused to take action. 393 Thomas Mason wrote to his uncle in 1842 about a family that wanted to settle in the Porirua district after their house was destroyed.

...the principal chief of the natives (Rangiaiete or Mokou [sic]) came also with about 50 of his men, and demolished the houses but scrupulously returned everything that the settlers had brought with them, such as nails, house fastenings & co [sic]. The settlers offered him payment to let them alone, but he (Mokou) refused it, saying that Wakefield had not purchased the land, and that he did not want payment, and that the white settlers must remain at Port Nicholson. 394

Nevertheless, Mason still concludes that “our new neighbours have been a good deal bothered by the native, they have left off annoying me now, and treat me as one of themselves.” 395 Such conflicts, as describes above, indicate that the shift in power, as similarly described by White for the Pays d’en Haut, had begun, with the consequent weakening of the Middle Ground. White concludes that “…This world, pulled forward by Europeans and Indians in tandem, vanished from most of what had been the pays d’en haut. The Middle Ground itself withered and died. The Americans arrived and dictated.” 396 Similar experiences can be found in New Zealand; with the growing independence of the British from Māori also here the Middle Ground withered and became unstable. However, on the personal scale things turned out to be more complex. Mason seems to have gained some respect from Māori and the
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annoyance was not targeted at him anymore but directed against others. We need to ask what made Mason different from the other settlers? He indicated that Māori treated him as ‘one of themselves’. He must have been on positive terms with Māori even though the world around him was already changing.

With the New Zealand Company struggling, and the Crown taking over, land problems, particularly in the Hutt, became more and more urgent. Francis Bradey and Mary Nevin in their *Wellington New Zealand Journal Book* give a fascinating picture of the difficult situation among Spain, the New Zealand Company, Wakefield, the settlers, and the British Crown. The frustration of the settlers is portrayed in great detail and Bradey even concludes that: “Colnl [sic] Wakefield was a complete swindler & so were the New Zealand Company.” As outlined by the Waitangi Tribunal, the claim of the New Zealand Company to the purchase of over 20 million acres from Ngati Toa set in motion a series of events. The Tribunal states that this initial land question played an important part in the causal events in Wairau 1843, as well as the conflicts that arose in the Hutt.

Ian Wards pointed out that the land in the Hutt, which had never rightfully been purchased by the New Zealand Company, was largely occupied by settlers. The negotiated Deed between the Crown and Ngati Toa’s Te Rauparaha was challenged by local Māori who refused to leave the Hutt. Māori rebelled, insisting on their right of land ownership. In 1844 John Seale Bird reported to his sister about the payment the Crown had made to Māori for the land in the Hutt. However, Māori refused to accept this: “They only laughed at him [the Superintendent] and told him they would be all killed before giving it [the Hutt] up or allowing any more settlers to come upon that land.” Taking this statement as an example we can see how settlers felt challenged, or at least frightened. Eventually this unease climaxed in the ‘Wellington Wars’, when British troops faced over 200 Māori at the battle of Boulcott’s Farm in 1846. Settlers and the Crown united, once and for all, to make sure the settlers could acquire land without interference from Māori.

Interestingly there is some evidence that in 1846, shortly before the fight at Boulcott’s Farm, a *Middle Ground* was still in existence. John Seale Bird wrote again to his sister in May 1846 referring to the troop movements in the Wellington region and the occupation of the outpost. Seale was convinced that the gathering of troops would frighten Māori and prevent conflict.

---
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On the other hand, he also acknowledges that not everyone in the settlement was of the same line of thought. Bird emphasises several times that settlers were prepared to fight and did not want to give up without a struggle. He concludes:

There we are and could be happy and contented could we but have security for our lives and property. The presence of the military have had a little good effect on the natives, he [sic] is more civil than a short time since nor do they seem disposed to take more land to their share – they have never yet molested us or passed (in the cultivation of land). The boundaries they themselves put up. Under all these circumstances the same communication between the two races goes on quite uninterrupted – they effect sales for their pigs and potatoes and repurchase Blankets and other necessaries from us and are making rapid advancement to our outward customs.401

Bird’s recognition that Māori would eventually fight back suggests that he knew them well. He also seems well informed about the land issues and even acknowledges that not everyone thinks in the same “anti-Māori” terms as he does. The fact that existing trade was continuing suggests that the building tensions had not yet reached its peak.

In a similar manner Eliza Lucy Gray emphasises in 1846 how much alarm was felt in the Wellington settlement, and concludes that warfare with Māori was a cause for regret, displaying sympathy for Māori:

Of all conceivable warfare I fancy N.[sic] Zealand warfare the most harassing for troops. Neither fame, honour or glory to be gained from it, & fighting to place or maintain people in possession of land, which too often had been unjustly [sic] obtained from the helpless Maoris [sic] – & alas how many of our brave countrymen have fallen & must I fear still fall in this sad cause.402

However, after the actual attack on Boulcott’s Farm, the Middle Ground began to decay rapidly.

The Wellington conflict, similar to Wairau in Nelson, put further settlement on hold. John Harding refers to the war in his letter of 16th September 1848 to his brother. He outlines how happy he is with the state of the settlement and commences:

I think as far as Produce [sic] is Concerned [sic] our Place is on the Rise [sic] but the Mad [sic] Polacy [sic] of the Government tends to uning [sic] and Perplex [sic] us we have not heard from the seat of War for near 2 Months [sic] so I can give you no later accounts of how the Gouvener [sic] gets on in the Murder [sic] Department than you got by the Papers I send[sic] sent to Mother some time since, this is (the war with the Natives) a Terrible [sic] Drawback [sic] to the Place those who would build and spend their Monies [sic] in Differrant [sic] Wais [sic] are afraid to do so till things are more settled and those who are Timmid [sic] are going away.403

Settlers were noticing changes in the settlements as well as in the world around them. In 1862, during the Taranaki Wars, Hannah Bennett writes to her brother and sister in Port
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Napier about the changing world around her, enquiring “... how you feel now as to Natives etc. The appearance of things here seems much altered...people seem now to think more of Gold than War... we think much about you all and pray for your protection and Safety.”

Bennett’s statements are all the more noteworthy considering that in all her other letters she never discusses the political situation. In this letter, however, she is particularly worried about the changes and explicitly asks about the Māori state of affairs. Furthermore, we learn that she wonders why people are more interested in gold than the wars. She concludes with the hope of protection for everyone; in the given context, this could again refer to the unstable situation.

To conclude: It is possible to identify a fluid *Middle Ground* in the private records of settlers and colonists of Wellington from 1840 to the mid-1840s when the first interruptions and changes in mindset occurred as a result of events in Wairau. Nevertheless, it seems that Māori-Settler interaction on the private level was still in full flow and the *Middle Ground* only slightly altered. Pressing land problems in the Hutt from 1854 onwards disturbed the foundations of the *Middle Ground*, and a shift of power, which leads to the destruction of the *Middle Ground*, was set into motion.

Distrust and fear overshadowed relationships as the Māori as well as the colonists lost lives in the fighting. Spurred on by Government actions and the victory at Boulcott’s Farm, Wellington settlers now felt superior to Māori. There was no need of further Māori help and knowledge. Settlers were self-sufficient and the strong connection and identification with the Empire finalised the shift of power. This tense situation in Wellington, as will be demonstrated further on in this thesis, was the setting and partial contributor to the total destruction of the *Middle Ground* of New Zealand caused by the outbreak of the Taranaki Wars in New Plymouth in 1860.

---
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5. Nelson Settlers and Māori

5.1 Historical Background

Nelson, situated at the northern tip of Te Wai Pounamu, the South Island, was finally settled in 1842 when the *Fifeshire*, with its first New Zealand Company settlers reached Ōtamaiea – Nelson Harbour. In November 1841 the survey team, Wakefield and some Company supporters from Wellington landed in Nelson and began to outline the Settlement and make preparations for the expected shiploads of settlers, who began to arrive from 1st February 1842 onwards. Nelson was established to lessen the problems in Wellington where land, and more specifically agricultural land, was in short supply around the rugged coastal areas. Nelson was primarily established with the intention of being an agricultural settlement to supply the Wakefield settlers with produce and establish a solid trading economy.

This chapter will first present an overview of the processes involved in the establishment of a settlement, to illustrate the unique challenges faced by Nelson. This will be followed by an analysis of the Māori-Settler interactions and their presentation in private records. As with the Wellington case study, particular patterns of encounter will be identified and placed into context. Particular emphasis will be given to the events of Wairau as the major point of disruption in Settler-Māori interactions in Nelson and on a wider scale. The chapter will test whether the concept of the *Middle Ground* is also applicable for the Nelson settlement between 1842–1860 and, if so, how the *Middle Ground* was weakened. Specific to Nelson, emphasis will also be given to surveyors’ reports, which will be treated as separate sources that are still private but nevertheless, strongly influenced by the work relationship with the New Zealand Company. The particular importance of the different social classes in Nelson will find accommodation by emphasising settlers’ status, as much as the sources allow, throughout this chapter. When referring to the settler community I refer to people with some sort of means, for example cabin class, upper class and successful farmers. Labourers, as the poorest of the Nelson settlers, with no means, will be identified as such by indicating their labouring eg.workingman status.

Long before Pākehā arrived in the region of Ōtamaiea – Nelson Harbour, Māori had already established a presence and knew about the advantages of the region. Nevertheless, the Māori population was far smaller than around Wanganui ā Tara. Flax trading and the whaling and sealing industries around Te Moana a Raukawa – Cook Strait established the first regular
contact between Māori and other ethnicities. The northern tip of the South Island had been visited by explorers such as Tasman and in particular Cook; scholarship shows that some white people regularly interacted with Māori for trade and whaling. 406

As occurred in Wanganui ā Tara, the region of Te Tau Ihu at the top of the South Island was in constant flux. 407 A changing power dynamic, established by war, conflict, death and alliance between the tribes, created a complex political situation that was entirely underestimated by the New Zealand Company. Several attacks on local tribes, by Māori from the north, had depopulated the region to such an extent that, at the time of the white settlers’ arrival, it may have given the impression that the land was unoccupied and a safe space ready for colonisation. 408

Ruth Allan pointed out that the initial impetus to establish a new settlement at Nelson came from some wealthy Company-loyal friends of Wakefield who wanted to create a settlement that was not based on labourers, but was instead designed for the wealthier and better educated upper classes. Furthermore, Nelson was supposed to be based on agriculture and trade which should have been overseen by the upper class but was also supposed to provide room for the fulfilment of romantic ideas of farm life. Like all the Wakefieldian settlements, Nelson was planned thousands of miles away from the Antipodes and followed a specific recipe to attract the wealthy upper class. However, potential investors foresaw long-term problems associated with attracting only a specific segment of society – for example, upper class or labourers – to the new settlement. Investors regarded a mix of classes as an important feature of the new settlements and some were uncertain about the plans for Nelson. 409

Finding the right place for the settlement proved challenging and, while negotiations and exploration progressed slowly in the Antipodes, preparations in Britain were in full swing. Negotiations between Hobson and the New Zealand Company were more complicated since the New Zealand Company land purchases had been challenged by the Crown. Jim McAloon pointed out how difficult the land situation in 1841 was. The land around Cook Strait had already been sold by several iwi to the New Zealand Company in 1839, but Governor Hobson and the Crown kept a close eye on the situation and further purchases in the South Island by the Company needed approval. Hobson, who rejected the idea of Port Cooper as a place for
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settlement by the Company, was not willing to extend the settlement so far south. The Company had to look for alternatives.\textsuperscript{410}

Under pressure from investors in London, the Company dispatched an exploration party.\textsuperscript{411} On 29\textsuperscript{th} October 1841, after days of investigation, William Wakefield, a survey team, and Captain Moore, a long-time friend of Wakefield with good knowledge of the territory, finally found Whakatū and Maitai to be suitable places for the settlement. To circumvent potential land problems, Wakefield engaged in negotiation with the local tribes. The 1839 land deed between the New Zealand Company and Māori had only been signed by Ngati Toa and Te Ātiawa and new negotiations with a larger group, in particular the people of the South Island, Te Ātiawa, Ngati Tama and Ngati Rarua, were necessary. Consequently, Wakefield invited people from various pā to gather and negotiated a final agreement.\textsuperscript{412} The diary of W.M. Stanton records for 29\textsuperscript{th} November 1841 the exact amount of the land transaction which mainly consisted of pipes, tobacco and gun powder.\textsuperscript{413}

Wakefield and the Company hoped that these payments, including a ‘tenth’ reserved for Māori, would solve all the land questions that might arise with Indigenous or the Crown. However, this was a false hope. As became evident with the conflict about the Wairau Valley, more emphasis should have been given to the complicated land ownership situation amongst Māori and more care taken when translating the deed into te reo to avoid uncertainty about which land had been sold.\textsuperscript{414}

Nevertheless, the establishment of the settlement followed soon after the negotiations in November 1841 and Arthur Wakefield became the Company’s Resident Agent for Nelson. Nelson was designed to be bigger and more profitable than Wellington in order to guarantee full success for the New Zealand Company. Nelson was promoted by Arthur Wakefield as having a better land scheme, and the Company hoped for a healthier situation for investors than in Wellington. The settlement offered different investment packages to choose from: one town acre, 150 rural acres or 50 acres in the suburbs. This was a far better deal than in Wellington. Still, the London market was not particularly interested in those sections and the Company was forced to drop the initial price from £1.10s [compared with £1 in Wellington] to
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a better deal for investors that offered a refund of 25% of the value of a section and £75 toward passage to New Zealand. Despite efforts to boost interest and in providing attractive packages, to the surprise of the Company, only one quarter of the land was sold in the first round.415

The main problem of the scheme and its realisation in the field was that the one acre sections resulted in a very sprawling town. The planners had high hopes of a large, flourishing settlement but, as time revealed, far fewer people than expected started their new life in Nelson. The large section sizes created a “wasteful use of land resources”416 and an extraordinarily high proportion of absentee investors, compared to Wellington and New Plymouth. These investors hoped to make their fortune in Nelson but in fact only contributed further to the limitations and social instability. Physically, in its early days, Nelson never had a real shortage of land. The problem was that land had been distributed in over-large lots and a considerable proportion was owned by absentee investors. Ironically, there was always enough land in and around Nelson for the people who actually lived there, but this land was unable to be used because it was in the hands of the investors, and settlers demanded their share from the New Zealand Company. Consequently this constant demand for land could only be supplied by extending the settlement.

As will be demonstrated later, this land hunger, as evident in all Wakefield settlements, overshadowed Māori-Settler relations and the Middle Ground became its first casualty.

Looking at the geography, the planned town site for Nelson was situated next to the beach and was reasonably flat, surrounded by hills. The rather large flat area near the water had similar problems to Petone; it was damp and swampy, and this reduced the suitable landmass for settlement significantly. Although some of the first settlers to arrive spoke in most positive terms about the chosen site, the preparations for the Nelson settlement were made too rapidly with insufficient planning, and the mistakes made at Wellington were repeated. There was no defined Nelson Block and the available land was simply not large enough to accommodate the settlement. Around 80% of the land was bush-covered. As a result the town was planned in suburbs composed of different geographical sections of diverse quality, which were surveyed in different cut-offs. No terrain had been surveyed when the first settler ship, the Fifeshire, arrived on 1st February 1842, and the level of hardship for the Nelson settlers must have been similar to that experienced by their fellow settlers in Wellington. The settlers
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found much of the land to be swamp and mudflat covered with bush.\textsuperscript{417} The first shelters were simple, either tents or shelters built by the first people ashore; and as will be shown later, the help of local Māori was welcome.

The New Zealand Company encouraged the settler men to build houses for their families who would arrive later. Because of the confusion and lack of preparation, suitable houses had not been built in time. The settlers needed to agree that after the assignment allocation of lots, they would then move to their allocated land. It was in the interest of the Company to have the settlement functioning and productive as soon as possible, but the Company knew that their preparations were far behind and the survey process and final land allocations would take longer than expected. Temporary land allocation seemed a logical solution. Hence, the settlement was in a constant state of flux since absentee investors allowed some people to stay on their land while others needed to move around or demolish their houses.\textsuperscript{418}

Nevertheless, the ‘boosting’ for the settlement was very successful, at least in terms of people who wanted to leave England and start a new life at the Antipodes. With the announcement of the establishment of Nelson, in April 1841, inquiries at the New Zealand Company office for the free passage skyrocketed. The Company used all means available to promote the new settlement and it was not surprising that even the departure of Arthur Wakefield, in May 1841 to New Zealand, was used for advertisement purposes. The publicity about the new expedition led to a significant rise in applications to the Company. Hudson showed that in May 1841, the month of Wakefield’s departure, the Company “saw the second highest number of applications received in 1841, and one of the highest numbers of applications ever received by the Company in one month.”\textsuperscript{419}

Ship after ship followed and brought families, settlers, labourers, people of the upper-and lower-classes to the new settlement, Nelson: the \textit{Fifeshire} on the 1\textsuperscript{st}, the \textit{Mary Ann} on the 8\textsuperscript{th}, the \textit{Lloyds} on the 15\textsuperscript{th}, and the \textit{Lord Auckland} on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} February 1842. Burns estimated that by the end of the same year around 500 people could be counted in Nelson.\textsuperscript{420}

These immigrants were mainly from Britain.\textsuperscript{421} Most of the Nelson settlers, attracted by the promises of the New Zealand Company, came from the industrial heart of the British Empire: London, Birmingham, and Liverpool. Employment was guaranteed and, if no work was
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available in the private sector, the New Zealand Company would take over and provide work opportunities. This idyllic outlook tended to attract poor industrial workers rather than farmers and the upper class. However, in reality these workers could not fulfil the Company requirements for this settlement, which was not built on industrial work. This created a massive unemployed labour force, which significantly destabilised the social order in Nelson, as became apparent in the ‘Working Men’s Revolt’ in 1843.

From its earliest days Nelson provided work mainly in farming and administration, and later, trade: skills with which most of the labourers had no experience, or at best limited experience.\textsuperscript{422} The result was irregular work for the populace that did not mind in the early days in anticipation that the settlement would grow quickly and the problems would correspondingly diminish. However, with the influx of more and more unsuitable settlers the situation worsened and the over-represented labouring class needed to rely on relief work provided by the Company. Once this work became limited, due to adjustment by the Company in 1843, labourers engaged in a revolt to secure their income and remind officials of the promise of full employment that lured settlers to Nelson.\textsuperscript{423}

However, in other respects the lack of work proved to be an advantage for the settlement. To the great joy of the New Zealand Company this irregular work allowed each settler family some time to establish farms and gardens. This appealed to the romantic view held by the upper class about what the settlement could be like: established by their own hands, self-grown and back to the roots of honourable, real work, their own little ‘Garden of Eden’. Early cultivation began quickly and by autumn 1842 most of the settlers had already established private gardens. Nelson appeared to be on a prosperous path; however, this boom was only short lived. By the end of 1842, the demand for essentials stagnated and although everyone had already established a place for living, settlers were still waiting for the land allocation. In this situation, with no real production of commodities, contact with local Māori was important and emphasised the need for friendly trading, which was essential for the survival of the town.\textsuperscript{424} Nelson was a very small settlement, in terms of numbers, and deeply divided between the classes. The upper class wanted to fulfil their romantic dreams. Meanwhile a large proportion of labourers and lower classes were only able to survive by turning to Māori. However, as in Wellington, these friendly relations deteriorated once settlers were allocated land and the settlement expanded.

\textsuperscript{422} McAloon, \textit{Nelson: A Regional History}. p.20ff.
\textsuperscript{423} Colbert, "The Working Class in Nelson under the New Zealand Company, 1841-1851." pp.34-48
\textsuperscript{424} McAloon, \textit{Nelson: A Regional History}. p.16 and p.20
As well as the large group from Britain, Nelson also attracted some smaller groups from other parts of Europe. In 1843 the *St. Pauli* brought a considerable number of German settlers to Nelson. James N. Bade pointed out that, with the help of a German branch of the New Zealand Company, nearly 150 German immigrants established themselves in Nelson.\(^{425}\) There were an unknown number of independent settlers from Australia and primary sources also point to a Dutchman and several Hawaiians.\(^{426}\) In consideration of available information it seems that Nelson, as well as being very strongly class-divided, was also a settlement of considerable cultural diversity; unlike Wellington, or as will be shown later, New Plymouth. Like all the Wakefield settlements, Nelson was a planned town with unique points of difference. As aforementioned, Nelson had been planned in advance in London in 1841. In accordance with the dream of the upper class, whose desires pushed for the establishment of Nelson, Graham Anderson argues that a great part of the town was reserved for military and public service purposes in order to provide work opportunities.\(^{427}\) This strong public sector was supposed to provide employment for the cabin passengers, and an agrarian sector was also set aside for farmers – however, factory workers and labourers were overlooked. The social structure of Nelson was to differ significantly from that of Wellington and New Plymouth. Nelson was seen as the first white outpost in the South Island: a stronghold of civilisation, the ideal society with an emphasis on the wealthy upper class. However, the reality proved to be quite different.

From the beginning, Nelson officials encountered challenges from different Māori tribes when expanding their settlement. ‘Land hungry’ settlers forced the surveyors out in the Wairau Valley to provide more land, which the Company insisted on possessing. The incumbent Māori, equally strongly, refused to give up. Hillary and John Mitchell stated that friendly Māori directly intervened in the situation and tried to find a solution for Wakefield and the Company.\(^{428}\) However, the chiefs Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata refused to give up the land which had never been sold, and which they thus regarded as theirs. The impasse deepened and Māori forced the surveyors to leave the Valley with a show of force. Mitchell and Mitchell state that “they took great pains to offer no violence to the man or their equipment, other than to burn the temporary whares and shelters made from local
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materials..., and to destroy the survey pegs and ranging rods." The settlers immediately took this as an act of aggression and 49 armed settlers, led by Police Magistrate Thompson, set out to Wairau to arrest the chief concerned. The move backfired and ultimately twenty two settlers, among them Arthur Wakefield himself and Thompson the Police magistrate, were killed. The number of losses on the Māori side is unclear but recent scholarship talks of six or seven, including Te Rongo, the wife of Te Rangihaeata. This outbreak of violence and the subsequent victory bestowed significant prestige on Te Rauparaha amongst Māori. The Nelson settlers, as it will be shown later, were on alert from that time onwards, and, to make matters worse, they lost face and mana when Governor FitzRoy decided that there had been no legal sale of land on that scale and settlers were in the wrong for taking Wairau.

After this incident in Nelson, the other settlements, especially Wellington, as well as New Plymouth, were fearful of further attacks from Māori [even though these never eventuated until the 1860s]. Newspapers like the Nelson Examiner published aggressive stories clearly showing the depth of settler unease. The New Zealand Company settlers once again yearned for self-government because of FitzRoy’s unsupportive stance. As argued by Mitchell and Mitchell, there were different tribal understandings about the rightful ownership of the land around Nelson including the Wairau valley, and its ‘sale’ was seen quite differently by the settlers and Te Rauparaha’s troops. On the Māori side, not all agreed with Te Rauparaha and his actions and, in so doing, feared attacks from the great chief themselves. This dynamic state of chaos created an interesting and diverse field of Māori-Settler interactions.

5.2 Settler–Māori Interactions

Nelson was the fourth settlement established by the New Zealand Company. In preparation for settlement, a huge advertising campaign for New Zealand was effectively underway by 1841. The early settler Johanna Maria Karlina Bisley recalls in her memoirs how her family came into possession of some books about New Zealand and made the decision to leave the old life behind and start anew in Nelson. Similarly, in letters to her grandmother, Sarah Greenwood records the preparations for leaving for New Zealand. Speaking of her husband
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she notes that “the chief part of the money Danforth expended on books, giving us full information concerning the colony of New Zealand, which I really think will be our ultimate home.”

This was followed by an outline of the difficult situation of expected British unemployment and the effects of the industrial revolution; she even apologises to her aunt, saying: “…and you will feel what a comfort it must be to reside in a country where every young person of good conduct is sure to meet with profitable and useful employment.”

However, things did not go as smoothly as expected for some settlers. Martha Adams, a late arrival in 1850, gives a strong and not very favourable description of her landing and the settlement:

From the descriptions we read in Hursthouse and other books of New Zealand we should not form at all a correct idea of the country, the land in this part is a continuation of hills rising one above another, and in some parts coming down precipitous to the sea. These hills were covered with brown fern, in some part burned, preparatory to cultivation, they were devoid of any trees, save a few shrubs in the lower parts near the white of wooden cottages, but we here from passengers who are returned from shore, that the gardens round the town houses are ‘perfect paradise’, and certainly the bouquet bro’t [sic] tonight by one lady is a good guarantee for it…. William and Stephan went off to the town as soon as possible after the Anchor was cast, to see for some sort or residence…. Some passengers are returned for their families, all complain of want of houses; one person has got a house ‘without any window put in’. And another has taken what he says ‘is a shelter, it does not deserve the name of a house’.

Booster literature had raised Martha Adam’s hopes and the length of time since the establishment of the settlement suggested she would have an easy start. Nevertheless, the living circumstances for the settlers of 1850 had improved little since the first landing in 1842. Analogous to the Wellington settlement, neither the bush and hills nor the unprepared state of the housing were expected.

As with most settlers, the new arrivals in Nelson also made their first acquaintance with Māori whilst still on-board ship. Martha Adams notes in her diary:

Several Maoris came in a boat on board, one evidently a Chief having a red blanket, and black flax cloak, while the others had only dirty old white blanket and their flax cloaks or capes were the natural colour before dyeing a dirt white. The Chief was a very handsome young fellow, with short curly hair and a brilliant pair of eyes, as jetty as his hair, his height, his well formed limbs and actions truly marked him as one of Natures’ Lords: he sat apart from his attendants, to eat his biscuit, which some of the people brought out for them all indiscriminately, but [he] seemed much pleased to be admired and with the help of a few English words he knew, and a few more
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native ones, a passenger was acquainted with, intermingled with signs actions, intelligent looks and merry laughs, he keeps up a very animated circle around him. Biscuit seems very much prized by them; one of the attendants afterward came and offered a large fish... and some biscuit, and we saw them rowing about from their island in the Harbour... 438

As seen for Wellington, basic communication was also essential in Nelson to facilitate the first positive encounter. The here given example shows how Māori and settlers share food, and, in doing so, exchange gifts. Even though driven by curiosity, Martha Adam’s words and descriptions show her colonial mindset to be one of British superiority. Nevertheless, she is still presenting a very positive picture of Māori: a handsome chief who seems trustworthy and was welcomed onto the ship, creating a positive, relaxed, welcoming atmosphere at the first encounter.

5.3 First experiences

Boosterism, with its utopian ideals of civilised Māori and a prosperous future, had a profound effect on immigrants to New Zealand. One year after the beginning of planning for Nelson, in 1842, expectations about the new colony were very high and there was hope that the new country would offer stability and a safe new life; potential hardships were swept aside by most interested parties. Advertising and boosterism created expectations that were even higher than those for the Wellington settlement. 439 Johanna Maria Karlina Bisley, nee Karsten arrived on the St Pauli from Hamburg. She emigrated at the age of 7 as a steerage passenger together with her family. 440 She recalls the landing of the St.Pauli in June 1843 and describes the excitement on board:

When we were out in the Bay everybody wanted to know where the town of Nelson was, there was nothing to be seen but Bush, Hills, and Scrub a few tents and some Maoris. No buildings, no place to land, no churches, no roads in fact it was a complete wilderness. There were a few buildings of wood on the Church Hill and a ‘depot’ was being built...

The post-arrival reactions varied greatly. While the first wave to Wellington/Port Nicholson had some expectation of encountering ‘the frontier’, many of the Nelson settlers showed deep surprise and disappointment about the lack of New Zealand Company preparation. Settlers had hoped, with the passage of time since the establishment of the new colony, that
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better preparation would be forthcoming. However, they were proved wrong. Neither
Wellington, Nelson – nor New Plymouth – showed the level of careful preparation promised
by the New Zealand Company.

However, some had a more positive experience. Sarah Greenwood wrote in September 1843
that the voyage to New Zealand was pleasing and she was “delighted with the beauty of the
climate and scenery, and glad to find the price of food and labour unusually moderate for a
new colony.”⁴⁴² The Greenwood settler family, consisting of Sarah, Danforth, and their eight
children, belonged to a privileged few who could afford a cabin for their voyage. Shortly after
their arrival they were able to move into a house, which was also rather rare. It took most
ordinary settler families months before they had their own accommodation.

What made the experience of the upper-class Greenwoods so different from that of the
Bisleys, in steerage class? Was there a difference in expectations or simply that social status
and wealth created different experiences? The hardship of the steerage passengers was
immense. However, like the cabin passengers, they also arrived in a country that was strange
and new to them. A bigger difference lay in the widely divergent degree of preparation for
labourers or farmers. Firstly, the New Zealand Company had strict regulations on what one
could bring and how much luggage could be stored.⁴⁴³ Secondly, with hardly any tools, money
or goods for exchange, a new home needed to be built, food organised, and an income stream
established. In contrast, the Greenwoods, representing the cabin passengers, had plenty of
furnishings with them and rented a home for the first six months while awaiting the arrival of
machinery for their milling businesses.⁴⁴⁴ Other cabin passengers even brought a whole house
with them as well as servants and plenty of belongings. It is safe to assume that such material
security had an effect on expectations and the start of the new life. Nevertheless, even for
cabin passengers the new life was challenging and frustrating in different ways.

As in Wellington, first experiences in the Nelson settlement were reported to be exciting, and
told the story of new encounters and learning. A. Saunders reminds us of this when he recalls
that he was amongst the first settlers to make landfall in Nelson and to be greeted by Māori.
He remembers detailed how a Māori woman came towards the settlers.

She suddenly dropt flat on the ground, and we heard a great noise and commotion, whilst all the
Maoris ran toward us, in apparently great anger, all pointing to one of our young men, who had
thoughtlessly been stupid enough to draw out an old fashioned telescope to its full length and

⁴⁴³ Simpson, The Immigrants: The Great Immigration from Britain to New Zealand 1830-1890. p.75-97
level it at the woman, who instantly fell to the ground, to prevent herself being shot by what she naturally enough took to be a gun.\textsuperscript{445}

He describes the difficulty settlers had in explaining that this was not a musket, and he reports further:

As we knew nothing of their language, nor they of ours we had to reassure them by signs; I’ve pitched the telescope always into the fern, pushed the young man around with his back towards them, and whilst the rest stood still, I walked up to the Maoris holding up my arms and shook hands with them all. They quite understood, and send one [of] their numbers to fetch the telescope and examined it.\textsuperscript{446}

This encounter illustrates the lack of knowledge on both sides and the ways of observing and encountering each other. Considering Māori had been exposed to muskets since the early 1800s in some parts of Aotearoa, it is not surprising that they mistook the telescope for a weapon. From a European perspective this encounter was not anticipated. After the initial feelings of being safe and welcomed, the confusion and anxiety generated by the Māori misunderstanding came as a shock. Moreover, the settlers, totally overwhelmed by the new situation, paid insufficient attention to the need for a careful and slow encounter. Nevertheless, once the misunderstanding arose, everything was done to convince Māori of their peaceful intentions. This first encounter would be vital for the later relationship.

Having said this, Saunders reports further: “But it was soon their turn to save us from a much more real danger.”\textsuperscript{447} One of the new settlers, in the process of eating a poisonous Tutu berry was rescued by Māori, who prevented him from swallowing it. Saunders describes how Māori used a codified sign language to communicate that these berries would be deadly. Recalling his first encounter with Māori, Saunders illustrates the strong connection between language and knowledge exchange, which, also evident in Wellington, was vital for the establishment of the Middle Ground.

Other letters also contain descriptions of the first interactions between settler and Māori. Frances Shepherd reports to her parents in her first letter after landfall in 1843 how impressed she was about Māori:

The natives are a fine well build race of man and behave very kindly to us. They are very fond of carving and their dexterity in this art is evident in their curious tattooing of their faces and their manners of ornamenting their houses and other utensils. Their diet is chiefly vegetable although they have abundance of pigs and fowls and catch abundance of fish at certain times. Their drink is pure water. They join their noses by way of a salute and to change name is their greatest mark of

\textsuperscript{445} A. Saunders, "Reminiscence; Fragmented Diary," (Nelson: Tasman Bays Heritage Trust, NPM, Fmz SAM A 2867, ca.1842). p.310
\textsuperscript{446} Ibid. p.310
\textsuperscript{447} Ibid. p.310
friendship. To their enemies they bear an implacable hatred but they are kind and hospitable to strangers. Their dress consisted of a blanket or mat worn over their shoulders and tied like a cloak.  

Frances Shepherd, a highly skilled observer of her surroundings, gives detailed evidence of what she knew about Māori and how she saw them. Her descriptions of Māori carving skills imply close contact encounters. Also her description of the hongi suggests that she must have had close contact with Indigenous People in the short time she had been living in Nelson. Her experiences, both of hospitality and hatred of enemies, are indicative of her familiarity with Māori.

Not all experiences were recorded as being so neutral. First experiences on shore might also have been shocking and frightening. Many settlers arrived in Nelson very close to the time of the shootings in Wairau. Sarah Greenwood, as will become apparent later, was one of those unfortunate newcomers. She writes in March of 1843 about her recent arrival and the shock that Wairau caused: “Just at this time [the middle of June] the dreadful occurrence took place which deprived Nelson of its invaluable friend Captain Wakefield…”

As in Wellington, the visual appearance of Māori surprised and shocked settlers too. Thomas Young, one of the early surveying staff, writes a detailed description about ‘the Savage’ to his parents. He first outlines in positive terms the generally admirable physique of Māori. However, clearly presenting his ideas about the ‘the savage’ and colonial superiority, he also outlines aspects he found less agreeable, in particular Māori women:

I am almost afraid to touch at a description of the fairer sex, having at present seen but few specimens even decent in countenance, and not more than two good-looking girls. All are tattooed that are Tao-a-Tap [sic], or married; they are particularly anxious to obtain English wearing apparel, but I am certain if they knew how much better they were looking in their own mats, or a clean blanket, they would never change them for a dress in which they appear so awkward; and, besides, it very materially diminishes from their height and appearance.

Young engages with the stereotype of the lazy Māori when he argues that Māori say: “…we plant our potatoes, fish, attend to our pigs, and make our own mats and canoes, and are happy without money: you white man must have all these, and money too.” Nevertheless, although concentrating on negative descriptions, Young also shows knowledge about the close relationships inside the Māori community: “The women here do a large portion of all

450 William C Young, "A Surveyor to His Mother," in Letters from Nelson (Nelson: Tasman Bays Heritage Trust, NPM, qMS LET, 4 April 1842).
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labour, and are quiet under the control of their husbands, yet there appears a strong affection between some of them.”

Certainly Thomas Young had had close contact with Māori since his arrival as a 19-year old on the Whitby in 1841 to survey the settlement. His judgement of Māori displays an attitude of superiority towards the Indigenous People. Nevertheless, his description contains interesting details, such as his comments on partnership amongst Māori, evidence of his living in the contact zone. There are also some indications that he was able to communicate with Māori, a skill most surveyors needed. His descriptions reflect his personal experiences at the pā. As shown, first experiences varied, but all show a considerable curiosity about Māori. These first experiences often laid foundations for further encounters. For many, overcoming initial uncertainties led to the establishment of trust, which found extension in the help that settlers received from Māori.

5.4 Help from Māori

Help from Māori was essential to establish the settlement in Nelson. As shown by Mitchell and others, the New Zealand Company preparations were rushed and inadequate. Nevertheless, because of the positive experiences at Wellington and New Plymouth, the Company also expected Māori help for the settlement at Nelson. It is not surprising that Nelson shows patterns in the encounter similar to those in Wellington. Help was offered in different ways and on different levels: from building shelters to setting up rescue missions and offering hospitality in various forms. Joseph Simmonds recounts his first days ashore, after a night in the overcrowded ‘depot’: “Our first work was to build a hut to live in... The Maories supplied us with Toi Toi for thatching, for which they were paid in clothing we could well do without.” Māori helped build shelters, and closer contact and exchange were established in the process.

452 Ibid.
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Connected to Saunders’ first experiences, help from Māori could take even more serious forms.\textsuperscript{455} Joseph Simmonds reports that, on one occasion, he and a friend were unable to get into the harbour and needed rescuing from their drifting boat.\textsuperscript{456} This incident illustrates the complex nature of any first encounter, the establishment of trust, and the collision of different worlds: ‘Red Shirt’, a Whaler and Pākehā Māori whom the duo had met before, came to the rescue and offered to sail their boat down the coast where he knew of some helpful Māori. Pākehā-Māori like ‘Red Shirt’, according to Bentley, were “inhabiting the zone where Maori and Pakeha cultures merge, [and] they continued to serve as intermediaries between the races.”\textsuperscript{457} Therefore, as will become apparent, ‘Red Shirt’s’ nature as a go-between encouraged Simmonds and his friend to trust him and his knowledge of Māoridom.

Accordingly, the trio sailed to a safer place to haul the boat ashore. ‘Red Shirt’, fluent in te reo, organised Māori to look after the boat. Simmonds reports about the scene:

\begin{quote}
...‘red shirt’ made his appearance with a large mob of Maoris, and, to our astonishment, behind him was a white man without hat or shoes and stripped to his shirt; and behind him there walked a Maori brandishing his fists, and gesticulating in a very menacing manner.\textsuperscript{458}
\end{quote}

Simmonds explains that ‘Red Shirt’, who did not want to explain the circumstances around the capture of this ‘white man’, took them both up the pā, leaving them, to organise food and talk to the chief to find out more about the white captive. Simmonds recounts this moment when he first encountered Māori hospitality and customs:

\begin{quote}
We waited a long time in perfect silence; no one came near us. We were very tired and hungry and the strange silence was very oppressive. What were they doing? We were full of conjectures, when from an opening in the opposite angle from the one we had entered, in walked a large number of Maories in single file. They walked all round, filling up the square with my mate and me in the middle. They stood in perfect silence for awhile and then squatted down and commenced very excited talk, which, of course, we thought had reference to us and the way we were to be disposed of. I confess I felt a creeping sensation run up the spine and settle in the back of my head to the spot where the Tomahawk would fall if it did come.\textsuperscript{459}
\end{quote}

Following Māori customs, ‘Red Shirt’ led the duo to a place where food was ready waiting for them. Before their departure, Simmonds made known to Māori, translated by ‘Red Shirt’, that he would return in some days to get the boat and bring some tobacco: “When the question of

\textsuperscript{455} Refers to Saunders description on how Māori prevented a settler from poisoning himself with Tutu Berries. In Saunders, “Reminiscence; Fragmented Diary,” p.310

\textsuperscript{456} The exact dates of the events were unable to be retrieved. The archive material about Simmonds outlines that he lived from 1819-1889. The Early Settler Database of the Nelson City Council only shows one Joseph Simmonds, a carpenter, aged 23 arriving on the Fifeshire 1842. He himself states that the boat used in this episode was the first one built in the Nelson Settlement. Considering the evidence it seems safe to assume that the here described event was a rather early and most likely before the 1843 events in Wairau.


\textsuperscript{459} Ibid. p.5
tobacco come on, she [a Māori woman] came forward and very graciously offered me a fat pigeon, ready plucked and dressed, as a present for my Wahine which I declined with thanks...”\footnote{460}

This episode, once again, illustrates how much help, trade, language, and cultural understanding were inter-connected. Māori helped with the boat and looked after it. ‘Red Shirt’, acting as an interpreter and intermediary between the cultures, helped the two settlers gain acceptance with the people in this new world; he also helped them comprehend what they had experienced. Simmonds and his friend encountered the Māori pā and hospitality for the first time. Each party overcame their anxieties and engaged with ‘the other’. This experience was taken back home to the new settlement. None of their fears was realised. In contrast, they had a very positive experience with Māori with no loss of life or disturbance to property. Help, cultural encounters, trust and communication, as well as the fact that, as later discussed in Simmonds’ diary, Māori transferred the ‘white prisoner’ over to authorities in the settlement constitutes part of the evidence of the \textit{Middle Ground}

Various sources indicate that Māori played a variety of roles in the daily lives of the settlers. Some interactions might even be seen as the development of friendships. Frances Shepherd reports in her first letter back home to her parents how her little family had settled in their new home:

\begin{quote}
We live close to one of the native women and are particularly acquainted with her. She and Eliza [Frances’ young daughter] went towards the sea coast a short time ago when the tide [was] coming up she put Eliza on her back and swam with her across a stream.\footnote{461}
\end{quote}

Frances Shepherd trusted this Māori woman to take her daughter with her. However, how the women communicated remains unanswered. None of the consulted letters show any use of te reo by Frances Shepherd. Nevertheless, these two women, as presented, developed a close relationship and their daily encounters, as well as non-verbal communication and understanding, contributed to the establishment of the \textit{Middle Ground}.

Nelson, as a case study, clearly shows there was help and support from Māori for settlers. However, Nelson settlers’ connections and interactions with Māori only become fully evident over a longer timeframe, in contrast to Wellington where developments were clearer and easier to identify. Accordingly, to assess the existence of the \textit{Middle Ground}, the material presented here is, in some respects, even more conclusive than for Wellington as we are able\footnote{Ibid. p.5} \footnote{Shepherd, “Letter to Her Mother and Father.”}
to consider the wider context of the encounter. This wider contextualisation is a factor that will become even more pertinent when engaging with the material for New Plymouth.

5.5 Trade with Māori

As already discussed, help was often connected with trade. Arthur Wakefield, the Superintendent, regularly reported to his brother and company officials about the progress of the new town and obstacles encountered. In August 1842 he wrote to William Wakefield:

Our merchants are inefficient or want money, there has not been a blanket in the place for 6 weeks, the natives come to me every day with sovereigns in their hands for them & I am told they have offered 30s, the pork is all out also & our supply will not last very long, the flour & sugar is also getting short, the natives are great consumers they take them both away a dozen bags a week. 462

The surveyors, who worked at the cultural and physical frontiers, indicated that trade with Māori was essential and even secured their survival. People like J.W. Barnicoat, Samuel Stephens and Thomas John Thompson relied heavily on Māori, especially for their food supply, which enabled them to make long and successful expeditions away from civilisation. 463

As one of the main ‘components’ of the establishment of the Middle Ground, trade in the Nelson settlement was mutual and based on the different needs each side could satisfy. Māori were interested in settler products like sugar, flour and blankets, which were often out of stock due to demand. In exchange, Māori brought fruit, vegetables, fresh meat and fish to the settlers.

Even up until 1843, one year after the first wave of settlers, trade was one of the central forms of interaction between Māori and settlers. It seems that there was a significant difference between Wellington and Nelson in the trading between Māori and Pākehā. Joseph Simmonds reports:

463 Barnicoat, "J.W. Barnicoat Journal."
———, "Extracts from Diary of Samuel Stephens Made by J.E. Clark," (Nelson: ATL, MS-Papers-2698-1A, 1844-1854).
[Our] style of living in these days was not very varied – salt pork and potatoes, which we got from the Maoris being our chief food. Occasionally we got Fish, when a five foot Haika[sic] could be brought for half a crown. A cabbage for which we paid a shilling, would sometimes make its appearance, in fact everything was shilling and upwards, the Maories appearing to have an utter contempt for anything less.

Simmonds’ report indicates that Māori around Nelson soon became accustomed to money. This contrasts with Wellington, where, for a longer time, most trading was on the basis of product exchange. This difference could be explained by the New Zealand-wide trade network that Māori developed. By the time Nelson had been established most Māori of Te Tau Ihu were already trading with settlers around Port Nicholson, were well equipped with European produce, and had very rapidly become accustomed to using currency.

In Nelson, trade was an important tool, both for cultural exchanges and the security of the settlement. A. Saunders gives us evidence of how rapidly trade relations were established when he reports that he bought potatoes from Māori immediately after he landed in Nelson. Fascinatingly, he never makes any reference to trade again. Was it that only this particular trade engagement significant for him, or did it become such a daily occurrence that it was no longer worth mentioning? From other sources we know that trade occurred frequently. Neale and McAloon pointed out that the Nelson settlers established their own gardens early on, in order to ensure their desired independence. Also J.F.H. Wohlers, a missionary, notes in his diary in 1843 that gardens not only provided produce for himself, but for trading with Māori, which suggests that the New Zealand Company strategy of establishing settlers’ self-sustainability by having their own gardens was successful. In comparison with the Wellington and New Plymouth case studies, Nelson is unique in this respect. After the first hurdles of establishing the settlement, mutual two-way trade developed.

It is noticeable that the trade between Nelson Māori and settlers in the 1840s was less intense than in the main settlement at Port Nicholson/Wellington. The distance from Nelson to the well developed Wellington was not great and products could be ordered and shipped to a secure harbour. Despite that, the preparation and planning by the Wakefield Company for
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Nelson was rushed. The available written sources show that most settlers were individually far better prepared than the settlers of the first wave to Wellington, at least in what they brought to the new colony. Plenty of literature was already available and even letters from the first wave of settler found publication.\textsuperscript{469} Trade, born out our mutual interest, instead of one-sided need, as seen in Wellington, contributed to the establishment of the \textit{Middle Ground} on more equal terms.

5.6 Language Adoption:

As already discussed in relation to Wellington, trade, adaption of language and exchange of knowledge go hand-in-hand. One of the most prominent Nelson settlers, Frederic George Moore, the ‘discoverer’ of the Nelson inlet, was highly involved in the settlement process. He gives convincing examples of language adoption.\textsuperscript{470} He recalls, in a letter of 1879, his early times in New Zealand. Unfortunately the source does not give dates but, we know that Moore was one of the first settlers of Nelson and that he moved to Motueka in 1842. Describing early Nelson he explains that there were only a few Māori around Nelson and he states that he was “determined to settle at Mautaka [\textit{sic}] amongst the Natives and take a farm as the pioneer of that district...”\textsuperscript{471} Subsequently he recalls how he began interacting with Māori through trade and teaching his new Māori neighbours European ways of agriculture and, in so doing, gained “the satisfaction of purchasing some hundred of bushels of wheat, barley, oats, and maize, [...] of their new industry.”\textsuperscript{472} He concludes:

I made myself not only acquainted with the Maori language and customs but that through the kind feeling they extended for me I was instrumental in preventing serious disturbance between the natives and some of the rougher of our Early Settlers at Motueka...\textsuperscript{473}

Clearly, Moore was a participant in the \textit{Middle Ground}; he was willing to learn te reo and interact in knowledge exchange, and, moreover, he married Te Parau, Riawai Turangapeke’s daughter.\textsuperscript{474} Nevertheless, it appears that Moore was only acting in his own personal \textit{Middle Ground}, established between himself and Ngati Rarua. Mitchell and Mitchell demonstrated

\textsuperscript{469} For example in: \textit{Letters from Settlers & Labouring Emigrants in the New Zealand Company’s Settlements of Wellington, Nelson, & New Plymouth: From February, 1842 to January, 1843.} pp.64-122
\textsuperscript{470} Lash and Smith, \textit{"Nelson Notables, 1840-1940: A Dictionary of Regional Biography.\textquotedblright} Keyword: Moore, Frederic George. p.110f.
\textsuperscript{471} Moore, \textit{"Journal and Correspondence, Letter to George Grey 7 November 1879 Wellington."} p.7
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\textsuperscript{473} Ibid. p.8
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that Moore experienced the full force of Māori frustration about the tenth land allocation in Motueka when Māori began to protest against settlers and their land use. The Nelson Examiner on 28th October 1843 states:

On Saturday last, an affair occurred at the Motuake [sic], which threatened an immediate and most serious collision between the settlers and the natives. One of the latter commenced pulling down a portion of a fence erected by Mr. Moore on a section occupied by him in that district. Mr Moore is well acquainted with the native language, and remonstrated with him, on which he seized his tomahawk to strike. Mr. Moore knocked him down and took it from him. On Monday a number of natives proceeded to Mr. Moore’s house with hostile demonstrations, demanding satisfaction for the blow he had struck the native. Mr. Moore sent off for the assistance of some of his neighbours, who came well armed and succeeded in deterring the natives from further aggression...  

As demonstrated, Moore’s understanding of te reo and participation in the Middle Ground were built on shaky ground. Nevertheless, after this incident he continued to engage with Māori and returned to his normal life as an active participant in the Middle Ground.

As in most settlements, language adoption in Nelson occurred gradually. Not surprisingly, whare was also one of the first most frequently-used words in Nelson settlers’ writings. Wohlers, a German missionary, notes in his diary:

I began therefore to call as loud as my throat managed: ‘hey!!!’ and I was answered soon. Then I asked them: ‘Have you dry ground in your whare?’ This is what they call such huts here but I don’t know whether it is an English word or stems from the Maori-language.

Wohlers used the Maori term for housing, naturally. Most interesting is his comment about the origin of the term. It seems that whare was used so frequently and naturally by English settlers that Wohlers, as a German, was not sure if it was a new English term or te reo. Taking into account the generally less common usage of te reo in the Nelson settlers’ writings, this observation is even more intriguing. Was this term, whare, only an expression of spoken language? The sources that record early Nelson suggest this, since the overall usage of Māori language was less than in Wellington’s recorded histories, yet Wohlers points out that the term was frequently used. It seems nearly impossible to answer this question because of the limitations in the sources available and the fact that so much time has passed. Nevertheless, it needs to be noted that whare, as an everyday word for housing, was used by Nelson settlers.

---
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Different words and phrases also absorbed themselves into English writing. Some settlers such as J.D. Greenwood, a medical professional, actively engaged in learning the new language and used specific terms. Greenwood notes in a letter to his mother-in-law: “I am learning their languages and only wish the state for my finances allowed me to set to work in earnest for their improvement...” He furthermore used Taguta [sic]\(^{479}\) as a word for Doctor.\(^{480}\) The adoption of Māori place-names was also frequent and hints at knowledge exchange between Pākehā and Māori.\(^{481}\) Letters and diaries of the Nelson settlers also use ka pai, as a term for good or very good.\(^{482}\) The word kai, which translates to food, was used regularly, as illustrated by H.S. Chapmann, the editor of The New Zealand Journal, who writes to his father in 1847 that it was common practice in the settlements to call food, ‘kai’.\(^{483}\)

J.W. Barnicoat reports in his diary about Māori also adapting quickly to English. He notes that “it is remarkable that they even frequently address one another in English. They seem extremely apt in acquiring our language.”\(^{484}\) This suggests that the less frequent use of te reo in the writings of Nelson settlers might stand in direct correlation to the more widespread adoption of English by Māori. Nevertheless, sources point out that there were fewer Māori in Nelson than in Wellington, which could also have meant less exposure and, therefore, less need to adopt te reo into daily settler language.\(^{485}\)

In contrast with the general findings in Nelson is the visibility of te reo in the surveyors’ diaries and letters. Surveyors, with their special role amongst the Nelson settlers and their relations to Māori, provide interesting ground to explore Settler-Māori relations. The surveyors acted at the frontline between bush and civilisation and between Māori and Pākehā, and had daily close encounters with the Indigenous People. Samuel Stephens, for instance, uses words like Korero, place names, kai, wahine, tangi and utu frequently as replacements for English terms.\(^{486}\) J.W. Barnicoat reports in his diary a discussion with a Māori ‘friend’ about the similarities between English and te reo. He notes that:

\(^{479}\) According to the Māori Dictionary the correct term is tākuta which translates to Doctor or practising medicine. See: "Te Aka: Maori-English, English-Maori Dictionary and Index “ Pearson Longman, [www.maoridictionary.co.nz](http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz) accessed 09/03/13. Keyword: Doctor.


\(^{482}\) For example scatters over: Stephens, "Extracts from Diary of Samuel Stephens Made by J.E. Clark." And also in Rich, "William Gordon Rich Diary 1852+1953." 5 January 1852


\(^{484}\) Ibid. 18 August 1842

\(^{485}\) Thompson, "Letters.”

\(^{486}\) Stephens, "Letters and Journals Vol.1.”
In talking to William [who is Māori] he disclaimed several words in common use by both whites and natives and supposed by the former to belong to the language of the latter. It would seem that the natives similarly supposed them to belong to our language. Among them William mentioned were – digadig [sic] (see), nap-a nap [sic] (quick), together with others obviously introduced by white people such as picanniny (little), savey [sic] (know). Among the words he disclaimed kaouri [sic] (no).\footnote{487}

It seems that reliance on Māori and the resulting contact intensified surveyors’ acquisition of the language.

### 5.7 Knowledge exchange

The limitations in the source materials, settlers’ and surveyors’ letters and diaries, becomes particularly evident when investigating the points of knowledge exchange between the two peoples. As already indicated, the contact between Nelson settlers and Māori seems more limited than in Wellington and New Plymouth. Despite the language acquisition, there is no evidence of either an emerging understanding of Māori cultural concepts or a deep knowledge exchange. Knowledge about the land became the main focus of recorded conversations. The source material suggests that only during the arrival process was there a diverse and strong knowledge exchange, evidenced in the previous example from A. Saunders about the tutu berry.\footnote{488}

Comparing the settlement layouts of Wellington and Nelson, it becomes evident that Māori in Nelson lived a considerable distance from the settlers. They came to town to trade their goods but left the settlement area afterwards. Māori were, simply, less evident. In consequence, spontaneous contact was less frequent and mostly restricted to a particular situation, like trade or work. Due to this limitation in personal, spontaneous contact, the strongest role in knowledge distribution was played by official publications, such as *The Nelson Examiner*.

*The Nelson Examiner* was the official weekly newspaper with its first publication on 12\textsuperscript{th} March 1842. Charles Elliott, the first editor, established the newspaper with the help of a New Zealand Company grant shortly after the first settlers’ arrival. Subsequently *The Nelson Examiner*...
Examiner, together with the New Zealand Gazette of Wellington, could be seen as representing the Company’s views.\footnote{489}

The Examiner presented rather colonial, negative views about the land question as well as about Māori. Nevertheless, readers’ letters, especially in the year before Wairau, show a variety of uncensored opinions amongst settlers. These letters talked about different experiences with Māori and the settlement. There were descriptions of the land, discussions about farming, and how people established themselves in their new homes. The Examiner of 1\textsuperscript{st} October 1842 started publishing a series of letters about an excursion to Massacre Bay.\footnote{490}

The series ran over several weeks and described the land and Māori. The anonymous writer informs readers about nights in the pā and close experiences with Māori guides. He frequently uses Māori place-names and some te reo. Furthermore, he gives readers a detailed impression of Massacre Bay, Māori customs he had observed, and descriptions of both flora and fauna. Letters and long articles like this example reached a wide audience and gave readers some idea about the new country they were living in. Admittedly, all the accounts were seen through Pākehā settler eyes, but nevertheless they passed on knowledge and understanding of the different districts and ‘the natives’.

The most reliable source about Māori help and gatherers of knowledge were the surveyors of Nelson. Their task was to survey Te Tau ihu – the top of the South Island – develop maps and extend knowledge about the surrounding land: to make, in settler terms, ‘useful’ commentaries. John Saxton notes about the land and Māori:

Mr. Tuckett informed us that one of the surveyors named Brunner had returned and said he has intelligence from the natives of an immense plain, in the interior, boundless to the eye, were there were birds larger than geese which killed their dogs and to which the former inhabitants had escaped from the attack of Raupero [sic].\footnote{491}

This example illustrates how information was shared and often exaggerated or altered. Whether this manipulation was done intentionally by Māori or by the surveyor himself is not certain. The particular role of surveyors as actors in the Middle Ground will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

\footnote{489} "Description of the Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle," National Library of New Zealand, \url{http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/cgi-bin/paperspast?a=d&c=CL1_NENZC&essay=1&e=-------10-1----0} accessed 17/04/2012.

\footnote{490} "Notes on an Excursion to Massacre Bay," The Nelson Examiner and New Zealand Chronicle, 1 October 1842. \url{http://www.paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/cgi-bin/paperspast?a=d&d=NENZC18421001.2.11&c=CL1_NENZC&e=--------10-TS-1---2%22burlington+street%22} accessed 09/03/13.

\footnote{491} Saxton, “Diary.” 31 August 1843.
It was not only Pākehā who learned from Māori. Māori were also influenced by Europeans. Barnicoat, for example, remarks that the style of Māori houses on the pā began changing to a higher roofline, which allowed them to be free standing.\textsuperscript{492} This suggests that the influence and exchange of knowledge during the settler arrival phase in Nelson was significant. Acting in the \textit{Middle Ground}, Māori helped settlers build their houses, during the process of which Pākehā and Māori exchanged ideas and techniques that each group took with them and used further.

5.8 The Surveyors

Surveyors acted in the \textit{Middle Ground}. The researched sources for Nelson contain a large quantity of material from two of the main surveyors, Samuel Stephens and J.W. Barnicoat. Both belonged to the leading staff of the survey teams around Nelson and were amongst the first arrivals in the new settlement.\textsuperscript{493} Their diaries and records span several years and contain nearly daily entries. These records are quite detailed and lengthy, and provide an interesting insight into the worlds of these men at the frontier, in the contact zone of an emerging settlement.

Samuel Stephens first landed in Port Nicholson in 1841, from where he immediately wrote to his mother in England. His first impressions of Māori were rather negative, describing Te Rauparaha as the “worst specimen of the New Zealand Savage... being treacherous, crafty, cruel and cowardly to the last degree.”\textsuperscript{494} Furthermore, Stephens emphasises the influence of the chief to whom most tribes are loyal. In a very early letter to his mother, Stephens reveals a deep knowledge about the Māori and tribal conflicts. He shows some adoption of language and uses Māori place-names. He informs his mother that he had visited the pā to interact with Māori and to learn from and about them.\textsuperscript{495} Intriguingly he notes that Māori speak little English, which suggests that he spoke at least some te reo.

Given his statement about Te Rauparaha, it is not surprising that Stephens felt superior to Māori and was driven by racist ideas. He notes about Māori:

\begin{quote}
No one need to feel any alarm as regards the natives, for although many of them have not progressed much beyond the condition of the savage, they are intelligent, peaceable and well
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{493} Lash and Smith, “Nelson Notables, 1840-1940: A Dictionary of Regional Biography.” p.15 and p.133
\textsuperscript{494} Stephens, “Letters and Journals Vol.1.” Port Nicholson 1841 My Dear Mother p.17
\textsuperscript{495} Ibid. Port Nicholson 1841 My Dear Mother p.25
\end{flushright}
inclined to white man. The men are a fine athletic and handsome race, but the men are generally far from being prepossessing. Many of them are dirty in their habit and their pahs [sic] or dwellings are low and ill-constructed. 496

He points out how difficult it was for Māori to adapt to European lifestyle. He notes that “...they are however, anxious to imitate the white people, but are afraid of incurring ridicule from the other tribes who have not associated so much with Europeans.” 497 It is questionable as to whether Stephens is correct in his assumption that Māori had difficulties in adapting to European lifestyle. Nevertheless, his statement is fascinating and indicates that Māori were well aware how much they had stepped out of their own culture while acting in the contact zone of the Middle Ground.

From the detailed descriptions of Māori culture and the adoption of te reo in daily language, it becomes clear how closely the surveyors interacted with Māori. Surveying the land meant acting at the direct ‘frontier’ rather than simply living in the settlements. These surveyors who were sent out to bring British order into the land relied on Māori for help and knowledge, and were the first who encountered resistance, the weakening of the Middle Ground. Stephens gives examples when he reports to his mother about the reluctance of Māori to give up more land. Māori approached the survey team telling them about their unhappiness and that they did not want them to ‘make the road.’ 498

The engagement with Māori and acting in the Middle Ground changed perceptions. The longer Stephens was in the country, the more he advocated for Māori. In his earliest letters from 1841 he still sees Māori through the lens of race and superiority. 499 However, by 1843 he has begun advocating for street and place names in te reo. 500 He also shows an understanding of the importance of kōrero as a way to solve problems and frequently reports receiving help from Māori. 501

In reporting about his new neighbours, a Māori couple, he indicates his change of mind and consequently his interaction in the Middle Ground. Over time he shifts from his first very resistant position towards Indigenous People, to a more caring and engaging one. He notes, for example: “The poor woman, who had just recovered from illness was very tired. During her
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illness I had gone several times to see her and took her medicine and gruel and other things fit for the sick.”^502

During the following month it seems as if friendship developed and the couple are mentioned in many of his reports and letters. He learns about the whakapapa of the families and tribes and status of women, and gives detailed descriptions and opinions about Māori. Lastly he makes his change of mind clear when he says:

They appear to be a happy race – always in good humour. What terrors should we not have pictured in our minds in England a few years ago, at the mere idea of savages and cannibals visiting our residence in the dead of night on a desolate coast far from the aid of civilised beings! Their banquet instead of fish potatoes and tea perhaps a portion of your own helpless self! Times and habits are indeed changed with the once barbarous New Zealander... Oh! How do I blush for my countrymen, when I write that our fears for the safety for ourselves and property are not from the natives, but from the gangs of bad whitemen [sic] who now infest this country... I have had many things stolen from me at different times by the whitemen [sic] whom I have employed, but never by the natives... You may glean from these facts that all fear of the natives is at an end – I consider them our greatest safeguard – I am on very friendly terms with them all. ^504

The contrast with his initial comments about Māori could not be greater.

Stephens, as a surveyor and well known settler, reported in great detail about the settlement’s daily life. The most intriguing example of life in the Middle Ground, from the Māori side, is illustrated in his diary. His story of a Pākehā boy who was raised by Māori has, so far, received no further reflection in the examined secondary literature for Nelson however, Mitchell and Mitchell mention the event briefly but only point out how ashamed Stevens was. On 8th October 1844, Stephens reports that he and William Fox, the Superintendent of Nelson, went to a pā:

While standing chatting to a group of Maories,...I noticed a little boy amongst them of much lighter complexion than the rest, although clad in nearly similar habiliments. On inquiring about him, I learnt than he was of English birth – the child of one of the immigrants. I then questioned the boy, who was about 6 years old, and ascertained that his name was Smith, and that his father was one of the unfortunate men who was scarifed at the late Wairao [sic] Massacre – that his own mother died before he left England – that he had no brothers, sisters or relatives out here – and that his step-mother (who I learnt afterwards was a woman of bad character) had after the death of his father founded a connection with another man, and turned the poor little fellow out of the house to shift for himself, without a friend to go to. ^506

Stephens learned that Māori had found the boy wandering alone in town without any one to look after him. So the Chief decided to take the boy on and care from him which “...the child

---
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gladly assented and went with him to the Pah [sic], and has lived with his kind protection ever since." On being asked whether he would like to return to settlements, the boy declined, saying “...he was happier now than he had ever been at all and that he never wished again or live with his own people who had treated him so cruelly—the Maories [sic] all of them were always kind to him and gave him plenty to eat.”

In his writing it becomes clear that Stephens wonders why the boy had not been looked after by the settlement and he emphasises the responsibility of the Government towards the settlers:

When the Governor was at Nelson, he promised to provide for the widow for those who fell at Wairao [sic] – but he has never redeemed his promise – and consequently, since the breaking up of the Company’s affairs, they have had no further help than what has been afforded them by private charity.

This fascinating episode illustrates how Māori actively participated in forming the Middle Ground. With the help of ship records, it is possible to verify some parts of the story. A family called Smith arrived in Nelson on the Charles Forbes on 22nd August 1842. The boy, James Smith, was eight years old on arrival and the child of the deceased wife of Isaac Smith. With Isaac came his new wife, James’ step-mother. Eleanor Smith was just 19 years old and nine years younger than Isaac. The list of the casualties of Wairau show two Isaac Smiths; one wounded and the other killed, evidently the father of the boy.

James, left by himself, was found by Māori who took care of him. To Stephens’ surprise, James did not want to leave his new home and was happier than ever before. Stephens indicates in his last statement that he lays blame on the New Zealand Company for the neglect of the victim’s families. Stephens comes to a positive conclusion about Māori:

Here a trait of kindness and good feeling on the part of one of the natives, (the son of a chief) accidently became known to me, and gave me much interest, and pleasure, at the same time that the circumstances of the case were revealed to me, caused an indignant blush at the apathy and cruelty of some of my own countrymen.

Stephens’ close and positive interaction with Māori intensified over the years, and the events of Wairau did not undermine this. He visited the pā and enjoyed Māori hospitality, learning and exchanging knowledge and also learning about the customary concept of utu. Māori often
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came to his house to ask for help and medical care, and he reports making more and more Māori friends. He closely observed a tangi, and his reflections about this experience suggest this was not the first time for him. Stephens’ diaries show a growing use of te reo and a better understanding of certain terms. For instance, throughout and after 1843, he refers to Māori women as wahine. Later in his recordings he also begins to explain the meaning of words and their context so fully that this should be seen as a further indication of the increased acquisition and exchange of knowledge. Up until 1852 his writings point out that he and others “reciprocate these hospitalities frequently when they [Māori] visit Nelson.” The established Middle Ground between Māori and some settlers, particularly the surveyors, was still in existence in the 1850s, and this ‘culture of giving and taking’ resulted in an even closer relationship.

In a similar and equally convincing way, John Wallis Barnicoat, wrote about his experiences with Māori. He arrived in Nelson on the Lord Auckland in September 1842 and took up a position, together with John Thompson, to survey the Waimea. Barnicoat’s diary contains the story of his life from 1841-1844, sometimes with very detailed descriptions.

Barnicoat, like most Europeans, was fascinated by the visual appearance of Māori and described them carefully. He observed early on that Māori women, if married to Pākehā, became totally immersed within white culture and, according to him, became good influences on their fellow people. Barnicoat seems convinced of the good nature of Māori and points out that “they came about in considerable numbers and have frequently opportunities of stealing …. But nothing has ever been missed.” He stresses the honesty of Māori at several points and gives frequent examples.

Like most settlers, Barnicoat also talks about trade and the strong desire of Māori to own European clothing. He notes that: “if they take fancy to anyone they will work for nothing.”

---
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Moreover, he expresses an understanding of tikanga, for example, in Māori welcoming ceremonies.\(^{521}\)

On a more moral tone and guided by the idea that the ‘noble savage’ could be educated, he notes:

> As far as I can learn, everything was going on very favourable [sic] under the missionaries. The people were advancing in morality and intelligence; they were being educated and daily assuming a more civilised appearance. But it is dreadful to think what a change European example may produce. Here are a set of drunken idle sailors and others [of] the worst character mixing with them every day. Who may in one year undo the work of the previous ten.\(^{522}\)

This evidence suggests that he engaged with Māori on a variety of levels and also shows his concern about their wellbeing.

Barnicoat gives several examples of close encounters and exchange of knowledge: Comments like “the natives do not expect rain for two months”,\(^{523}\) or “another day of heavy rain, with occasional intermissions. The Natives told us yesterday ‘rain tomorrow – no rain next day’”,\(^{524}\) may seem trivial but are a sign of close engagement and interaction with Māori in the *Middle Ground*. Like Stephens, he also visited different pā sites and enjoyed Māori hospitality. During his time at the pā he observed and talked with people, learning a great deal. Chiefs became acquainted with Barnicoat and he became used to Māori customs. Almost weekly he mentions parties of Māori coming to his tent or house to trade food or simply share a meal and talk. Once again Barnicoat reveals how rapidly Māori were learning and adapting to European dress, language and writing.\(^{525}\)

In 1843 Barnicoat encountered a carver and tattooist who explained his art and whakapapa. This broadened Barnicoat’s horizons again, as shown by his remarks about a canoe: “The carving on the prow and stern of some of these [sic canoes?] is rich and elegant in the extreme, presenting nothing barbarious [sic], harsh or rude.”\(^{526}\) As with Stephens, Barnicoat’s writings also illustrate the change in surveyors’ perceptions from ‘Māori Savage’ to educated and civilised Māori society. His growing understanding of Māori allowed the Indigenous to appear less ‘Savage’. Barnicoat, for example, seems amazed when he found that Māori had a calendar based on the moon.\(^{527}\) This abstract concept was for him a sure sign of civilisation.
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It becomes clear that Māori were part of the everyday life for both the surveyors and the Nelson settlement. They traded, went to school and church, and even attended local attractions such as a vegetable show. Barnicoat paints a picture of a community in which Settler and Māori live peacefully next to each other and had some sort of influence on one another: living in the contact zone and creating the Middle Ground.

Nevertheless, this functioning Middle Ground was vulnerable and not universal and consequently shaken by the events at Wairau.

5.9 Wairau

The events at Wairau on 17th June 1843 were unique for Nelson and shed light on how the Middle Ground was shaken by conflict. In common with the problems outlined in the Hutt Valley near Wellington, the fighting at Wairau was also triggered by the unjustified actions of the New Zealand Company and, in this case, by the ‘overreactions’ of Police Magistrate Thompson. Nelson, short on flat and fertile land, sent surveyors to expand into the Wairau Valley. Māori reacted immediately and Ngati Toa insisted that the land was not part of the Kapiti Deed of 1839. Te Rauparaha’s elder brother, Nohorua, and his war party, travelled to Nelson in January 1843 to express their views more strongly. Underestimated by the New Zealand Company, Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata arrived in March from Kapiti, to reinforce the Māori protest even further.

The Company ignored Te Rauparaha’s reference to the ongoing Spain investigations; they also ignored his insistence about ownership of the land. Te Rangihaeata’s threat to kill the surveyors if they should enter the Wairau plains again, made no impression on the officials of Nelson. Land Commissioner Spain, still in Wellington at that time, was willing to investigate the claims at a later time, once his investigations in Wellington were completed. Not prepared to wait, the Company proceeded with their survey mission and Māori saw no choice other than to intercept them. Mitchell and Mitchell pointed out that Māori made every effort to keep their actions peaceful. They escorted the survey team with their equipment back to

---
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Nelson, pulled out survey pegs and burned down the temporary housing that had been erected in the valley.\textsuperscript{533}

J.W. Barnicoat was one of the surveyors in contact with Te Rauparaha shortly before the conflict at Wairau. Although not having a high opinion of the chief, Barnicoat’s description of the Māori party that escorted him and his men out of Wairau seems rather unemotional. From Barnicoat’s description it appears that Māori were peaceful and had no intention of harming anyone. He noted that houses were burned only after all interior fittings had been removed. Likewise, survey tents were burned but all the equipment was retrieved. Māori also helped Barnicoat’s team pack up their belongings and transfer everything onto the canoe. The Surveyors journal emphasises that nothing was damaged or went missing.\textsuperscript{534} Barnicoat stresses that Te Rauparaha used no physical force to remove the survey party. In the canoe, he even engaged with Barnicoat in friendly conversation.\textsuperscript{535} The entire scene, as described by Barnicoat in his diary, differs strongly from what was reported by the New Zealand Company officials, in \textit{The Nelson Examiner}, which, in sharp contrast, highlighted the violent nature of Māori as well as the rightfulness of the Company’s actions.\textsuperscript{536}

The relatively peaceful protest by Māori did not convince the Nelson officials. These outbreaks of Māori resistance led the rather ill-tempered Police Magistrate, Henry August Thompson, to believe that this land dispute, similar to the previous problems in Motupipi, could be easily swept away by the strong force of the Police and untrained Pākehā. The incident of Motupipi was another example of how the Company had overstepped its boundaries. Māori complained to the Nelson Police officer that Pākehā had invaded their territory in Massacre Bay and traded resources like limestone and coal in defiance of the Māori veto. In response Māori sabotaged the ‘limeworks’, an action that was not well received by settlers, the Company nor by the Police Magistrate. Against general orders of the Crown to keep the peace between the races, Thompson assembled a police party and successfully intimidated Māori and, while holding an unofficial trial, punished Māori with considerable fines for their actions. This incident led Thompson as well as Wakefield and the settlers to believe that Māori resistance could be easily crushed and that all the land around Nelson was for the taking. This often overlooked incident illustrates a \textit{Middle Ground} that was shaken for a short period of time; in particularly on the Māori side, who felt settler power for the first time. For Thompson and his

\textsuperscript{534} Barnicoat, "J.W. Barnicoat Journal." 1-21 June 1843.
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followers of the upper classes, investors, and traders, this apparently successful demonstration of power made them even more arrogant and overconfident: an attitude that led the settlement into the conflict at Wairau.

Police Magistrate Thompson, who was later named by the Government as the unjustified aggressor, quickly swore in special Constables, as well as some settlers who felt pressured to follow orders to retain their relief employment, and Wakefield set out after Te Rauparaha, to teach “these travelling Bullies” a lesson once and for all. Company officials and Thompson wrongly assembled a group of settlers, equipped them with weapons, and made their way to Wairau. The Police Magistrate was obsessed with the notion of arresting the two main Chiefs, even though he had been instructed to ease tensions between Māori and settlers and to try to maintain peaceful relations under the Treaty. However, his obsession became evident when Arthur Wakefield begged Thompson to abandon the mission and follow Puaha’s advice to bring the people in question to Nelson for trial instead of using an inexperienced posse of Pākehā to act as marshals. Thompson was unwilling to change his plan. Instead, during a moment of hesitation on Wakefield’s part, he convinced everyone of the rightfulness of his actions and proceeded into the valley.

The events that followed have been well documented by different scholarship and this incident needs to be seen as an official police operation, even if only tolerated by the Governor. On 17th June 1843, Pākehā and Māori met at Taumarina Creek, but any hope of discussions ended when the first shot, presumably fired by accident, came from Wakefield and Thompson’s party. As a result Māori and settlers engaged in fighting: three Māori were wounded, four died, twenty two settlers were killed, five wounded and 27 were able to
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escape with their lives. Arthur Wakefield was the most prominent victim of the escalation. The event left Pākehā New Zealand in a crisis, while Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata and their men, with increased mana, left for Kapiti.

As the Pākehā survivors made their way back to Nelson and word about the, at the time so-called, ‘Wairau massacre’, spread fast. The events of 17th June shocked the settlement and many settlers left Nelson in a panic, in the hope of finding a safer haven. Simmonds reports that “the alarm caused by the Wairau Massacre caused many of the out-settlers to leave for the more settled districts, and others to beg to be allowed to work their passage to other colonies.” Simmonds and his family were living in very poor circumstances and he concludes about his depressed situation:

At length we could stay on our land no longer. Our neighbours had fled. The Māoris troubled us by their importunate begging from our lonely woman, of food that could not be spared without extreme hardship. Shouting and firing of guns at night by the Māoris, though probably meaning no harm to us, caused extreme alarm amongst our woman. When parties of Māoris were known to be in the locality, my wife would sit outside in the cold with the children wrapped in blankets ready for flight, keenly listening for hours, until the tide was so far gone as to make her feel assured they would not come that night. This state of things compelled us to abandon all we had done and seek more settled districts of the Waimea.

Simmonds’ example indicates that some settlers had already been troubled by Māori. But he also states that he, in contrast to the women, was not afraid and felt no threat. Why were he and his family not attacked? The way he describes ‘begging for food’ could indicate a close connection to local Māori. Trade and food exchange seemed to have taken place but now, with the escalation of tension, this was all on hold. In consequence this suggests that, even with the conflict at its peak, a personal Middle Ground was still functioning and Simmonds was still prepared to interact with Māori. His writing shows that he was not willing to leave his land, because he was scared of Māori; rather it seems his intentions were driven by his wife’s insecurity and the difficult living circumstances caused by the commotion.

Other settlers expressed similar feelings. Frances Shepherd, only three months in the settlement, reported home that “there was a sad disaster a short time ago but all the fault was on the part of the English Magistrate, but at present the natives are all quite quiet. The Company’s agent and 19 others were killed.” Then, as if nothing happened, she goes on: “...the native cultivation has an immense quantity of potatoes which they sell at a pretty
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reasonable figure."\(^{545}\) Shepherd expresses no fear whatsoever toward Māori, and emphasises that there was no further disturbance. Most intriguing is her statement about trade, which showcases that Māori and settlers were still acting in the contact zone. This implies that the Middle Ground was not destroyed, merely shaken. Some Māori were still trusted and had an interest in keeping the trade relationship going. The assessment illustrates that trade was still occurring, and even with the fragmented evidence it suggests a continued contribution to, and reliance on, the personal Middle Ground.

J.M.K. Bisley, at that time a young child, reported in her later memoirs about the day in 1843 when an alarm was raised in the town of Nelson. All the women and children were evacuated to Church Hill for better protection. Bisley went to her neighbour to tell them “that the Maories were going to kill us all.”\(^{546}\) But the reaction of the neighbouring lady was calm. Bisley notes: “She was just taking off a pot of potatoes from the fire. She looked at me and said: Are they child, well take a potato and she gave me a very large one.”\(^{547}\) Bisley reports that she ran off to Church Hill and stayed there the night with the frightened mothers and children. In the morning the news circulated that it had all been a false alarm and that Māori were simply going fishing. All the settlers, shaken but thankful, went home to their own beds.

As discussed, reactions to Wairau varied. Some settlers, as in the examples above, displayed fear and concern about the official nature of the event. However, not everyone left the settlement in alarm; many stayed and reacted to the new situation, for example, by barricading themselves on Church Hill.

Barnicoat, arriving back in Nelson after news of the killing had spread, reports the horror and confusion that Wairau brought to the little settlement. Normally either positive or unemotional about Māori, Barnicoat now shows an exceptional mood swing. Full of hate and feelings of superiority he seems no longer willing to engage with Māori when he writes:

While at Wairoo [sic] I was mixed a great deal with the Maouries [sic] and had an opportunity of forming an opinion on their character better than I before possessed. I must own that they do not improve on acquaintance. Their manners are certainly mild cheerful and prepossessing, here I'm afraid their praise must end. Excessive covetousness is their chief characteristic. Of hospitality the usual virtue of Savage I have ever seen an instance. In their intercourse with us they only seem to endeavour to invent pretext of obtaining payment in some shapes... they will cheat, receiving your bounty and cheat again. No kindness of treatment or fairness of dealing seems to make an impression on them. Gratitude they are incapable of. They are mean, selfish cringing, entirely
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destitute of a sense of honour of anything like high mindedness... They are treacherous and faithless...

He also reports on the strong pro-and against Māori reactions within the settlement:

The town is now divided into two parties who may be called Mourietes and Anti-Mourietes. The first party maintain that the natives in coming to Wairoo [sic] had no express intention of shedding blood or committing violence to personal property but merely to uphold their claim to property in the lands there, which but for the unfortunate and untimely interference of the Magistrates of Nelson would have terminated bloodlessly and peacefully. They further maintain the general right of the Natives as men to defend themselves against attacks (as in this case) unprovoked on their party by any injury violence or moral criminality and regard the mere legal rights (if it exists) which is the sole excuse of the white party as not affording a justification of their conduct. The second party declaim violently against these views which they endeavour to connect with indifference to the fate of those who have fallen, and a general partisanship with the natives in their acts of extortion and rapacity. They say that the New Zealanders being now British subjects are equally with white people amenable to British law the supremacy of which it is necessary to support and they are unwilling to make any allowances for native habits of acting and thinking.

This shows that some settlers supported the universal application of British Law while others still believed in the right of Māori to protect themselves. However, Barnicoat’s diary entries illustrate that his anger and hate diminished rather quickly. By September 1843 everything seems to have gone back to a normal pattern of engagement with Māori.

However, in more general terms, Nelson settlers reacted rapidly to the perceived threat. The community held a meeting on 30th June 1843, just 13 days after the actual event at Wairau. As already discussed, they decided to set up “Church Hill as [a] refuge for women and children in case of attack.” By September, Fox, Wakefield’s successor as Nelson agent, arrived, and just one month later, a “warrant [was] issued for arrest of Rauparaha and Rangihaeata, signed by 4 justices, D. Monor, G. Duppa, C.A. Dillon and J.S. Tyler, but was never executed.” W.M. Stanton, who noted these details in his diary, makes no further mention about Wairau and its effects. Similar to Barnicoat, it appears as though Stanton, and presumably along with him the whole settlement, quickly returned to normal life. Stanton’s entry on 27th November 1849 seems like the closure of a file. Without further comment he notes: “Te Rauparaha died.”

Other settlers also report the actions the settlement took to protect itself against an attack. As if as an aside, John Saxton notes in his diary in September: “Mr. Land came and plastered the
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two fire places and brought a report that the Maories were coming. Over the following days Saxton attended several community meetings about protection of the settlement and he notes that he went to get his 'pistol mended'. After a long period without mentioning Wairau, finally, in mid October 1844, Saxton reflects on the past year, admitting that something had gone wrong with the purchase of the land in Wairau and that the translations were more than a little astray.

As discussed previously, Sarah Greenwood arrived in the settlement shortly before Wairau and reports in her letter of September back home about the ‘dreadful occurrence’ that took place. Sarah Greenwood reflects deeply about the cause of Wairau. She concludes that:

While civilised nations are continually disputing about boundaries, it is not wonderful that misunderstandings should arise between people who can scarcely make each other comprehend what they really do mean, and I fear that these disputes will every now and then disturb our tranquillity. We are anxious to have a few soldiers here in case of need, and I believe some will be sent from Sydney. Most of the principal men here practise and ere [sic] regularly drilled for some weeks; ....their minds were much relieved by the fortification of the church hill, and the Maories [sic] now trade with us as usual, but the mutual confidence is shaken, and I fear it will be longer before the two parties feel as well disposed as formerly. There is no Pah [sic] or native village here, but numbers come in from Queen Charlotte’s Sound and trade in potatoes, fish, maize vegetables, pig, shell fish and firewood.

Just weeks later, in early October, she writes another letter in which she describes the uneasy situation in the settlement:

We are kept in a state of comparative uneasiness (and have been so for some weeks) by frequent rumours of the hostile intentions of the natives. Some have left the place from alarm; others ridicule the idea of danger; others (perhaps the majority) are rather puzzled what to think; at all events the fortifications are being completed so as to afford a plan of defence in case of alarm. Many consider this the extreme of folly; and this diversity of opinion tend greatly to split our little society into parties, and to destroy the feeling of unity and good-fellowship which is so delightful. I am pleased to tell you that this is not the case at the Motueka, where the most friendly feeling exists amongst the little band of settlers.

Sarah Greenwood’s report describes the settlement two months after the event as still being on high alert and in confusion. Nevertheless, not all settlers developed negative feelings towards Māori. Some, as discussed [for example the case of Bisley’s neighbour], went back to their normal lives after the initial panic and insecurity, which quickly wore off. This suggests the continued existence of the Middle Ground or, at least, its reestablishment after the disruption by the events of Wairau.
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The surveyor Samuel Stephens, on a personal level, was not at all alarmed after Wairau; nevertheless, he noticed the effect it had had on race relations. He states in a letter to his mother:

> Although this dreadful affair has shaken our faith in the disposition and ability of some of the New Zealand savages to commit aggressions upon the white population – my opinion is not in the least altered as to the favourable inclination of the greater body of them to the English settlers who have come to reside amongst them.\(^{558}\)

Further he notes that there was an absence of punishment by the government for the crime, and recommends strong separation between the small group of aggressive and “savage like” Māori and the Māori who are on friendly terms with the settlers. Stephens’ writing is fascinating because it illustrates the contradiction between self-perception and the words and actions taken. Stephens, although obviously not ‘anti Māori’, uses Eurocentric language and indicates that the races should be separated. However, he still emphasises the good relations he has with Māori and his ongoing willingness to engage with ‘the other’ in the contact zone. Stephens’ writing suggests that Nelson settlers made a clear distinction between the Māori who were part of the killing and those still engaged in the Middle Ground or even more so in a personal Middle Ground.

Wairau did not only affect Pākehā society. Settlers like Wohlers noticed that the Māori world had been shaken too and that they feared reprisal attacks. Wohlers’ records in his diary: "Nearly all the natives have vanished from Nelson because they are afraid of revenge."\(^{559}\) He continues:

> On top of the hill in the middle of the town, on which the church and the survey office are situated, a fortification wall is being built. The citizens are having drill and exercise every day. The Natives have vanished from sight. They are afraid of retaliation; and as they were the ones who provided the food for the town – the victuals – similar to when a town is under siege, are now all very expensive.\(^{560}\)

Samuel Stephens’ journal also reports how shaken Māori were: “Eoodi, his wife and other natives paid me a visit to day, and had a korero about the Wairoo [sic] affair. They all seemed deeply to lament the death of poor Captain Wakefield in particular."\(^{561}\)

Comparing the different reactions of Wairau, it becomes evident that the settler community of Nelson was initially shocked but people dealt differently with the new situation. The evidence suggests there was uneasiness and fear directly after Wairau, but most people did


\(^{559}\) Wohlers, “L. F. H. Wohlers Diary/Transcribed.” p.14

\(^{560}\) Ibid. p.22

\(^{561}\) Stephens, “Correspondence and Typescripts.” Continuation of Extracts from Journal, Riwaka, Nelson Settlement, New Zealand 31 July 1843.
not seem too disturbed and still felt safe. It seems intriguing to note that in the scholarship often referred to ‘Working man revolt of Nelson’ in 1843, as a result of the event in Wairau, to be of no importance to the settlers themselves.\textsuperscript{562} The examined material showed no mention of any hostile intentions on the part of working men toward Māori, even though the scholarship often refers to the lines of The Nelson Examiner: “We are blessed with two privileged classes- Maoris and road–makers”, which suggests a negative perception toward the indigenous triggered by the changes in the New Zealand Company relief working scheme. This event, however, could not be found in the examined letters and diaries, which only talk about Wairau as such and do not discuss the Working man revolt.\textsuperscript{563}

The material presented shows the scratched feelings of settlers towards Māori but also outlines that, even after Wairau, interaction was still possible. These positive reactions were also enhanced by Government actions which, as Ann Parsonson noted, ensured that all Police Magistrates in the settlements, as well as settlers, were ‘publicly warned’. No right of land ownership should be exercised until land title was approved by the Claims Commissioner which aimed to reduce tensions between the two peoples.\textsuperscript{564}

The evidence has shown that Nelson maintained a feeling of safety and positive interaction between settlers and Māori, one of the characteristics of the Middle Ground, which these settlers were engaged in. However, the New Zealand Company as an official body felt quite annoyed about Māori and, with the Crown representatives’ ruling in the case of Wairau in favour of Māori, the Company attitude became even more vindictive.\textsuperscript{565} This observation contrasts with some of the evidence from private experiences, reinforcing the point that

\textsuperscript{562} For the long-term effects of the event in Wairau refer to: Hill, Policing the Colonial Frontier: The Theory and Practice of Coercive Social and Racial Control in New Zealand, 1767-1867. pp.160-212
McAloon, Nelson: A Regional History. pp.10-41

\textsuperscript{563} Original in The Nelson Examiner, 9 September 1843 as cited in ———, Nelson: A Regional History. p.131
Also referred to: Allan et al., Nelson: A History of Early Settlement. p.267

Due to the scope of the present research the events of the ‘Working man Revolt’ cannot be discussed further. Due to the micro historical approach and the idea of the History from Below, the events of Wairau and its conclusive effects will only be discussed as presented in the personal perspective of Nelson settlers.

\textsuperscript{564} Parsonson, "Wai 143 A1 Land and Conflict in Taranaki, 1839-1859- Nga Whenua Tautohetohe O Taranaki; Revision of Report No.1 to the Waitangi Tribunal: 'The Purchase of Maori Land in Taranaki, 1839-59'." p.44
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History from Below and Microhistory, can show a different picture and perception of the same historical event.

In general the evidence presented suggests that, as time moved on, the constant false alarms reduced, and settler panic subsided with fewer and fewer people fleeing to Church Hill. This also corresponds with the fact that reports about Wairau in Nelson settlers’ letters and diaries lessened after three to four months. Taking this into consideration, a picture of a community that realises there is no real threat emerges, enabling people to return to their normal life patterns. Joseph Ford Wilson writes to his family in great detail about Wairau and the fortification of Nelson on 19th December 1843 before concluding in a positive manner “… but now all fear of the natives subsided. We are all quite well …”

It is evident that the alarm over the Wairau incident in the Nelson settlement was short-lived and less intense than in Wellington. As already touched on in the preceding chapter, the main settlement at Wellington seemed on alert in regards to the potential threat from Māori far longer and far more often. This might correlate with the larger Māori community around Wanganui a Tara compared to Whakatū-Nelson, where the Māori population was smaller. Also the proximity to Kapiti, Te Rauparaha’s stronghold, could well have influenced the longer-lasting unease of the Wellington settler community.

5.10 Middle Ground?

The presented examples show that the Nelson Māori-Settler relations were built on individual experiences. Immediately on the arrival of first settlers at Te Tau Ihu, positive experiences were made: “All the luggage had to be carried by hand to its destination, and boxes were lying about in all directions, but not a single theft took place, though some of the boxes were exposed for weeks without shelter or protection.” As illustrated, the help and affability settlers received from Māori created an initial trust in the new people.

The discussed material suggests that, over time, many Nelson settlers lived reasonably independently of Māori with less intimate contact than, for example, the majority of Wellington settlers. Nevertheless, some individuals fostered a Middle Ground in their personal lives or for their little community. It is likely that Sarah Greenwood was one such person. As

---
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outlined above, she was critical of the Pākehā reactions at Wairau and still willing to engage in the positive space, the *Middle Ground*. One year after Wairau, in March 1844, she wrote to her mother about her positive feeling towards Māori:

> The longer we live here, the more we like the native character and the more we feel assured of our perfect safety amongst them. They are exceedingly honest and sober, and though rather covetous, seldom intruding or wanting in propriety of conduct. Many of them are really noble-looking fellows, and the women, though less handsome, are frequently very pleasing.\(^{568}\)

In November of the same year further evidence for the established personal *Middle Ground* can be found when she writes:

> We are on very comfortable terms with the natives, who have indeed great reason to be grateful to Danforth, who renders them all sort of kind offices without return. They are not in general grateful set of people, but he is so much liked by all, especially by the rangitiras [sic] or gentlemen, that even in case of any outbreak of which there is not the least prospect I should not feel alarmed for ourselves, I believe I may boast of enjoying a good share of popularity myself; they all call me ‘Tarah’ (they cannot pronounce the S), and make themselves very much at home, though not often in a troublesome manner. I am now so aware of the national failing, greediness, that I know how to manage better than at first,...\(^{569}\)

Thus Sarah overcame her fear and uncertainty to develop a very positive feeling about living with Māori. Her writing reflects on relationships built over time, revealing how Māori and settler acted together in the contact zone.

Elisabeth Caldwell, in the same way as Sarah Greenwood, had continuing contact with Māori. In her reminiscences she outlines that she once gave a concert and “Edwin Wilson, a Māori” was present to listen to her playing, totally dressed in English style, and also speaking English to her. Seen through Pākehā eyes, we get a glimpse of a Māori man totally immersed in a European lifestyle with maybe a deeper interest in the British lady than she was willing to admit; a Māori engaging in daily Pākehā settlement life. Caldwell further enhances the picture of the lived *Middle Ground* when she notes that she made sure that her son was learning te reo and reports about the visits of Māori to her house and travelling and enjoying the hospitality of the pā. She engaged in trade with Māori and learned about their perspective on the land problems. Furthermore, she employed a Māori girl to do the washing, and, in addition, her writing traces the adaption and engagement with, Māori through her frequent use of te reo.\(^{570}\)
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As demonstrated, Samuel Stephens became a clear participant in the *Middle Ground*. He established a new relationship with Māori and, spoke in favour of Māori. Wairau shocked him, but nevertheless, he continued to engage in his ‘local indigenous network’ and made a strong distinction between the people around him and Māori who were part of the attack. Stephens, despite in some instances expressing strong racist ideas, embraces the *Middle Ground*. He learns about Māori culture and language. He trades with Māori and employs them and also advocates for the rights of Māori as well as settlers.

As outlined, Māori also participated in town life to a certain degree. The reports of the first anniversary of Nelson indicate that the *Middle Ground* was still in existence in February 1843, just before Wairau. Māori were greatly involved in the celebrations and even performed a ‘war dance’.571 Saxton also notes in his diary about the canoe race:

> We were in time to see two canoes with eight natives in each, paddling with all their might. The smaller one for Pekoe would have won I think, but was thrown back some yards by Captain Moore’s Sailing boat driving between the two. I saw Pekoe after the race, bared to the waist and I never saw a more splendid specimen of the human frame either in size or Symmetry.572

Samuel Stephens mentions that Māori won the race and that it was a “very interesting scene.”573 Barnicoat remarks that “The most interesting and animated of these was the canoe race. Unfortunately only two started (owing to the religious prejudices on the part of the native) but the contest between these two was novel and interesting beyond description.”574

Martha Adams records in her diary other convincing examples of the existence of the personal *Middle Ground*. Her new neighbours, a Scottish family, settled near a pā and Martha Adams recalls:

> In commemoration of last Christmas day, this gentleman gave a dinner to his wild neighbours, and to amalgamate themselves still more with them, offered to dance a Scotch reel or Highland fling in his full highland costume, on condition the chief of the pau [sic] previously performed a war dance. After immense preparations for a coarse but plentiful meal and the due eating thereof on both sides, the performances commenced.575

A long and exhausting dance followed and as everyone settled down again she reports: “The space is cleared, and the natives seated round, calm themselves to look on with wondering
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eyes, and charmed ears to the music of a piano forte [sic] touched by the light fingers of Miss M[sic] as an accompaniment to her Father’s Highland reel.\textsuperscript{576}

The chief was fascinated by the piano and lady and wanted to “offer Mr.[sic] ‘50 pigs for the Pickaninny and the Whisle’, and so urgent was he for the bargain, that he doubled and redoubled his bidding up to 200 pigs before he could be made to understand that it was an impossible purchase, impracticable bargain.”\textsuperscript{577}

In this rather amusing scene, a cultural exchange took place. Both peoples entertained and learned about each other by observing and sharing. Assuming that this event was not based on cultural misunderstanding on the Pākehā side, the clash of cultures becomes evident with the attempt to purchase the beautiful woman, which seemed acceptable and reasonable for one party, while the other could not relate to these practices.

Māori-Settler relations in Nelson present a different picture from Wellington. The most influential factors seem to be the Nelson settlers’ later arrival, the different mix of people, altered climate, greater proximity to the main settlement of Wellington and, most importantly, different exposure of settlers to Māori.\textsuperscript{578} Several sources mention a small Māori community around the settlement, which was significantly different from Wellington, where the pā was right in town and other ‘native villages’ were close by.\textsuperscript{579} While Māori in Whakatū-Nelson also came to town and participated in town life, in contrast with Wellington, this happened on a much smaller scale.

In consequence, there was lower level of Māori-Settler exposure, which resulted in the creation of a stronger personal Middle Ground. The examined material, in accordance with Mitchell and Mitchell’s detailed research on Māori in the Nelson Region, clearly shows that cultural understanding and positive interaction were in evidence.\textsuperscript{580} The Middle Ground in Nelson was based on personal interaction rather than upon the common pattern of a whole settlement, as seen for example in Wellington. The Nelson experiences reveal language adoption, friendship, cultural understanding, trust, and trade with Māori. The somewhat fragmented reporting about Māori in Nelson does not indicate any negative perceptions. It should be noted that people who do not write about Māori do not necessarily, through their
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silence, demonstrate any negativity towards Māori. Rather it would seem that they saw no need to express their attitudes and perception of ‘the other’.

The shocking events at Wairau seemed to change the described patterns for a short period of time. As outlined, participants in the Middle Ground mostly regained their trust in Māori or perhaps never lost it. Life seemed to return to normal sooner than expected and Māori and Pākehā continued to engage with each other on mutual terms. Wairau, in a similar way to the ‘Hutt Wars’, did not have the power to destroy the individual or personal Middle Ground. The events shocked the settlement and relations with ‘the other’ but were not strong enough to create long-lasting negative perceptions. In Wellington we can see how the fear of Māori developed progressively with each interruption of the Middle Ground, but without long-term damage to the contact zone. The proximity to Te Rauparaha and larger hapū and iwi may have made Wellington settlers more anxious however, it did not destroy the Middle Ground. It was only the outbreak of the Taranaki Wars in New Plymouth that would change the perception of Māori significantly.
6. New Plymouth Settlers and Māori

6.1 Historical Background

New Plymouth was planned by the New Plymouth Company, which officially merged with its financially stronger parent organisation, the New Zealand Company, in 1843. Located north of Whanganui, New Plymouth was supposed to provide more land within reach of Wellington for settlement. The fertile land on the West Coast of the North Island, near Mt Taranaki, was purchased in 1839 during the Tory expedition under the so-called Nga Motu Deed, and was thought to have rich soil for agriculture. Seen as an addition to Wellington, New Plymouth and Whanganui together, were supposed to stabilise supply of agricultural produce to the growing town. The planning committee for further settlements in New Zealand was so convinced of the advantages of the Taranaki region that they ignored issues of isolation and difficult harbour access, both of which proved to be considerable disadvantages. More than 1000 settlers arrived at New Plymouth between 1841 and 1843 to begin a new life which, as they found out soon, was to be heavily influenced by Māori.

This chapter will provide an overview of the establishment of the settlement of New Plymouth and will illustrate its unique challenges. This overview will be followed by a more detailed examination of Māori-Settler encounters, gathered from the private records of the New Plymouth settlers from 1841 to 1860. Particular emphasis will be afforded to the established pattern of those encounters: the first experiences on shore, trade, help, language adoption and knowledge exchange. New Plymouth’s patterns will be examined in relation to White’s Middle Ground ideas, to determine whether there was in fact a space of mutual interaction in New Plymouth. Furthermore there will be a focus on the destructive powers of the emerging land problems which ultimately resulted in the Land Wars of the 1860s, and how these complications affected the interface between the two communities.

Danny Keenan showed that Taranaki, and especially the region of New Plymouth, experienced constant warfare arising from disputed landownership. Patricia Burns pointed out that by the early 1840s the region was relatively depopulated by Māori, which convinced settlers that Taranaki could be a suitable place for a new settlement. However, this is contested by the

According to Parsonson, while some families remained on the land to “keep the home fires burning”, a large proportion of the northern iwi were not living on their ancestral lands. Driven by inter-tribal warfare from 1820 onwards, large tribal movements occurred in the North and South Islands. Most of the local Maori, including Te Ātiawa, had retreated or expanded during the invasion of the Waikato tribes in 1832 to the Wellington region, Kapiti Coast, Wairarapa and also Te Tau Ihu. However, the Waitangi Tribunal report for Taranaki points out that after 1839, and the departure of the Tory, Māori began returning to their homelands. Even though different estimates of the actual Māori population are presented in the scholarship, the effect is unchanged. Both the New Zealand Company and the settlers and planners of the settlement, according to British understanding, regarded the region as depopulated and up for taking, when the decision for settlement was made.

By 1839 William Wakefield was convinced that the terrain, with its fertile and flat land, was suitable for a new settlement and that Māori would be no further problem. With no owners or occupiers, according to Wakefield, what better place could one find for more new arrivals from Britain? Nevertheless, it was precisely this misinterpretation of landownership by the British that became the basis for years of war and the resulting loss of life in New Zealand. It will be argued in the forthcoming discussion that this conflict created a significant changing point in Māori-Settler interactions and disrupted the Middle Ground.

The Plymouth Company was launched at a public meeting in Plymouth, England on the 27th January 1840. Land, newly acquired by the closely-connected New Zealand Company, was purchased and a survey team was sent to Aotearoa/New Zealand to establish the settlement of New Plymouth. Carrington, the chief surveyor, and his team landed first at already well-established Port Nicholson-Wellington, to get some assistance from Wakefield in the preparation for the new settlement further up the coast. They were then to proceed to Sugarloafs, a conical headland on the Taranaki Coast.

The New Plymouth Company was always closely under the umbrella of the New Zealand Company and merged on the 10th of May 1843 with the New Zealand Company due to

financial difficulties.\textsuperscript{589} Today, New Plymouth is seen as essentially a New Zealand Company Settlement and the Plymouth Company has been largely glossed over. This is not surprising, given its short lifespan.

Scholars agree that New Plymouth was the most complex of all the New Zealand Company settlements. New Plymouth was a planned town like Wellington and Nelson and like these other settlements it faced its own unique challenges. Firstly, there was the town plan, which was created far away from New Zealand with no knowledge of the geography of the site.\textsuperscript{590} Secondly, New Plymouth was planned as an agricultural site, which was difficult to realise, given that the investors were merchants, not farmers. Lastly, like Nelson and Wellington, surveying of the land was very slow and the land was still largely covered with bush.

Ship after ship arrived and settlers poured in to the Taranaki region: The William Bryan as the first ship arrived 31\textsuperscript{st} March 1841, followed by the Amelia Thompson with 187 passengers on the 3\textsuperscript{rd} of September 1841. The Oriental arrived on 7\textsuperscript{th} November 1841 and the Timandra on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} February 1842. The Blenheim arrived on 19\textsuperscript{th} November 1842 and the Essex docked on the 20\textsuperscript{th} of January 1843. These six ships transported a total of at least 900 settlers to New Plymouth and created a settlement of respectable size in terms of population.\textsuperscript{591}

According to Dalziel, New Plymouth, which was often described as the ‘garden of New Zealand’, took far longer to become self-sufficient than expected.\textsuperscript{592} Remarkably, 1844, three years after the first ships arrived, was the year of the first significant grain harvest. The rather slow progress in obtaining a stable food supply was not helped by the fact that most of the settler ships arrived during the winter months. Beginning to farm was challenging and the weather conditions were not ideal, and unfamiliar to most of the new farmers. The settlement was constantly short of food. The frequent food shortage had already been outlined by early historians like R.G. Wood who estimated the food problem as one of the fundamental early issues of the settlement, distinguishing it from Nelson and Wellington.\textsuperscript{593}

In addition, the isolation and the lack of a good harbour created a complex mix of challenges for the juvenile settlement. To compare, Nelson was close to Wellington, was more easily restocked and had a far more accessible harbour. Also, the stable Māori population at Te Tau Ihu helped to supply food to the new arrivals at Nelson in 1842. In contrast, Taranaki was
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isolated, difficult to reach, and seemed depopulated of Māori to the British. According to Wood, the young settler community of New Plymouth only survived because of help from the small number of local Māori and the arrival of new ships with more supplies. But the absence of a satisfactory harbour made the reliance on ships hazardous. Settlers described ships being seen out on the sea for days unable to be unloaded, while the settlement suffered from the severe food shortages.

Illustrating the complex nature of the first years on shore, Dalziel estimates that only 251 acres of land was under cultivation in 1843 and that the settlement had only one ox and three cows per farm, while most did not own a horse. Therefore help from, and trade with, Māori was essential for the establishment of the settlement. Nearly every diary and almost all of the letters of settlers of New Plymouth report in one way or another about the significant impact of the Māori involvement.

Māori, despite disrupting early attempts at British surveying, nevertheless, welcomed the British settlement and hoped for protection from, and opportunities for trading with the settlers. Some Māori, returning to their homelands, had already experienced these advantages around Port Nicholson. Belich argues that the effect of settlerism brought considerable economic stimulus not only to Britain but also to the New World. Māori, with their system of trading routes around Aotearoa and strong economic network, hoped also to participate in this boom, which partially explains their interest in the new settlements like New Plymouth, Wellington and Nelson.

New Plymouth stood in strong contrast to Wellington where the settlers were mainly of British middle and lower classes; and Nelson, which had a stronger upper class in conjunction with untrained labourers and a very diverse settler mix. However, as shown by Raewyn Dalziel, New Plymouth settlers came mainly from Cornwall, Devon and Dorset, which were the very poor and mainly agricultural parts of England. These had been purposely targeted for recruitment to provide a sufficient influx of agricultural labourers to this settlement. Easily influenced by the promise of the boosters, at a time of economic distress in England, these settlers were hoping for a new and better life with more opportunities.
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However, soon after arrival, many realised that New Plymouth was far from a promised land, and was not the well-functioning settlement in the Pacific as envisioned. Once again the advertisement strategies of the New Zealand Company had been successful and people hoped for paradise but were given wilderness. Lambert argues convincingly that settlers were devastated as they realised that they would spend at least six months in temporary housing. Land distribution took time and even when in full swing, the new landowners were dissatisfied with their share. Some tried to make arrangements for clearing bush and make their land useable but the lack of sufficient workers slowed the process down. Furthermore, according to Lambert, “there was a serious problem of boredom, which in turn led to drunkenness and disorderly behaviour”. This gives the impression of a rather depressed state amongst the settlers of 1841.

The difficult living circumstances became manifest in their personal writings. Nevertheless, not all newly arrived settlers were depressed or negatively affected. Reactions varied, from some who were overly excited and felt they could cope with the new situation, to others who were stunned and shocked by the new life that was not at all what the boosters had promised.

As in Wellington and Nelson, the Taranaki problems between settler and Māori were based on the issue of land ownership. Shorty after settlement, the New Plymouth settlers saw a slow return of Māori to the region. Questions about land ownership and the legality of land sales became increasingly prominent in the discussions recorded in the microhistories of the time. Over time, and especially after 1848 when Kingi returned Waitara to protect the homelands from being sold, discontent increased on both sides and conflict regarding land ownership and sales became an increasingly pressing problem.

Given their initial resistance to acknowledge the presence and return of Te Ātiawa and their protest against the surveying processes, Pākehā of New Plymouth felt increasingly uneasy. Having completely misunderstood the inter-tribal situation, George Cutfield, the Director of the New Plymouth Company, reports on 2nd of May 1841: “Since we have been here there has been much talk of the Waikato tribe coming. Should they come with a bad feeling I shall be prepared for them; however, I hope they know better than to molest the whites.”

---
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As times moved on the social problems in the settlement increased. Burns pointed out that, as in Nelson, New Plymouth suffered from the stubbornness of investors who sought to invest in trade rather than agriculture. By 1846 it became evident that the Company could not fulfil its promise of full employment in the settlement, and this resulted in unrest and pressure on Company officials.\textsuperscript{604} The settlers who had come from Devon and Dorset were accustomed to violent protests back home. They strongly criticised the Wakefield Company and took to the streets to fight for, what they thought, were their rights – which destabilised the situation amongst the settlers to an even greater extent.\textsuperscript{605}

As previously noted, the mix of immigrants for New Plymouth proved to be an explosive blend and the Company officials felt the full force of the settlers’ wrath as tensions increased in the settlement. Dalziel calculated that on the first six ships, there were 313 [almost one third] males over the age of 15, and of these only 64 were registered as cabin class; 15 of these left the ship in Wellington, which left only 49 reasonably well-educated, upper-class men for the establishment of the new settlement.\textsuperscript{606} This clearly shows that the bulk of the settlers were uneducated lower class citizens who were willing to go on the streets to fight for their rights to land and work. These figures highlight one of the main issues in New Plymouth: there simply were not enough people of means to create employment opportunities for the flood of settlers with only labouring skills.

Nothing came easy for these settlers of the New Zealand Company in New Plymouth. There were basic problems of daily survival; there was a volatile mix of social classes; and then there was the ubiquitous and devastating feeling of having being betrayed by the Company. These issues paint a picture of a settler community in crisis. There were personal difficulties such as infestations of fleas, sandflies and rats. Added to these, some settlers recorded of stories of bad weather and wind. These unexpected circumstances destroyed the vision that the Company had created - the dream of an easy life.\textsuperscript{607} And, over time, these hopes and dreams came under even more pressure with the question of land ownership, and Crown action — or lack thereof — to gain control of the emerging Māori resistance. The worlds of both settlers and Māori changed dramatically in the twenty years, from 1840—1860, after the first wave of eager immigrants set foot on the soil of Taranaki.
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6.2 Māori-Settler interactions

The first immigrants to New Plymouth, in their letters and diaries, conveyed a profound impression of the new country that they were to make their home: a new landscape, with its towering mountain peak and its occupation by Māori. Nothing on the ships or back home prepared them for this reality. Remarkably, the records of New Plymouth settlers offer us a glimpse as to their preparation on board the immigrant ships; this is in contrast to the diaries of settlers coming to Wellington and Nelson, in which this topic was never recorded.

Sydney Evelyn Liardt Wright arrived in New Plymouth on the Blenheim in 1842. Her particularly detailed ship diary is an intriguing source. Her recordings detail the preconceptions while on the ship as well as the perception of Māori, and her diary stretches from the beginning of her voyage until 1844 when she had settled into her new home. She reports of events during the voyage, including a lecture on the evils of drinking and the status of Christianisation of Māori. She also reports on discussions amongst the passengers who had been hoping to find a better society in which Māori, in accordance with the booster literature, had been civilised and Christianised so that the new settlers had nothing to fear.  

Henry Weeks, who was one of the surgeons with the New Zealand Company, arriving on the William Bryan on 30th March 1841, also provides evidence of what the settlers knew in advance about New Zealand and Māori. As a highly-educated cabin passenger, he refers to books and European literature about New Zealand. He even points out aspects that he presumes to be wrong and in addition also shows some knowledge and skills in te reo Māori. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that nowhere in his ship diary is there mention of any language lessons or special preparations for the arrival in the new country.

By the 1850s plenty of news and information had made its way back to Britain, triggering lively discussion on board the immigrant ship Mariner, as Mary Homeyer showed. Homeyer, a cabin passenger on the Mariner from Gravesend, England, stopped over in Dunedin, Nelson, and Wellington before finally disembarking at New Plymouth on 11th October 1850. She provides some fascinating insight:

Mr Weston wished very much to stay in Otago, his better half would not agree to it his reason for wishing to stay then [sic] was because there are so few natives in the middle island than there are in the northern and his nerves had been so much worked upon through the tales what had been told by Mr Hertslett and Mr Macworth of their dangerous ferocity, a blue book was bought [sic]

on deck, with the full details, of a shocking murder that had been committed by them some years before at Wanganui and many other similar stories and as he believed all that was told they kept it up. Mr Herstlett who had been among them when he was in New Zealand before, danced the war dance and shouted. 'Wallahi Wallahi, love white man, eat him too', this poor timid man thought so much about it, that at last he became ill and took to his bed... so at length I was obliged to tell Mrs Weston that a great deal of it was exaggeration, and was more a joke than anything else,...

While the experienced New Zealand traveller here bases his humour on ready stereotypes, it nonetheless shows how varied knowledge about the new country still was. Some, seeing the performance, were able to identify the exaggeration, while others still believed and feared meeting the ‘cannibal and savage’. Putting these observations into the context to the time of occurrence, it can be speculated that the tensions between Māori and Pākehā by 1850s had already grown significantly and, as will be shown in more depth later, was already having an effect on the newly arriving settlers with an re-emerging fear towards Māori.

However, these examples only portray the situation of the upper-class immigrants to New Zealand. Further research is warranted on the question of how much of the preparation for going to New Zealand was left to the individual settlers’ families and how the differences in preparation for the different social classes were manifested. Although covering a later period and set in a different region of New Zealand, the works of Arnold, McCarthy, Brooking, Fraser, Hearne and Jock Phillips show fascinating insights into the lives of immigrants of different social classes, genders, origins and destinations. However, there is a significant dearth of traceable records, particularly in pertaining to the lower class, of the earliest days of settlement.
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6.3 First experiences

As outlined in the previous chapters, the first experiences of interaction between Māori and settlers were important for the establishment of a dynamic comparable to that of White’s *Middle Ground*. These first encounters were very positive and trust-building, and this situation seems universal while the experience of the geographical regions differ.

The sighting of the most prominent mountain, known by the British as Mt. Egmont but known to Māori as Taranaki, marked an important point in the new life of the pioneers of New Plymouth. The excitement grew with the knowledge that the journey around the world would soon come to an end and that a new and better home would await them. Although still a long way from shore, and probably at least with one more day of voyage ahead, people could see the mountain, providing a renewed hope. As they approached, settlers “observed several fires on shore and the huts of some of the natives.” And, similar to the scenario in Whanganui ā Tara, once the ship was close enough Māori came on board. Most of them, as the passenger Sarah Harris pointed out, had been from the nearby whaling station. These Māori, probably already accustomed to Europeans, made the first contact and prepared the new arrivals for their transition.

It is not surprising that, like Nelson and Wellington, New Plymouth was ill prepared. Dicky Barrett, a whaler and so called ‘Pākehā-Māori’ had worked for the New Zealand Company since 1839 as a translator and had been instructed to make the preparations for the settlers. But as a settler wrote home: “nothing but the beach and a great forest behind” could be seen from the ship. Scholarship seems divided about the actual amount of preparation by Barrett. However, we know that he instructed Māori to build temporary shelter and to help the landing settlers.

Mr. Stokes, one of the surveyors, gives a vibrant description of how helpful and busy Maori were in making preparations for landing the new arrivals. He notes that:
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All their time of late has been occupied with the erection of houses, even to the neglect of their potato ground. They speak of nothing else but Port Nicholson and the settlers there. And their questions are directed to that point. Stokes’ comment points to the economic and personal interests of Maori in the establishment of a settlement.

The Māori welcome in New Plymouth had a deep and long-lasting, if varied, effect on the settlers. John Newland, the first policeman of New Plymouth, noted in his diary shortly after his landfall: “The kindness with which the Natives received us desired to be recorded, all had smiling faces and outreached arms which made a strong impression on all our feelings.” A settler statement that found also reflection in R.G. Woods early work on the history or New Plymouth: a work that illustrates the friendly welcoming of settlers by Māori.

John Hursthouse, in contrast, noted in his diary: “The natives of whom one stood by at our landing are fearful to look at, their tattooed [sic] faces are horridly ugly.” Clearly Hursthouse’s encounter was driven more by fear and disgust than by happiness and excitement, emotions that certainly had been influenced by the feeling of British superiority. The Tā Moko was something a few settlers had perhaps read about in books and had seen in paintings and lithographs. However, only rough and wild sailors, prisoners and ‘the savages’ had these; which were seen by the British as signals of an uncivilised existence: therefore the negative perception seems not surprising.

Nevertheless, the art of tattooing fascinated the new arrivals and some even developed a particular interest in it. Henry Weeks, the New Zealand Company surgeon for New Plymouth, a man of the upper class and good education, wrote in his diary about tattoos:

The Taranakiens [sic] are by no means so dark as the engravings and wood-cuts would lead you to suppose; another error is common in the latter and this is to be seen often in ‘The New Zealanders’ of the Library of Entertaining Knowledge where the tattu [sic] is lighter instead of being darker than the skin. Too many of these drawings being made by persons [sic] who never saw the original they have made the faces on their usual model— the Grecian or Roman; the former of which perhaps never had a living existences in any country. The best likenesses will be found in Captain Cook’s ‘Voyages’; and more recently in those of Captain Fitzroy [sic].

---
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Mary Homeyer, who stopped in Wellington on her way to New Plymouth, noted that: “some of the marries [sic] woman among the natives are tattooed [sic] on their lips and chin with fine blue lines...”

Encountering tattooing and the Tā Moko was, to varying degrees, a shock for the British. It was the ultimate sign of ‘the savage’, a lack of civilisation, whilst at the same time being fascinating and intriguing; an ambivalent encounter that excited settlers as much as it frightened them.

Some of the first experiences for New Plymouth settlers were outside of the Taranaki region. A number of ships, for example the one on which Mary Homeyer sailed, docked first at Port Nicholson–Wellington. Even if Mary Homeyer and others are not writing about Taranaki Māori, the experiences from Wellington illustrate their initial contact with New Zealand and Māori. This initial contact was part of the expectations, fears and hopes they brought with them to their final destination: New Plymouth. For example Sydney Wright notes of the visual appearance of Māori:

What we saw of the natives they seemed a very fine race tall bony well proportioned black and long air [sic, hair?] fine white teeth bright eyes and a quick and lively expression of countenance are are [sic] mostly of a copper color [sic] some darker than others, and the oldest had their faces tattooed [sic] which was cut very deep in the face and some very regular and curious figures they brought a few potatoes of which they exchanged for biscuit [sic].

On the other hand, some immigrants stopped over at New Plymouth before reaching their final destination of Wellington or Nelson. In return these immigrants took their experiences of New Plymouth with them. Martha Adams final destination was Nelson. Her experiences on 31st October 1850 in New Plymouth were very positive. She recalled that she was “carried on the shoulders of the Maories [sic] thro’ the surf and wet sand up to the dry part on the beach”, and that “there was a cheerfully welcome from settlers and Māori alike.”

Thus, once again, New Plymouth was like the other two case study towns in that it offered the first settlers nothing that they had been expecting. Henry Weeks arrived in New Plymouth in 1841. He reported:

Wholst [sic] one party was engaged at the loading place another was busy creating tents and providing for the night. Fortunately Mr Bau [sic probably Dicky Barret] who had recently arrived here for the purpose of whaling, had just built a row of natives houses, part of which being unoccupied afforded us excellent shelter. By the night every one [sic] had his place, and what with the delight of being released from the ship, and the fineness & [sic] watermelons for biscuits,
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the children were throwing each other about, and gipsy-fires [sic] washerwoman & soapsuds were universal.625

Weeks catches the excitement on shore and the ‘smell of adventure’ very well. His description reads like an exciting camping trip, but reality was hitting hard after the first days. The new settlement needed to be planned, built and the new surroundings needed to be explored.626 However, even one year after New Plymouth had been established as a settlement, it was still in an unfinished state. Josiah Flights noted about his arrival in New Plymouth: “On shore...the people on shore are living in tents, huts formed of reeds or mud, and a few in one storied [sic] storage or storey?] houses. Put up a tent.”627 As indicated by these examples, the creation of a functioning town with sufficient shelter took much longer than most settlers anticipated. This resulted in a strong sense of community amongst the settlers and families; already-established ones offered help and shelter for the new arrivals.

In general the material shows that the shock after the landing was most pronounced for the British Victorian women who found many aspects of the new land to be rather frightening and surprising. Sarah Harris reports to her father about her landing and the first night on shore. She recalls in a most emotional description:

When I arrived all was confusion, boxes all about, some open to get at blankets and sheets to divide the apartments. Some Natives brought poles and flax to make a bedstead which being done a quantity of green fern was laid on the top on which was my matteress [sic] and bedding. Then I had my sleeping place enclosed with curtains and a table made of a box on which I placed a white cloth and looking glass etc. The children slept on boxes placed close together – some people lay on the ground but I could not, nor would I let little ones particularly as there was no flooring nothing but the earth. I fancy how shocked you would have been, no door, no window, no fire, and the Natives coming in when they liked particularly when we were eating. Notwithstanding my dear Father, I slept [sic] well that first night and when I awoke in the morning I found Edwin gone and two ghastly Maoris [sic] with their faces tattooed all over sitting down on the ground close to my bedside. How I felt or looked I cannot describe – I did not scream or speak but waved my hand to them to go away.628

She feared that “they would take some of my clothes which they were handling to my disgust. Soon after Edwin came in – he looked quite horrified — and soon sent them off...”629 Sarah Harris encapsulated the excitement of being ashore on one hand with the clash of culture on the other; and gives a picture of her appreciation of the new and very simple living circumstances with her uneasiness towards Māori.
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However, as argued on a more general level by Raewyn Dalziel, Charlotte Macdonald and Judith Binney, settler women felt a sense of adventure and demonstrated pioneer courage.  

For instance, as well as writing of the turmoil she felt, Sarah Harris also wrote about the ‘pioneer spirit’ that was expected from the first immigrants such as herself. She noted in a letter to her father:

> I hope to be able to write longer letter to all soon but the uncomfortable place we are in prevents our doing many things Edwin sleeps in his warie [sic] with Corbyyn I remain in a place without a door with the natives looking in to me in bed and talking before I am up they are a complete set of beggars like to have a bit of our meat and so on we seldom take a meal without three or more about us.  

Sarah Harris’ start in her new life seems to have been both difficult and shocking, and Māori presence had a considerable impact on her. It is interesting to note how closely Māori engaged with the settlers. Sarah Harris, for instance, reported that Māori were not only interested in her clothing, but also in the settlers’ food and in Pākehā in general. Irrespective of whether she wanted it or not, this close contact inevitably created a contact zone. The two people, each interested in the other for different reasons, needed to engage with each other on mutual terms and find a way to accommodate each other. 

The initial expectations of the New Plymouth settlers, driven by the boosters and advertising, were not fulfilled. Overwhelmed by bush and green land surrounding them, the settlers soon came to realise that New Zealand was far from the flourishing British outpost that they were led to believe. The limitations that the settlers experienced made them realise that the establishment of a prospering settlement would take much longer than they had anticipated. 

These times of hardship, especially the first year, made the new arrivals heavily dependent on Māori. Sarah Harris wrote to her father: “We are all anxious for the produce. Our living is very unprofitable and poor, month after month we have tasted nothing but flour and pork, there has not been a potato for three months.”  

Settlers relied on Māori but, as Sarah Harris points out, there was a problem with the supply: “The natives are very busy planting them [potatoes] for next year.”  

Harris gives a detailed description of the hardship in the early days of the

---

630 Dalziel, “The Colonial Helpmeet: Women’s Role and the Vote in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand.”
632 Binney, “‘In-between’ Lives: Studies from within Colonial Society.”
635 Ibid. ‘ My dear Father’, New Plymouth, 13 November 1841.
settlement; rats, rain, no shelter, high costs for all products; no land suitably surveyed and distributed, as well as limited work opportunities. Nevertheless, she concludes:

...you need not fear the natives, there are few here, sometimes they come in great numbers to visit us, and it has been said that there would be a war between two parties about this land as the Wicati [sic] people consider the Tarnaky [sic] natives had no right to sell the land, however, we don’t think there is truth in this report, and we have no fear.

However, young Anna Flight wrote in her diary about stronger fears in the new settlement. She comments about some problems between Māori and settler and concludes that “we all feel very anxious.”

Reflected in the settlers’ comments are the events that have been pointed out by Patricia Burns. She states that as early as 1841 a group of Waikato Māori caused alarm in the settlement. According to their right of conquest they started planting potatoes and about 1000 Māori demanded payment for their land, otherwise the settlers would have to leave. This brought considerable unrest to the little British community. The New Zealand Company ignored the Māori demands and asked their own settlers to help the case. Governor Hobson intervened, and £250 was paid to Te Wherowhero, the chief of the Waikato tribe, to settle the claim and secure the peace. However, and not surprising, the payment made by Hobson was referred to William Wakefield to compensate the government, which he refused to pay. Wakefield estimated the claim of the Waikato chiefs as too high and saw no reason to pay anything more than he had already. Land and the different connotation of ownership, as outlined by Berwick can be identified here. These conflicts intensified with the extension of the settlement.

Living as part of the Middle Ground in a constant flux was never easy. Life went on and Pākehā and Māori accommodated each other in a tolerant way. The obstacles for the settlement had been considerable and only local Māori, especially during the first years of settlement, had the resources and knowledge to keep settlers alive. Therefore the establishment and engagement in the Middle Ground was inevitable for the New Plymouth settlers as it helped them to adjust to their new life and country.
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6.4 Help of Māori

Help from Māori was essential for the earliest settlers of New Plymouth. As we have already seen, Māori helped the new arrivals in several different ways during their landing on shore. Settler men and women firstly needed to be transported safely through the swells to the shore; next, they needed help building houses and transporting goods. Trust from the settler side toward Māori needed to be built quickly and often the bond, established during the short trip over the rough seas and rocky shoreline from ship to land, intensified over time.

As with the other settlements, also at New Plymouth, housing was one of the first challenges for the new arrivals and a prime field for early interactions. Edwin Harris, one of the surveyors, employed Māori to build him a house and to help his family settle into the new country. Mr. Stokes, also a surveyor, gives a vibrant description of his first encounter with Māori in Taranaki and he describes how helpful they were in preparing for the expected shipload of settlers. He notes that:

> All their time of late has been occupied with the erection of houses, even to the neglect of their potato ground. They speak of nothing else but Port Nicholson and the settlers there. And their questions are directed to that point.

This statement strongly emphasises the reciprocal nature of the relationships that developed. Settlers needed help in building shelter but on the other hand Māori of New Plymouth were eager to participate in the economic wealth the setters could bring to the region, a wealth in trading opportunities that some had already seen at Port Nicholson.

As pointed out by Dalziel, the new life on shore was challenging and demanding and therefore all manner of help was welcome. Especially during the early days of the settlement, the private records show that Māori were helping around Pākehā houses and with the establishment of farms and gardens. Mary Hirst reported for New Plymouth:

> ‘Tipene’ [Stephen] a Maori came in, and James asked him to help him an hour to do a piece of ground for the Mango wurzel; he promised to come tomorrow to split rails for fencing we thought ourselves very fortunate in getting him, as they are all so busy on their own land it is next to impossible to get one.
In addition, more serious farming incidents served as a catalyst for trust and interaction in the contact zone. Sydney Wright reports of an incident where a cow fell in a kumara pit and, as settlers arrived to pull the poor animal out, they saw that this had already been done by Māori. Was this a sign of the respect for the inter-connectedness of everything that lives, as presented in the idea of Mauri, the life force? Was the cow simply in the way? Or were Māori simply around and did they know how important the cow was for the struggling British settlers? We can only speculate, but in any case the outcome was a positive one.

It appears that for New Plymouth, as well as for Wellington and Nelson, friendships or regular working relationships developed. For the Hirsts, ‘Tipene’ became quite close to the family unit while working for some days and months. He even came so close that Mary Hirst noted:

> Tipene has dinner with us; he had two rings on one of his fingers and one ornament hung on his ear, and was very particular to wash his face and hands before coming to table; he behaved very well. Papa was very much pleased with him.

Cultural differences become evident when she points to his rings, and superiority is noticeable in the reference to her father liking the civilised behaviour. However, the Hirst Family soon created a strong bond with a ‘friend’ they could count on in all difficulties and the *Middle Ground* became a living reality.

Friendships like these were important if we consider the vulnerable situation the British settlers were in. Sarah Harris, one of the first settlers in New Plymouth, gave a good account of the community dilemma. As referred to previously, she reports about the lack of food and further records that Māori planted additional potatoes to fulfil the high demand in the settlement. Furthermore she wrote:

> We know nothing about the fruits if there are any in the wild. We can only get fish from the natives who do not go out once in a month and we cannot get any under a shilling each, it is rather a large sort.

Food was a constant worry and the lack of knowledge in this area made the settlers of New Plymouth dependent upon Māori. In contrast to the other case studies and as will be demonstrated in the ‘knowledge exchange’ section of this chapter, few reports of Māori
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educating settlers could be found. It seems that this is one of the most significant differences between the settlements. The reason for this can only be speculated upon. The Māori population in the proximity of New Plymouth was lower relative to Nelson and Wellington; as a consequence it seems logical that there was less exposure to Māori as well. With the increase in Māori population so increased the level of conflict, which thus lessened the probability of help and chances for ‘education’ about the particulars of the new country for the new settlers.

In all settlements Māori hospitality was one of the key forms of interaction. This hospitality was well known during travel and several settler records and pioneer descriptions reflect this. Particularly during travel, Māori around New Plymouth granted settlers help in the form of shelter, food, and guidance about river crossings. Henry Weeks noted: “Notwithstanding our anxiety to get away, our hospitable friend would not hear of our leaving until we had breakfasted [sic],’for what’ said he, ‘will they say at Moturoa when you tell them that Abatu allowed you to go away without Kai?” The sharing of food and looking after guests, manaakitanga, is an essential of Māori tikanga and was something that settlers could not ‘escape’. The given example illustrates that Weeks and his men just wanted to get away from the pā as soon as possible. Nevertheless, they were invited to stay and involuntarily engaged once again in the common space of the Middle Ground.

As discussed above, travel was a common cause of interaction with Māori; and since New Plymouth was so isolated, the journey over land was long and difficult for the inexperienced settlers. George Curtis went overland from Wellington to New Plymouth in 1849. In his very detailed letter back home, he reflects on his experiences when he wrote:

This evening we walked about 4 miles when we fell in with a party of natives who were landing in a canoe and who ran after us to hear the news and I suppose were surprised to see two white men alone at that time of night however they were civil and one went about half a mile with us to show us the road.

Clearly Māori showed great interest in getting news from other parts of the country and demonstrated ‘friendly terms’ with the white strangers by guiding them over a longer distances and helping them find their way. George Curtis and his travel companion needed to engage with Māori on their journey. The duo visited several pā, had different Māori guides
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who helped on several dangerous river crossings and found that close contact was essential to reach their destination safely. Amongst several reports about the changing landscape, Curtis also wrote about a Māori-Pākehā couple that he met. He noted that they lived in a poor house but “were as well fed as at every other place in New Zealand where a white man lives.” The examples Curtis gives suggest that he and his travel party constantly acted in the contact zone. They built new relationships with the Indigenous and also discovered a couple who lived in both worlds.

Henry Robert Richmond also undertook the overland journey to New Plymouth. Originally from Auckland, he and his brother James left Auckland, the Capital of the time, in 1851. They went on a journey to reach their new home, New Plymouth, by foot. This long and dangerous trek would have been impossible without help of Māori. Richmond informs us about a written agreement between him and his guides, which was made at their request. It seems fascinating that Māori requested the written contract and not the other way around. Was there no trust or had they simply had bad past experiences? By 1851 questionable land purchases by the Crown had created bad blood amongst Māori, and Wiremu Kingi had already established himself back in Waitara as one, prepared to defend Māori land. Settler and Māori experienced conflict and difference more openly and Settler and Māori interpreted words and actions differently, so perhaps a written contract was a way to avoid potential problems.

Nevertheless, Māori carried the luggage, organised food and shelter and kept the travellers safe. During their journey the Richmond group encountered a small party of state officials and settlers living with Māori near the Waikato River. Richmond pointed out that they all live “their own ways” and that collectively he was warmly welcomed by all of them. This record by Richmond is yet another example of the Middle Ground in which different peoples live together but all in their own way; with, as Richard White proposed for the Indians and French in Canada, mutual understanding, need and respect.
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651 Ibid. p.3
652 Binney described these mixed relationships as a life between worlds. Binney, “‘In-between’ Lives: Studies from within Colonial Society.”
654 Waitangi Tribunal, "Wai 143 the Taranaki Report- Kaupapa Tuatahi." p.27f.
From Richmond’s diary we learn that during their travels, Henry and James stayed at several pā and, in one instance, in an empty whare for which they paid by leaving some tobacco for the rightful owners. Richmond notes that they traded extensively, sometimes not profitably, and experienced life both on the pā as well as amongst missionaries. This trip was not just a journey to reach New Plymouth. It was also a journey that brought those two white settlers into closer contact with the country and its different peoples. Stand-out experiences for Richmond were his observations of different Māori fishing methods and seeing how a missionary lived happily with a Māori wife. However, he also heard the opinion that it was impossible to ‘civilise’ Māori, which, interestingly, he did not comment upon. Was he agreeing? What was his opinion on the matter? His diary does not give enough evidence to answer these questions, but it remains noteworthy that he is not making any statement that signals his opinions. If he did not have a preconceived view, perhaps his long and painful journey brought him closer to Māori, and it is possible that during his nights on different pā he realised how, and in what ways, Māori had their own type of ‘civilisation.’

Richard Chilmann, the clerk of the New Plymouth Company, and pioneer of the first wave of the settlement, also had close and constant contact with Māori. Māori helped him build his house and he also had a very close relationship with his “own Maori” called “Amouri.” During travels he enjoyed the hospitality of the pā and Māori helped him to cross rivers, and organised food and shelter. After saying goodbye to his new ‘friend’ Ebattu the chief, he noted with delight: “...we took our leave of him highly delighted with the hospitality he had shewn [sic] us, there were several little things he was in want of which we promised to send him [at] the first opportunity.” This indicates that help and support was not only granted from the Māori side. Pākehā too saw to the needs of Māori and took part in trust-building actions.

Sarah Harris provides evidence of how she developed a strong and close relationship with Māori around her and how she helped and supported them. In 1843 she wrote to her father in Britain:

I walked to the town a day or two since to get a little medicine for a native woman who lives near us, she has some flour from us every day and indeed she was very ill, on my return I went to her hut which is something like a dog's house, they cannot stand upright in it and they lie on the ground. I did not find her and on returning home I met her husband who was running and looking very wild, I asked him where his wife was and he told me she was in [sic on?] the road, that he
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had cut her head for they had quarrelled. I went on and found from some people that saw him
strike, that all was true. I could not follow her for she had gone to her friends as fast as she could,
the injury she had received was not so great as I expected but I felt for the poor creature.\textsuperscript{661}

The next day when the Māori woman returned to her hut she

found her husband had gone to the bush to hide for fear of the white men who, he thought,
would confine him. I had her head bound up and gave her food, and three days after her husband
returned and told me he would never beat her again, and put his arms round her, kissed her to
assure me they were friends. (An Englishmen could do no more.)\textsuperscript{662}

The lived reality of the *Middle Ground* becomes apparent in the strong, emotional connection
between Sarah Harris and the Māori woman. Emotionally attached, Harris considered the
whole event so important that she reported it to her parents. Medicine, expensive and scarce,
was shared and she knew well where to find the Māori couple. Most intriguing is Harris’
reporting that the Māori husband feared the reaction of the white people. It seems he was
well aware of cultural differences, and it is fascinating that he was hiding to make sure that
everyone who took part in the episode was convinced that everything was settled between
him and his wife before he returned. Different cultures with different sets of actions and
values collided in this instance and both seemed to have already learned to estimate,
understand and accept the reactions of the other, which was a vital part of the *Middle
Ground*.

As shown, under the difficult circumstances of New Plymouth, help from Māori to Pākehā was
most essential. By interacting and helping, further trust and a common ground was
developed, and the interactions in the contact zone developed: a *Middle Ground*.

### 6.5 Trade with Māori

Trade was the most important area of engagement in the contact zone for the young
settlement. At New Plymouth the settlers relied on Māori for food and other consumer goods
far more than in Wellington or Nelson. New Plymouth had no natural harbour and it was very
difficult to ship in supplies and as a consequence the isolation meant that the settlers needed
Māori to function and survive. As indicated previously, settlers ran out of rations shortly after
landfall and waited anxiously for the next ships to arrive; without the help of Maori they
would have perished. The private records of settlers suggest that over the first year of
settlement, Māori could not supply the full demand of the settlement which led to misery and
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food shortage for both peoples. These extreme shortages forced settlers into the contact zone while Māori engaged voluntarily they also saw great economic opportunities. The mutual needs and desires created a situation that enabled the establishment of the *Middle Ground*, a situation that is analogous to that described by O’Malley in pre 1840s Northland.663

Multiple sources report on the importance and nature of trade. Shortly after landfall relationships had been established and the *Middle Ground* began to form. Henry Weeks, the Surgeon of the New Zealand Company, noted: “The natives were battering [sic] their potatoes and watermelons for biscuits...”664 And commenting on the trading skills of Māori he noted:

We soon discovered that our new acquaintances were good hands at a bargain and excellent judges of a blanket. A pig could be procured at first for a large blanket; but the prices rapidly rose to two or more according to the quality, of which the natives were generally better judges than the Europeans. They sold their fish well, also, generally getting a shilling for a scdnapper [sic]. A man would come to your window and hold up a fish which after a little bargaining he would sell for a shilling; he would then produce for under his blanket a much finer one, which you think to be the last, and obtain for another shilling; when lo! [sic] another is produced finer than both! But a little experience of theirs sort made me feel them round carefully before I commenced fish dealing. We find them very honest...665

Weeks’ description gives a fine idea of how strongly settlers depended on Māori supply. Besides he also noted that he found Māori to be honest. A reciprocal trust seems to have been established between the parties.

Josiah Flight also recorded over the four-year duration of his diary, plenty of instances of trade, which commenced immediately after his arrival on shore.666 He noted: “Bought pig of Maories [sic] for a blanket”.667 Once settled in the country, and after the successful establishment of a farm, he also noted that he found lambs and other livestock regularly in Māori gardens or in a kumara pit.

As presented for Wellington and Nelson, lost livestock were often a reason for interaction between settler farmers and Māori. Unfortunately Flight gives no further details on these encounters but he outlines in one case: “Self went to look for lamb, found it dead apparently killed by a Maori dog, afterward had this suspicions confirmed, Tiara a Maori saying that a Taranaki Maori had killed his[sic dog?]for it.”668 Fight’s statement reflects the close interaction between him and local Māori and illustrates the interactions in the *Middle Ground*.
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As indicated in the beginning, food was scarce in the first year of settlement and Māori could not supply enough for the constantly increasing numbers of settlers. As already seen, this short supply left Māori in a strong position and they negotiated very good deals. John Wallace, a New Plymouth entrepreneur, wrote to his friend William Lort in 1842 about the settlement and trade with Māori:

A struggle has now commenced between the natives and Europeans in many places for supplying the market with pigs and potatoes, and from the facilities which the former possess of taking pigs in the bush, and planting large quantities of potatoes, I expect that many of them will grow very rich, and that the money will be hoarded and kepēd [sic] entirely out of circulation.669

Unlike the situation in Wellington, John Wallace showed that the Māori of New Plymouth, had, as early as the second year of settlement, traded in exchange for money rather than goods. The Nelson example shows that Māori had quickly realised that money was a better trade than, for example, a blanket which they could probably purchase more cheaply in the main settlement. It needs to be asked whether the effects of strong ties between Wellington and New Plymouth-Te Ātiawa played any part in this realisation. Māori travelled between the settlements and money was easier to transport than goods. According to some settler reports, the isolation of New Plymouth meant that products were mostly overpriced. By exchanging goods for money Māori could access the better bargains available in Port Nicholson.

In addition it seems that some settlers felt uneasy about giving money to Māori. Richard Chilmann, the clerk of the New Plymouth Company, noted:

“I am very anxious to get [sic getting] into the way of taking money in payment for their goods, and are sufficiently cute (as my friends the Yankees would say) to raise the price of articles and their labour in proportion to the demand.”670 Nonetheless, Richard Chilmann trusted Māori:

What I particularly admire in these people is that you may trust them safely with goods & co, under circumstances that would require a good knowledge of the parties beforehand if white people were concerned, for instance Mr. Cutfield a week or two ago, gave a Maurie [sic] who was going to Ateranui [sic] 4 days journey from here a double barrel’d gun for which he said he would get him a pig in exchange, yesterday he returned, and brought the pigs with him, having made a better bargain than Mr.C. could have done himself.671

This story seems similar to that of Edward Betts Hopper in Wellington who gave a Māori his gun to shoot a bird for him.672 Encounters like these were shaping the Middle Ground. Settlers,
not really hoping to see their belongings again, were proven wrong and as a result trust between the two races was strengthened.

But this trust does not seem to have been universal. John Wallace, by contrast, pointed out that Māori “are desirous of being supposed to be honest, but will take every possible advantage of a European, and will be paid for the same thing two or three times over if they can exact it.” 673 Wallace’s statement may seem harsh but other sources indicate that, over time, Māori in and around New Plymouth became more hard-nosed about their trades. George Curtis, on his travel from Wellington to New Plymouth overland in 1849, gives evidence of this. Writing about frequent trade over the duration of his journey he concludes nearing New Plymouth:

> We always found the natives civil [sic] generally bought any thing [sic] we wanted with tobacco which is as frequently used as a circulating medium as money in small transactions. The native have become such Jews that at one place they would not give us any water to drink unless we paid them, which very much disgusted our Irish soldier. 674

Trade by 1846 had led to an extensive change of possessions. Aubrey Harcourt, one of the police inspectors of New Plymouth, notes in a letter with some official overtone to Sir Donald McLean: “The Native are now in possession of all the guns originally belonging to the white people, which they have obtained from time to time in exchange for Pigs [sic] and other commodities.” 675 He also pointed to Māori employed by the settlers and concludes that

> …the Settlers continue on friendly terms with the Natives – both are anxiously awaiting the arrival of Governor Grey, the whites to be put in possession of their land, and the Maories [sic] to know what utu they are to get for it… 676

Emerging questions about land ownership and waiting for an official investigation of the New Zealand Company purchases, as presented in this private record, seem to have had only a marginal effect on the interactions between Māori and Pākehā. Both apparently continued to engage in the Middle Ground and wait for a solution from authorities. Trade, for a variety of reasons, kept going and helped to keep the established Middle Ground alive. The isolation of the settlement and its difficult food situation had, in Pākehā terms, created a particularly unique and complicated situation in New Plymouth that forced settlers to engage with Māori. We can only speculate if this engagement would have occurred in a more stable situation. However, evidence from Wellington and Nelson suggests that some form of trade relationship
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would probably have developed naturally. Considering the long Māori history of trade with different entities, it is also safe to assume that Māori would be the driving force. Still, this is hypothetical and further ground research as to the motivations for trade from settlers as well Māori could bring new insight to these multi-causal relationships.

6.6 Language adoption

Settlers realised rapidly that communication with Māori was fundamental for their survival in the first years of settlement. As already apparent in some of the previous examples, settlers in New Plymouth showed some use of te reo in their personal writing. Sarah Harris in her first letter back home, had already adopted the words whare and kai and also gives a description of the hongi. As seen in the beginning of this chapter, the letters and diaries of the New Plymouth settlers provide stronger evidence about the personal preparation of immigrants as they read and learnt about the new country. Sarah Harris was one such example. She was a cabin passenger on the William Bryan in 1841, providing room for the assumption that she must have learned some basic words in te reo prior to landing in New Zealand. It is intriguing to note that she used these learned te reo terms instantly after her arrival. This immediate use of a newly acquired language, in personal writings, indicates she had confidence in the new abilities and these terms had become natural for her. Her examined letters, which cover a variety of years, show only the usage of single words and never full sentences. Therefore it is impossible to evaluate how often Māori language was used. However, it was clear that Harris learned new words over time, which could only have been the result of interaction with Māori and further interest in acquiring the language. Frequent and essential trade with Māori, as already seen, probably enhanced communication skills in ‘the native language’, which were an imperative.

George Fuller, a simple farmer, also used te reo in his personal writings. However, he only uses particular terms such as whare, kai, and wahine when writing in a Māori context. Outside of these, when talking about his family and his regular life he uses English. This could be indicative of limited language skills. However, he clearly understood that these terms were strongly connected with Māori life and should be used in this context. He knew some te reo and it seems plausible to assume that he also used it when acting in the contact zone.
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The reminiscences of Mary Vickers also show the use of te reo but because of the nature of the source it is not clear when she recorded her thoughts. It is assumed that, over time, Vickers [and many other settlers] probably acquired more knowledge about Māori terms and concepts. One of the most astonishing words she uses without explanation is te taipō [evil ghost]. Taking all the other evidence about language acquisition of settlers into account, this rather complex expression was certainly not one she would have known soon after arrival, when mostly simple terms like kai and whare have been used almost instantly. Terms like te taipō were acquired only in close contact with ‘the other’, by experiencing cultural settings, which probably became intensified as the communication became progressively easier.

The most detailed and lengthy reflection on Māori language for New Plymouth was found in the diaries of Henry Weeks. His diary shows that he engaged intensively with both te reo and Māori culture. As early as 1841 Weeks used te reo expressions in his writing; as for example Paketia, kai, waihina [sic], whare and Tenaqui [sic]. But as time moved on he also learned and used more complex terms like Tiupha which he translates as fence, or wai-pero which he translates as spirits, or Momai which he translates as native, and Karibuka – Ship, Pakiha’ – whites, and Warrekino – prison.

Weeks was a fast learner and points out that “the expression ‘that is you’ (teanara koe) [sic] is the New Zealand mode of greeting-similar to your ‘howd’ye do’ [sic] etc etc.” Furthermore Weeks also explains pronunciation and concludes: “...in the pronunciation of strange languages the accent is most important, and I am surprised that travellers do not give it more frequently in their works.” He was so immersed in Māori language and concepts that when reporting on an earthquake he noted: “The weather has lately been very wet and stormy and was particularly so last evening when an old native ‘Hunuko’ prognosticated the shock, or Mumu.”

Because of the nature of this research, the acquisition of English by Māori can only be addressed in a very limited way. The reflection of settlers on the adoption of English by Māori is limited but nevertheless, can be seen in all three case studies. In New Plymouth Sarah Harris mentions a Māori who “…spoke English, he had been to England, London.” As outlined by O’Malley, several Māori had travelled beyond New Zealand and returned with new skills to
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contribute to the establishment and growth of the *Middle Ground* in New Zealand.\(^686\) O’Malley also argued that the acquisition of language was a form of accommodation which made it easier for Māori to engage and influence the outcome – an observation that seems applicable to New Plymouth prior to the 1860s.\(^687\)

As presented, there is considerable evidence for language adoption by the New Plymouth settlers even though it is not as plentiful as for the Wellington or Nelson studies. This may be the result of loss of material or an outcome of the particular type of sources that have survived, amongst other reasons. Further research on the language acquisition of New Plymouth settlers would enhance understanding of the patterns. However, the traces of language adoption presented here suggest that language was a vital part of the *Middle Ground* in which New Plymouth settlers participated.

### 6.7 Knowledge exchange

Knowledge was essential for survival in the new country and therefore highly valued by the settlers arriving in New Plymouth. As we have seen, some people shared their knowledge about New Zealand whilst still on board the ship. However, there was so much more to learn about a country on the other side of the world.

People like Henry Weeks, for example, read widely beforehand and presumably shared his knowledge readily. Directly after his arrival we find detailed reports about Māori scattered throughout his diary. Amongst accounts of typical daily encounters is his reflection on cannibalism in which Weeks included some stories he had heard. In contrast to the booster literature, and building on evidence from Māori cannibals themselves, he concluded:

> ...and I cannot leave this subject without remarking on the obstinate blindness of some writers in England, who notwithstanding the mass of indisputable evidence showing that cannibalism was common in New Zealand, not only doubted but altogether disbelieved that it existed.\(^688\)

Weeks clearly engaged with the history of the country in which he was living. When he refers to the history of war with the Waikato and gives the most brutal descriptions, we can see how knowledge of Māori tribal warfare was transferred to Pākehā who then transformed it to fit into Pākehā knowledge and belief systems. Māori oral traditions required settlers to engage closely with the indigenous, and communications and mutual trust must have existed. Week’s...
diary also shows how he used his acquired knowledge about Māori to outline how this could affect the settlement. He notes:

Peace had existed now for more than 6 years yet the natives had still a great dread of their former adversaries, and a threatened invasion was talked of which made us feel uncomfortable when we heard that the Waikato’s could muster 2000 warriors, and it was impossible to foresee what effects the strong temptation of possessing our goods [sic] and stores might have on them.\(^{689}\)

Along with warfare and knowledge of tribal conflict, Weeks also shows an understanding of different Māori customs. He describes the hongi as follows: “Acquaintances on meeting after a separation rub noses... a ceremony of a very melonancholy [sic] caste and is performed by rubbing the bridges of the nose together, accompanying the actions with a low moaning.”\(^{690}\)

The examples discussed indicate that Weeks was well accustomed to New Zealand and that he had close contact with the Indigenous People. Trust and understanding, which play a vital part in the establishment of the *Middle Ground*, are symbolised by the knowledge that was shared with him and the experiences he underwent in learning about his new life.

Dr. Peter Wilson was based in Wanganui, and became a New Plymouth settler very late in his life. His story should also be explored because he provides an interesting perspective on the broader Taranaki region. One of his diaries, written at the request of Sir George Grey, covers a voyage from Wanganui to New Plymouth in 1853. Like Weeks, he also demonstrates a good understanding of tribal warfare and how it affected Māori of the region. Moreover, he gives a very detailed description of different pā, and, in his position as a medical doctor, also reports on Māori health.\(^{691}\) Near the end of his journey he seems confident enough to conclude that Māori “all clearly enough indicating the transition state, or beginning confidence as safety assurance that savage warfare is coming to its end, and that man may sit under his vine and Fig tree now and none to make him afraid.”\(^{692}\)

Nevertheless, next to this rather abstract knowledge some settlers learned more practical skills from Māori. During travel, Chilmann learned about indigenous fishing methods and how to travel in a traditional canoe; skills that must have been very helpful for a new ‘inhabitant’ in New Zealand.\(^{693}\) Despite this all being new for him, Chilmann noted: “…although it seemed

---

689 Ibid. 31 March 1841. p.5
690 Ibid. 31 March 1841. p.6
691 Peter (Dr.) Wilson, “Diary of a Journey from New Plymouth to Whanganui,” (New Plymouth: Taranaki Research Centre/Puke Ariki, ARC2002-21 Box2, 1853).
692 Ibid. p.218
693 Chilmann, “Journal.” 17 July 1841. p.8
venturesome to trust ourselves, I have such confidence in the skills of the natives that I was under no apprehensions.\textsuperscript{694} Arriving at the pā he noted:

> Upon our arrival we were greeted by about a dozen natives & barked at by the same number of dogs (the natives are particularly fond of these animals which are the ugliest & most worthless set of curs I ever beheld, and on particularly good term with the rats which they never molest).\textsuperscript{695}

Evidently Chilmann knew a lot about the close relationships of Māori dogs and their owners. To realise this strong bond Chilmann must have observed Māori and their dogs which would have required him to engage in the life of the pā. The trust that Chilmann described as well as the knowledge that he acquired suggest that he also was an active participant of the Middle Ground.

As we have seen already, earthquakes were a common occurrence in New Zealand and the New Plymouth settlers also reported on the subject. Sarah Harris wrote in a letter to her father about the earthquakes and the alarm amongst the settler community. She also added:

> ...the natives say that this country is subject to them [earthquakes] twice a year, but they never do any harm, that may be very true for their huts would not be very easily thrown down, nor our waries [sic] which are made of sticks and straw, would not do much mischief, but a house of stone we all fear.\textsuperscript{696}

Richard Chilmann also comments on earthquakes, observing that “the Mauries [sic] say it is a common occurrence here...”\textsuperscript{697} The uneasiness generated by earthquakes caused the New Plymouth settlers to look to Māori to learn and understand how to protect themselves. Māori had lived for many years with earthquakes and had adapted accordingly. Knowledge exchange on this subject seems natural and, from settler perspective, most important. Māori were able to assure settlers of their safety by sharing knowledge and settlers quickly learned how to adapt.

Settlers actively participated in a life with Māori. This becomes particularly evident in times of disaster. Josiah Flight noted in his diary that the Taranaki region was affected by some river flooding which caused considerable damage and the loss of one Māori life. Settlers played an active role in this tragedy and, as Flight noted, “Parsons [a settler] made a coffin for Maori.”\textsuperscript{698} Many questions can be raised by this rather short note: Why did Māori not take care of the funeral? And if they did, is there any evidence of an adaptation of Christian burial practices? Why was this event so important that Flight noted it in his diary? Even if these questions...
remain unanswered, this example suggests strong bonds between settlers and Māori, which, in consequence, would provide further evidence of the *Middle Ground*.

Knowledge exchange was not just restricted to personal interaction. On a more general level, the New Plymouth settlers learned fast that the Māori world was very different from their own. On a more official level, colonisation, in terms of British understanding, involved gaining control and acquiring the service of Māori experts. From the colonists’ perspective one of those experts was Karira, a Māori policeman in New Plymouth. Karira first appeared in 1852 in the negotiations between Donald McLean and local Māori about acquiring more land near New Plymouth. Karira, acknowledged by McLean as a man of knowledge, influence and understanding, became the constable of the Native Police in New Plymouth.699

The Native Police were designed to promote stronger interaction between Māori and Pākehā.700 Karira acted in the field of the established *Middle Ground* by negotiating between different world views of customs and laws. For Pākehā, the Māori Police had a most welcoming effect. The main motivating force was the idea of Europeanising and assimilating by giving tangata whenua, in the view of Pākehā, a good role model. The main mission, according to the local Government, of gaining control would only be achieved by ‘civilising’ and turning ‘rude savages into dutiful British subjects’.701

The wider political concepts of policing, power, Rangatiratanga and especially native policing, as discussed by Richard Hill, cannot be addressed in this thesis.702 However, the material explored here provides insight on the personal and experiential levels. Wandering between worlds, negotiation and maintaining peace and understanding was more than challenging for these Māori Policemen. Sergeant Karira, who was extremely dedicated to his position, admitted on his death-bed in 1867 that ‘a Ngarara’, a mystical monster like creature, was strangling him slowly and painfully to death. For Māori this shows a customary punishment for interfering with tribal tapu laws.703 This could be interpreted to mean that he was well aware
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of how much he stepped out of his indigenous world into the world of the Colonisers, and maybe finally, by referring to Māori mythology, found the way back to his roots on his death bed. Karira’s struggle shows his difficult position – caught between his tribe, hapū and Pākehā. He may have felt he compromised his own belief structure, based on his upbringing. Karira acted in the contact zone of the Middle Ground, probably from the arrival of Pākehā in New Plymouth 1841, until well into the wars of 1867 and his death, when he finally had to admit that there was no positive interaction between peoples anymore. The Pākehā military forces that had adapted to the new challenges of the war with Māori had taken over. From the 1860s Pākehā outnumbered Māori in New Zealand with the consequent destruction, as suggested by O’Malley, of the Middle Ground. Still connected with the indigenous world, but under pressure from the Pākehā world and seeing how the war had changed New Zealand, by 1867 Karira turned back to his cultural roots and accepted his self-inflicted punishment.

However, it was not only Māori who shared their knowledge and interacted with the British. As discussed by Belich, for example, Māori were very curious about all the new products and ideas that Pākehā brought and therefore the knowledge exchange from Pākehā to Māori is of equal importance. The Middle Ground was an ethereal space for mutual interaction where both peoples actively participated with an exchange of new products and knowledge on a mutual base. Mary Vickers, for example, recalls how Māori first saw a steam ship. In 1853 the steamer Nelson arrived for the first time off the coast of Taranaki and she noted: “The natives were very much alarmed, [sic and?] could not understand a vessel moving in without sails, and smoke coming out of her. They thought this was ‘te Taipō’[bad spirit, ghost]. As with the introduction of horses in Wellington, Māori in New Plymouth were at first frightened of the new technology. They tried to make sense out of what they encountered, within the context of their own belief-system. Mary Vickers’ report suggests that Māori shared their fear and confusion with Pākehā. Consequently, Vickers was able to use te reo to describe what Māori had thought because she had learned the appropriate word. Unfortunately she does not give any other evidence in regards to how Māori adapted to the new type of ship on their shores.
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We can only assume that Māori learned quickly and that possibly the participants of the *Middle Ground* explained the harmless nature of the new ‘ghost’.

The exchange of knowledge and cultural concepts is evident in all three case study towns. However, such exchanges were less evident in New Plymouth. It is noticeable that, over time, settlers’ knowledge in terms of nature increased, but whether this occurred because of knowledge exchange with Māori or was simply a product of the time spent in the new environment as yet unknown. There is less evidence of cultural encounters in the *Middle Ground* for New Plymouth. Perhaps settlers were simply too busy dealing with more pressing problems, like food. Or, it could be that Māori were well aware of their powerful position and simply did not want to share too much valuable knowledge too soon with the British. Fuller research into the ‘trickle down’ of knowledge and culture in the Taranaki region, and perhaps over the whole New Zealand, could offer a deeper understanding of how people influenced each other in the *Middle Ground*. The *Middle Ground* of New Plymouth was diverse and the different factors such as the first encounter, trade, help, knowledge exchange and language contributed, in varying degrees, to the definition and lived reality of the contact zone.

### 6.8 Middle Ground?

As shown, there are clear indications that *Middle Ground*, with a positive mutual interaction, was also created in New Plymouth. Henry Weeks was certainly a participant. Engaging in Māori language and daily encounter with tangata whenua created a positive attitude on both sides. Weeks concluded after a successful trade transaction: “All this was satisfactory; we had entered into ‘amicable relations’ with a neighbouring power. The afterward frequent visits of these lively people were very acceptable…”

It is difficult to pinpoint when the *Middle Ground* in New Plymouth exactly weakened; however, the first conflicts appear in 1841-42 in Waitara when the New Zealand Company wanted to possess land that had never been sold. In general, the material examined suggests that the space for positive interaction decayed slowly and at different rates in different places. Still, by 1848 Thomas Newsham reports in very friendly terms about Māori. He writes to his mother, about his new land in the Taranaki region, that “it is a most delightful district and what is still better the natives that have always been so friendly to the white, my section is
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about 4 miles from the town...” As discussed previously, Richard Chilmann seemed to have made close contact with Māori with whom he engaged for trade and other activities until at least 1849, at which point his diary finishes. He shows confidence in Māori skills and feels safe during his travels with indigenous guides and hospitality. No negative or hostile intentions or thoughts can be found in his writings, indicating him to be a participant of the Middle Ground.

There is also the case of Mary Vickers [who arrived in New Plymouth in 1851], who recalled her life in the settlement at New Plymouth, noting:

We were on friendly terms with all the Natives, a pah [sic], joined our farm, the Natives of which were always about our house. One woman used to wash for us, and they always come to us in any difficulty. We used to teach them to cut out and make their children’s clothes, make bread, better manage their money and many other domestic things.

But by 1854 her reporting changed and she concluded that, with the arrival of the military from Wellington, “a great deal of ill feeling began with the Natives against the white people.”

Nevertheless, some people seemed to have not been affected by these ill feelings. Mary Hirst gives one of the most fascinating examples of what it means to live the Middle Ground. In her diary, which was written in form of a letter to her aunty, she gives a detailed account about how she and her family engaged with Māori on a daily basis. She shows knowledge of people’s names and their relations and uses Māori place names and some te reo in her writing. She gives several examples of the lived Middle Ground:

Annis and I began washing, while hard at work an old Maori woman came in and would insist on helping us. She said two shillings a day was her charge. Annis told her she might do as she pleased about helping, but we should not pay her. She said if we would give her some dinner she would be content, so we were glad of her assistance, and I never saw anyone wash better. Just picture to yourself a very ugly old woman with a very wrinkled face the colour of a new penny piece, a lot of black hair about a quarter of a yard long standing up all over her head like a mop without being combed, brushed or parted and on the top of it, my old crimped straw bonnet which I wore in England, an old petticoat tied round her waist, and another tied over one shoulder and under the other not forgetting a very short dirty pipe in her mouth, and you may form a very good idea of what our Peara is like.

As is evident, the two worlds collided. Here we see Peara, the Māori woman, described through the eyes of Europeans and the aesthetics of European upbringing. Clearly we can
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identify the feeling of British superiority in Mary Hirst’s description of her foreign encounter. However, despite their prejudice, Mary and Annis recognised that Peara was the best washer they had ever seen and such an acknowledgement may well have influenced their future thinking and dealings with Māori.

We can only speculate as to why this Māori woman began to engage closely with these Pākehā ladies. However, the episode described above, offers an intriguing glimpse of a Māori woman who was in the process of adapting to European ways. It seems remarkably forceful of Peara to ask for work; clearly in this scene she is the proactive party. She was the one who asked for work and also negotiated the terms and payment. Further investigation into Hirst’s diary shows that Peara continued to come to the house at times that suited her. She engaged actively with these Pākehā women and, by doing washing and other household work, helped them out in a time of need. This relationship provides further evidence of the ‘mutualness’ in the Middle Ground. Both parties stayed in control of what they did and when, and each side had the power to end the relationship. But no one did; instead a relationship of trust, understanding and exchange developed and both gained from the engagement.

But Mary Hirst did not only engage with one indigenous woman; she also reported that a variety of Māori often came around her house. Knowledge exchange happened. They informed her and her family about the fighting around Kaipako Pā.

A Maori dressed in a green cloak trimmed with satin (that Jane wore coming out, and which we had sold them a week before), came with his gun and described to us on a slate the different positions occupied by the Maoris [sic] round Kaipakokapo [sic].

Trust and close relationships between the Hirst family and local Māori seems to have been established. Mary noted full of pride about this. “He [her brother] is a very great favourite with the Maoris, they call him ‘Hemi.’”

The evidence given above indicates that the Hirst family engaged with Māori on a daily basis. We also see a Māori community that interacts with settlers and lets them participate in their lives. As a result of this interaction a strong bond and a personal Middle Ground was maintained.

Broadening the view from the personal space of interactions to the wider actions in the little settlement, we can also find the Middle Ground woven into descriptions and observations. For example, Mary Hirst reported the first marriage, between a Pākehā girl and “a very handsome
young Maori.” She concluded that: “If this match comes off it will be the first instance here of a white woman marrying a Maori, there have been several the other way.” Most scholarship about intermarriage emphasises the bonds between white men and Māori women which have often been identified as often being overshadowed by purely sexual intentions. Most recently Vincent O’Malley, who demonstrates the influence of the ‘sex trade’ in the Bay of Islands before 1840, suggests that there was a decline in these kinds of arrangements because of the influx of white women after the 1840s. With the arrival of British ladies, Pākehā men turned their backs on their Māori women, while some Pākehā women turned toward Māori men. The New Plymouth example reported by Mary Hirst supports O’Malley’s research. Considering that this marriage was reported in 1854, at a time when the conflict around land was escalating, we can assume the continued maintenance of the *Middle Ground* as evidenced by this unusual marriage. Bride and groom interacted at the cultural frontier and finally married. Moreover Mary Hirst, the observer, commented positively about this engagement. It would be interesting to know if all settlers in the community approved of this bond but unfortunately the sources shed no further light on this event.

Yet alongside the positive interaction there were early disturbances. As early as 1842 the private records of the New Plymouth settlers show the conflicts with Māori; however, these interruptions did not have the power to destroy the *Middle Ground*. Sydney Wright noted in his diary that “Arangi’s wife [Arangi was a warrior and fighting general] came up and danced and jumped away in their savage style saying the land was theirs and no money had been paid for it.” A month later “Arangi and his wife on our ground again contorting their visages and trying to frighten us about the land.” Finally three days later Arangi and a group of men came back and were “speechifying” and “going on about us and their land”. The Wrights thought they were about “to be cooked soon” and so they left the property in panic.

As pointed out in the Waitangi Treaty Tribunal Report, the tensions between Māori and settlers grew in response to the growth of the settlement and by 1842 Māori started claiming all the land beyond the boundary of Waitara. The Wrights belonged to a group of settlers who had been driven off their farms at the northern end of the Waitara River. To the great
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annoyance of the settlers, Māori started putting up a fence which Pākehā tried to prevent on several occasions. In the end the son of one of the Māori leaders was arrested which, according to Wright, “ended the fray.”

These events of 1842 seem not to have impacted significantly on the established Middle Ground. It is clear that some settlers were annoyed and felt threatened; however, during all the fighting and quarrelling no one was harmed. Wright emphasised this in his journal and, in addition, presented the fight about the fence and survey stacks more as a kind of game with humorous overtones.

Josiah Flight also reported on the problems of 1842. His diary gives another fascinating insight into how the Middle Ground became a lived reality and how settlers and Māori arranged their living at the frontier. Following a detailed description of the incidents and the investigation, Flight mentions:

...after the meeting the previous evening, a number of the native [sic] came to him and expressed themselves as much concerned at the annoyance they had given, saying they should not have done so had ‘Rangatira’ come down to take possession of the land, but that they considered the Baylys and Pearses and Painter [presumably talking about some land markings] to be...[sic]. They reiterated their promises not again to disturb the Whites and to await Commissioner Spain’s arrival for any further remuneration.

Once again Māori, as in Wellington and Nelson, had looked to Spain and the Crown to solve the land conflict. While waiting for this to happen settlers and Māori in New Plymouth seem to have found an arrangement, and even if it was just temporary, the Middle Ground was still in existence.

However, the killings in Wairau in 1843, also made news in New Plymouth. Sydney Wright writes at length in his diary about what happened in Nelson and concludes: “All the settlers [are] in the deepest excitement[,] the powerful and warlike tribe of Waocatos [sic Waikato] [are] expected down, natives [are] fortifying themselves”

New Plymouth, like the rest of Pākehā New Zealand, was in shock and instantly the relations with Māori seem to deteriorate. Wright, having a close relationship with Māori, and in my opinion, a participant in the Middle Ground, suddenly seems to turn back to the time of uncertainty and recalls the initial shock of his arrival when, in describing a scene of Māori fishing during night, he wrote: “a wild scene and they appeared like so many devils the night was so dark you could not see a foot before
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you."

Probably influenced by the violent events in Wairau he expresses his fear of Māori by describing them as ‘devils’ and the whole experience as a frightening scene.

However, the private records of settlers in New Plymouth show that these negative perceptions did not last very long. After some weeks, Wrights’ diary, for example, shows that he was interacting with Māori in his usual pattern of trade, help and friendship. A return to the language of respect and understanding for the other culture is apparent.

Josiah Flight also mentions Wairau, but in a more general way. He simply states:

Cook today received intelligence letter from Wakefield at Wanganui that 37 [in actuality, 22] whites had been killed by the Maoris [sic] at Wairau (Nelson settlement), Captain Wakefield and Mr. Thompson said to be amount these slain, Natives fortifying pahs.

Here, and as already presented for Nelson, we see how Wairau also put Māori on high alert. Nevertheless, this alert did not last long and some months later Flight, emphasising the strong bond and support between Nelson and New Plymouth, met with some other settlers to attend “a meeting for memorializing the Governor on the conduct of the Natives in resisting to quiet occupation of the land by Whites and to pray for protection.”

Undoubtedly tensions between settlers and Māori were increasing and the meeting, as noted by Flight, was “respectable but not numerously attended.” One suspects that after Wairau there must have been considerable uncertainty in the settlement, and it became apparent that land problems were intensifying. However, the diaries of Flight and others do not document this. We can only find reports that Māori kept trading with ‘whites’, clearing bush and seemed to have lived a peaceful coexistence which leads to the conclusion that the Middle Ground of the early 1840s was under attack for a short time but not conclusively destroyed; this happened much later.

Diaries and letters show us that by 1851 the situation in the New Plymouth settlement was deteriorating. Henry Robert Richmond assessed the situation in a letter to Christopher William Richmond:

More land is all the cry here, but the Waitara natives still hold out, and refuse the Governor last time he tried to persuade them to sell. Whatever C.H. may say they are far more numerous and powerful here than the settlers like, and although quite peaceable, they occasionally take the law into their own hand in a way people here don’t relish. We see very few of them about the town,
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although there is a pa close by. Many are employed in agricultural operations, clearing, driving bullock carts, etc. but the settlers, and they call there every now and then to enquire for work. Richmond, is describing the situation of Kingi’s return to the land of Waitara and his ongoing negotiation and consequent conflict with the Governor to prevent further Māori land sales to the Crown. The Tribunal report for New Plymouth outlines how essential the question of landownership was and that Kingi was not willing to give up his land and instead tried to engage in trade and friendly contact with the nearby settlement. However, the resistance to land sales and the influx of Māori into the region resulted in an atmosphere of conflict, uncertainty and expectations with diverse reactions from Settler to Māori. Richmond, for example, reported about the ongoing land problems and a crisis for which settlers had been arming themselves for to “offer resistance to any Maori aggression”. Nevertheless, and on a more individual level, Robert Richmond himself emphasises that Māori “have not occasioned me a minute’s fear or uneasiness so far.”

As presented, the private letters and diaries of the settlers of New Plymouth showed a strong and diverse Middle Ground between Māori and Settler from 1841-1855. The Middle Ground of New Plymouth differs from that in Wellington and Nelson. For Pākehā, positive relations with Māori were essential for their survival. As shown, Māori were willing to engage with settlers in terms of trade, help and knowledge exchange. Settlers and Māori established a complex network of trust, dependence, and mutual interest. Based on the evidence presented, it seems that the Middle Ground in New Plymouth was under far more pressure, compared to, for example, Wellington. Some of this was created by settlers between settlers and not necessarily between Māori and settler. The sources for New Plymouth also indicate that there was a strong connection between the question of land ownership and conflict and negative perceptions of Māori. However, as was with Nelson, we can find strong ‘pockets’ of positive interaction between Pākehā and Māori which certainly created the contact zone of the Middle Ground.

As outlined in the beginning of this project, each settlement had its unique challenges and mix of settlers. New Plymouth was the settlement with the most difficult circumstances, lacking a harbour, isolated, with a rather diverse mix of settlers and high hopes. The Middle Ground,
inevitably, became as unstable as the settlement itself. However, a contact zone was created and positive interaction did occur, at least till the Governor’s actions in regards to the purchase of Waitara began to influence the delicate balance of power.

The finding of a *Middle Ground* with a positive space of interaction seems intriguing and suggests that maybe the conception of New Plymouth as a zone of constant conflict needs to be re-evaluated at least for the period up until 1855. The 1996 Waitangi Tribunal Report for Taranaki claims that the main conflict began in 1841 and continued over 19 years, with the beginning of the war in 1860, which bought a new level of conflict to the region. However, this project shows that, at least on the personal level, positive interaction was part of the lived reality of settlers and Māori in the immediate contact zone.

To conclude, the examples presented clearly reflect a strong and intimate connection between Māori and Pākehā in New Plymouth in the early days of the settlement. This was because, without the help of Māori, the settlers would have either perished or simply never been able to establish New Plymouth in such an isolated, remote and unfamiliar environment. The *Middle Ground* between Pākehā and Māori accommodated both cultures. Māori and settlers arranged and adjusted their living situations in relation to each other, exchanged goods and knowledge, and showed a developing understanding and respect for each other’s culture.

This space of understanding and acceptance became increasingly unstable, principally because of the ethnocentric arrogance of the British upper classes from 1858 onwards, and was finally broken down with the outbreak of the Taranaki Wars of 1860. Shifting power relations and significantly different understandings of land by settlers and the Crown as a commodity and an asset, but which for Māori was held communally and valued principally as a place of sustenance, wairua and group identity, finally undermined the good intentions of the Treaty and inevitably destroyed the *Middle Ground*. The Taranaki Wars, as outlined by Belich and others, marked a significant changing point in New Zealand’s history.
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enforce British power in New Zealand, especially over Māori, resulting in a complex ‘civil war’ that lasted several years.\textsuperscript{740} As a result the \textit{Middle Ground} between Pākehā and Māori in New Plymouth disintegrated as the power imbalance shifted inevitably in favour of the European settlers and the Crown.\textsuperscript{741}
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\textsuperscript{741} Further microhistorical research into the war years however might reveal new insights into far more acts of kindness between soldiers, from Māori as well as Pākehā side. Some have been documented loosely already but it seems plausible that there could be a far stronger evidence.
7. Conclusion

“Nations, like narratives, lose their origins, in the myths of time and fully realise their horizons in the mind’s eye.”

Drawing on private records, this research has highlighted the existence of positive interactions between Maori and early settlers in the contact zone of 1840-1860 in the Wakefield Settlements: the Middle Ground. It has been shown that Māori–Setter interactions in the Wakefield Settlements from 1840-1860 in New Zealand, as presented in the private records, present the existence of the Middle Ground which was interrupted and weakened by several events and factors.

The case studies of Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth presented in this thesis demonstrate similarities as well as unique aspects. Wellington, as the first settlement of the New Zealand Company, plays a unique role. The Wellington settlers were the first to start a new life in the Antipodes under an organised colonisation scheme. They embarked on their journey with hopes and dreams, and were influenced by the early booster literature of the New Zealand Company. Upon arrival they realised that the challenges would be much greater than expected. Nevertheless, their partially expressed uneasiness about ‘the natives’ was not realised and the settlers were greeted warmly by the chiefs of Whanganui ā Tara.

As shown in the analysis, the first settlers of 1840 in Wellington relied heavily on Māori. Māori helped unload the ships, built shelters and provided food, provisions and protection. This close and very positive encounter forced settlers into the contact zone. Settlers and Māori quickly established a way of communication. Some settlers even immersed themselves so much in te reo Māori that they used it in their personal writing as a substitute for English words. Trade, as the essential for survival in the early years of settlement, stimulated the acquisition of language and, as I suggest, cultural and knowledge exchanges. These were vital parts of the functioning of the settlement and established the basis on which Pākehā and Māori interacted. The private letters and diaries of Wellington settlers from 1840-1860 examined in this thesis suggest that there was close contact between settler and Māori on a daily basis. Both gained in the contact zone and together formed the Middle Ground for Wellington: a space of mutual understanding that was defined by cultural interaction and acceptance.

This positive space was vulnerable and power relationships were in a constant state of flux. For this project each of the case study settlements has been also examined with regard to one significant conflict which affected the *Middle Ground*. For Wellington, as shown, the conflict in the Hutt Valley, the so called ‘Hutt Wars’, reveal considerable evidence of the disruption of the *Middle Ground*. Settlers felt threatened by Māori, feared attacks and, consequently, armed themselves. Nevertheless, settlers also realised quickly that the different pā around Whanganui ā Tara did not all have hostile intentions towards Pākehā.

The private accounts consulted suggest that Wellington was shaken by the events in the Hutt Valley but that the conflict caused only limited disruption. Many still engaged in the *Middle Ground* with trade, knowledge exchange, language adoption and help. Like the settlers, so too did Māori still participate in the established pattern. Diaries and letters did not show that the wars in the Hutt had the power to destroy the *Middle Ground*. In contrast, they reveal the conflict’s marginal effect at the personal level of Settler-Māori interactions.

Nelson, as the second case study, was the fourth New Zealand Company settlement. Established at the top of the South Island, Te Tau Ihu, it was supposed to provide better agricultural space and be more successful in attracting the desired immigrant groups than the previous Pākehā strongholds in Wellington and New Plymouth. By 1842 the first wave of settlers arrived in Whakatū-Nelson. Books, pamphlets and talks, which were plentiful by that time, as well as letters from the already-established Wellington and New Plymouth settlers, made a strong case for the new colony and convinced people to leave Britain and try their luck. However, like most settlers, the Nelson new arrivals were devastated by the limited preparations of the New Zealand Company, such as the lack of housing and surveying. They realised quickly that the new home was not as ‘civilised’ and prepared as they had been led to believe.

Nevertheless, the arrival at Te Tau Ihu was, at least in one respect, more positive than expected. Māori welcomed settlers warmly, helped unload the ships, provided food and helped build shelters. As shown, these first days were crucial for subsequent interactions with Māori. However, Nelson settlers’ dependence on Māori diminished over time. Close contact with the main settlement, Wellington, as well as the establishment of settlers’ own gardens, created a different and unique contact zone for Nelson which transformed the settlement rather quickly into a visually attractive place.
Trade, as one form of Māori-Pākehā interaction, was only crucial on a large scale for a short time and eventually declined. Some settlers used supplies from Māori regularly over an extended time to supplement their own resources, but did not fully rely on them. Furthermore, in accordance with the other two case studies, Nelson settlers also quickly adopted te reo Māori although some letters and diaries report a lesser degree of English amongst Māori. Help from Māori during the establishment of the settlement, as well as for transport to more remote places [especially for the surveyors], was essential and also contributed to the establishment of the Middle Ground.

Nevertheless, this Nelson Middle Ground was not universal and not all settlers or Māori participated in the mutual exchange. The material examined shows the existence of very personal contact zones and, as I suggest, a personal Middle Ground rather than a general zone of positive interactions was created. It seems that some settlers, as well as Māori, simply had no interest or need to engage with ‘the other’, while others consciously made the decision to connect with their new neighbours. Settlers had no need to engage because the New Zealand Company provided as much as they could to the developing settlement. Furthermore it seems that the Nelson upper class preferred to interact amongst themselves. Gardens and personal supplies intensified this independence from Māori. On the other hand Māori did not seem eager to engage with the Nelson settlers because their society was fully functional and self-contained. With no immediate threats, unlike Māori in Whanganui ā Tara and their fear of rival iwi, allowed Māori to develop a strong relationship with Pākehā. In addition, Māori of the Nelson region had already had access to Pākehā goods and knowledge due to the presence of whaling stations across Cook Strait–Te Moana o Raukawa for several years and therefore, because of the arrival of the New Zealand Company settlers, Māori interest was rather limited. Nevertheless, this lesser interest in each other did not deny the existence of a space of positive interaction. As I have shown, this personal Middle Ground was still in existence, or only slightly disturbed by the events in Wairau, in 1843.

Twenty-two people lost their lives when an official party of policemen and settlers, under the command of the Police Magistrate Thompson, used force to displace Māori from the Wairau Valley. Te Rauparaha and his men insisted that Wairau had never been sold to Pākehā and sought to protect their land. Throughout the escalating conflict Māori intended to keep their protest reasonable and never harmed any of the surveyors. The events peaked and violence spread when, according to historical records, the Pākehā party accidentally fired at Te
Rauparaha’s troops. Māori and settlers lost lives and, most significant perhaps for the Nelson settlement, was the death of their leader Arthur Wakefield.

As illustrated by the sources, Nelson went into shock and many settlers felt uneasy about the violent outbreak. The intelligence of the ‘attack’ in Wairau made news all over New Zealand, as well as on the home shores of Britain. For example, Wellington Pākehā reacted strongly to the events with barricades and military service for the settlers. In Nelson, the shock was immense. Nevertheless, the diary sources show that the feelings of fear and threat, even in existence, rapidly disappeared. The anxieties were directed toward Te Rauparaha and further attacks but settlers quickly realized that Māori around them had nothing to do with the attack and that the majority were also fearful of the chief. For some this strong distinction between different groups must have been clear. Hence a small group of settlers did not even mention any disturbance due to Wairau, and still engaged with Māori as if nothing has happened.

Interestingly, Māori around Nelson felt similar to the settlers: threatened and anxious by Te Rauparaha too they waited for the settlers’ utu for the events of Wairau. The sources make very clear that Māori had no interest in further violence which, for sure, took a while to be taken for granted by settlers. Both sides, Māori and settlers, experienced an interruption in their trust in each other. However, this trust was soon re-established and mutual interaction in the Middle Ground and, in particular, in the personal Middle Ground resumed only three months later. While the Wairau event was strong and shocking to the extent that it diminished settlers’ pride and hope, it nonetheless did not have the power to destroy the Middle Ground indefinitely. The vulnerable space of the contact zone became destabilised and a wave of horror and shock swept all over New Zealand. Nevertheless, a situation of acceptance and trust on personal levels between the two peoples was soon re-established.

In contrast, New Plymouth, established as the third settlement in New Zealand in 1841 and seen only as an addition to Wellington and Whanganui, was always very isolated. The challenges confronting the New Plymouth settlers included the lack of a harbour combined with some areas of dense bush. The predominantly working-class settlers, recruited primarily from regions of unrest: Devon, Cornwall and Dorset, for example made for an explosive combination in the new settlement. This created a unique, challenging and even depressing atmosphere on shore which was constantly fed by slow progress in the survey work and a continuous food shortage for at least the first two years of settlement.
Unlike the situation in Wellington and Nelson, the Māori population in the New Plymouth region in 1841 was depleted due to the invasions of the Waikato Tribes in the 1830s which resulted in a move of many Te Ātiawa to Whanganui ā Tara. The region seemed relatively ‘depopulated’ to the British when they acquired a considerable amount of land to establish their settlement. However, this changed during the years of the establishment of settlement. Gradually, in several migrations, more and more Māori returned to their homelands and by the mid to late 1840s the struggle around land intensified.

As discussed, the primary source material for New Plymouth is particularly interesting because some of the New Plymouth settlers provided insights into their preparation for the New Country. Cabin passengers especially showed some knowledge of New Zealand and of Māori. However, not all were that well prepared and some felt uneasy about the stories they had been told on board.

The welcome for settlers in New Plymouth, as in Wellington and later Nelson, was very positive. Māori helped with shipping to and from the shore and, under the supervision of Dicky Barret, had already provided the most basic shelter. However, the excitement of arrival faded fast and settlers expressed their frustrations about the poor preparations. Settlers were amazed by the bush and frustrated by the lack of housing. Particularly in New Plymouth, the letters and diaries of early settlers show a fascination with Māori tattoos, or Tā Moko.

Women were relieved to arrive in New Plymouth but also experienced confusion and fear which found expression in a certain “disgust” expressed towards Māori. These first moments on shore, filled with shock, excitement, fear and curiosity, laid the foundations for a possible Middle Ground within which both peoples began interacting.

The issue of help is one of the main forms of interaction explored for this project, and seems to have been very diverse in New Plymouth. Maori helped to build shelter and, as outlined, played a crucial part in the landing process of settlers. Friendships and close relationships developed and settlers knew well how dependant they were on assistance from Māori. As already highlighted for the other settlements, New Plymouth Māori also provided significant help with the exploration of the land and during travel. In return Pākehā provided assistance to Māori in form of medical help and in times of difficulties.

The dependence on Māori is most apparent in their strong and diverse reporting about trade. As shown, trade with Māori was essential for initial settler survival. However, trade was reciprocal and Māori, in return, hoped for protection, an increase in mana and the acquisition
of desired products. Māori also anticipated that that interaction with the New Plymouth settlers would provide the same opportunities afforded to the Maori of Whanganui ā Tara. These regular trading relationships showed that settlers and Māori developed trust in each other and met each other’s needs.

Settlers found Māori to be trustworthy and even acknowledged that Māori neglected their own people to supply the settlers with goods. However, some settlers also remarked that Māori quickly realised the desperate situation of the British and used this to extract bargains. These bargains multiplied when Māori requested money instead of an exchange of goods. Nevertheless, a balance was maintained and the meeting of mutual needs contributed to the establishment of the Middle Ground.

As for Wellington and Nelson, New Plymouth engagement over trade required some sort of communication. Vincent O’Malley has remarked that the adoption of language was built on mutual accommodation. This seems applicable for all three case studies of the research. However, the letters and diaries of New Plymouth settlers offer only limited insight as to the use of te reo Māori. Simple words rather than phases were used although the well-educated upper class engaged in active learning of the language supported by complex explanations of te reo Māori and its meanings. The extent of English use by Māori is difficult to estimate. Only limited evidence could be found. Nevertheless, taking all the data into account it seems likely that at least some settlers and Māori facilitated trade and other interactions in the contact zone by engaging with each other’s language.

Since daily trade contact between Māori and settlers was inevitable it might be assumed that language adoption came naturally on both sides. However, some engagements in the contact zone were more complex and an exchange of knowledge took place. Especially for the ill-equipped and isolated settlers of New Plymouth, the knowledge that was passed on was essential to understand ‘the other’ and to engage in the new world around them. The upper-class settlers of New Plymouth report things they have learned from Māori or that they have observed. Often a stay at the pā opened a totally new world for them. Māori also learned from the settlers. As in Wellington, with the introduction of horses, so in New Plymouth the introduction of the steam ship caused intense curiosity and introduced Māori to new
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technology with which they happily engaged. Events like earthquakes also provided a space to engage and disasters connected with death seem to have had the power to connect people.744

However, in contrast with Wellington and Nelson, the knowledge exchanges in New Plymouth seem rather limited. This could be due to the nature of retrieved material. It could also be that the difficult living circumstances meant that settlers simply had no time to engage with Māori. It is equally possible that this limited engagement was triggered by emerging conflicts about land as shown, for example, by Parsonson.745 Unfortunately, the retrieved sources do not provide enough material for a detailed analysis.

Many sources indicate that positive interaction between settler and Māori in the Middle Ground as part of daily experience. However, it became evident that the Middle Ground decayed over time. The presented diaries and letters suggest that, with the emerging land problems and the return of Māori to their homeland, the Middle Ground was weakened. As shown, by 1842 with the first conflict about Waitara, and later in 1843 when the news of the killings in Wairau reached New Plymouth, settlers began voicing negative feelings towards Māori in different ways. However, these events did not have the impact necessary to destroy the Middle Ground. Instead, it seems that these events laid the foundation for suspicion amongst some settlers that became evident in the 1850s and in the further emerging conflict over land. Settlers no longer needed Māori and felt they were in the way, as Māori resistance intensified. This, as also suggested by O’Malley for his case study prior 1840, lead to the final destruction of the Middle Ground which was identified by O’Malley with the strong emergence of negative labelling of Māori. This also becomes apparent in Parsonson’s material about the land conflict in Taranaki where a negative view of Pākehā towards Māori increased analogous to conflict.746 By the 1860s New Zealand was engaged in a war for land, sovereignty and political power – a war which changed race relations and inevitably destroyed the positive space of interaction, the Middle Ground, as a space of acceptance of the other culture and multiculturalism, and which gave way for a Europeanised, Eurocentric, monocultural New Zealand from 1860 far into the 20th century.747
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The contact stories between Pākehā and Māori presented here, as stated in the beginning of this thesis by John Sutton Lutz, transmit something about the other. Settlers and Māori, living the Middle Ground, had “the capacity to get a glimpse of a world beyond the horizon of [their own] culture, beyond the fences of [their] minds.” They created, even if only for a short time, a space that was defined by exchange and mixing – the space that O’Malley proposed for the North before the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and that he considered was possibly still in [a weaker] existence until the 1860s. In his paper about Scots and Māori, Brad Patterson, alludes to the existence of the Middle Ground in Turakina. Although not using this specific concept, his descriptions, suggestions and findings indicate that his case study on Turakina, extends the evidence on the space of positive interaction in regards to time and geography proposed by this thesis. In 2012, Margaret Mutu, focusing on events in the early 19th century, also hinted at positive interaction between settlers and Māori in her work on Custom Law and the Advent of New Pākehā Settlers. In this work she briefly described how some Māori chiefs involved some Pākehā into the principal of tuku whenua and that the settlement of Pākehā in their community was intended to benefit all. However, Mutu also pointed out that, with the extensive acquisition of land by Pākehā, these traditional concepts became ‘unbalanced’. Undoubtedly some connection to the findings of this thesis and the work of O’Malley could be made. Looking overseas, it is apparent that scholars engage with the complex relations between ‘Intruder’ and Indigenous; however, the Middle Ground as a concept is generally given little consideration. However, at the 2012 Australian Historical Association [AHA] Conference themed ‘Connections’, a number of papers presented some engagement with positive interactions rather than conflict between settlers, colonisers and the indigenous. The Research Cluster on Settler Imperialism, at the University of Trier, under
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752 Most noticeable focusing more on positive perceptions for example in: Tracey Banivanua-Mar and Penelope Edmonds eds., Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity (Basingstoke; Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
755 Next to some broader papers talking about indigenous-settler encounter, on 13th July 2012 a whole session was titled “A Middle Ground?” In particular the paper from Mark Dunn (University of New South Wales) ‘Exploring Connections: Bungaree in the colonial Hunter Valley’ suggested, though not specifically using Richard White’s concept, that some sort of Middle Ground was also in existence between Aborigines and the British in Australia. This research is still in progress and nothing has yet been published.
the leadership of Prof. Dr. Lemkuhl and Dr. Eva Bishoff also explores the concept of the Middle Ground in more diverse ways.\textsuperscript{754}

Following Richard White’s suggestions regarding the Middle Ground, O’Malley proposes that that the Middle Ground in Aotearoa/New Zealand existed only as long as both parties had a mutual need. With the emerging military strength of the Colonisers, this need eventually became obsolete and the “‘middle ground’ sank without a trace.”\textsuperscript{755} O’Malley’s views are also reflected in the findings of this research that show a strong positive space, which decayed over time. Nevertheless, it needs to be asked whether the military strength, as suggested by O’Malley for the Northland region, was sufficient for the Wakefield Settlement Pākehā to turn away from Māori.

The private records of early Wakefieldian settlers suggest that ‘mutual need’ extended well beyond the 1840s in the Wakefield Settlements. The military strength and power of the Crown were deliberately limited in the Wakefield Settlements for a longer time than, for example, in the northern regions of New Zealand, because the Crown’s main interest lay outside of the New Zealand Company.\textsuperscript{756} From the establishment of the first settlement, the Wakefield Company strived fruitlessly for autonomy from the Crown, even though British sovereignty had been declared by 1840 and the whole of New Zealand was purportedly under British control. The British Governor, as a representative of the Crown, was unwilling to give extensive support to the independent Wakefield organisation. This tension-filled relationship between Crown and Company became, for example, evident when Wellington did not become the Capital of New Zealand, as hoped for by the New Zealand Company. Also, despite settlers’ calls for strong military forces to intervene in the Hutt Wars, as well as after the events of Wairau in 1843, the Crown limited its actions to what was needed to establish order and British presence.

The Northland region, as described by O’Malley, was under stronger Crown control, while the region around Cook Strait was being further developed by the New Zealand Company, which maintained rather casual relations with the Governor of New Zealand. The Governor resided in the Bay of Islands and Auckland was created outside the New Zealand Company sphere of influence. With limited military forces it was understandable that the Governor would keep his troops close to his main areas of interest and would only support the New Zealand

\textsuperscript{754} As a result of a colloquium different findings of the Research Cluster will be published in a special edition of the Journal of Settler Colonial Studies in 2014.
\textsuperscript{755} O’Malley, The Meeting Place: Māori and Pākehā Encounters, 1642–1840. p.8
\textsuperscript{756} This becomes evident in: Wards, The Shadow of the Land: A Study of British Policy and Racial Conflict in New Zealand 1832-1852.
Company on questions of land, race relations and breaches of the Treaty. Such support was required during the Hutt Wars when Grey sent a military force to intervene.

By the 1860s, when Pākehā and Māori population levels were even, and the New Zealand Company had been incorporated into the Crown, conflict around land became inevitable. The settlements, and in consequence the Crown, required more and more land while the resistance amongst Māori to sell land grew. In 1848 the New Plymouth settlement comprised around 3,500 acres which grew in the following 10 years to 32,000 acres due to intensive land purchases by Governor Grey. However, the success of Pākehā settlements was built on the availability of free, cheap, and fertile land which was increasingly difficult to acquire from Māori and the land so far acquired by the Crown and Company was not sufficient to fulfil the dreams of flourishing settlement under British control.

As is well documented, the Waikato and Taranaki regions felt the effects of the colonial power and the demand for land. It appears that the interventions of the Crown in and around Taranaki, led to the wars of the 1860s onwards and created exactly the strong military presence, suggested by O’Malley, which brought about the destruction of the Middle Ground. The mutual need between the two peoples was destroyed and an even stronger Coloniser emerged, taking Māori land and civil rights.

It is evident that the Middle Ground, as shown in this thesis, was strongly influenced by the situation around land. It has been suggested that the complex nature of conflict in New Zealand emerged in Taranaki when Māori returned to their homeland from the Wellington region: “Tensions then developed between Māori and Māori, settlers and Māori, between government and Māori and between settlers and government – and an unending series of legal claims were set in motion.” With settlers who wanted land, Māori who wanted to sell land, tribal leaders who opposed sales, and a New Zealand Governor who had a considerable interest in a flourishing settlement, it was inevitable that these different positions would collide, which happened finally in 1860 in Taranaki.

---

757 Belich, Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939. p.553
758 For example: ———, The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict. Keenan, "'Amalgamating Maori?' Maori, Land Tenure and 'Amalgamation' before 1860."
759 ———, Wars without End: The Land Wars in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand.
760 Boast and eds., Raupatu: The Confiscation of Maori Land.
Add, "Te Muru Me Te Rauputu: The Aftermath."
761 Bohan, Climates of War: New Zealand in Conflict, 1859-69. p.33
The wars of the 1860s, as a manifestation of the struggle about land and sovereignty, put an end to the positive interaction between settlers and Māori. Although falling largely outside the scope of this thesis, I would nevertheless suggest that the strong military presence in Taranaki resulted in a shift of power in favour of the British, and that, according to Richard White’s concept of the Middle Ground, the Colonisers finally occupied dominant roles that denied the Middle Ground had ever existed. Further research into the factors that undermined the positive relations between Pākehā and Māori, as a result of the Taranaki wars, could give greater insight into the concept of the Middle Ground. Additionally, research focusing on different Middle Grounds could produce a surprising and more diverse picture of New Zealand’s race relations and could contribute to a broader understanding as to how these relationships of the indigenous and non-indigenous peoples were formed. During this project, it became evident that it would be useful to focus on one particular settlement or region over a longer time period, thus enabling an even stronger micro approach. From a wider perspective, a comparison between official and private records could complement the findings of this thesis, leading to a better understanding of ‘lived reality’ and the construction of official perceptions and intentions.

This micro historical thesis has opened intriguing new windows into the colonial past of New Zealand. Due to limited language abilities, and cultural limitations as a result of an outsider view, research into records in te reo could not be undertaken. Further research using Māori sources could confirm and/or challenge settler records and could give further agency to Māori in the process of colonisation and land loss, emphasising the importance of this topic in regard to current race relations. An indigenous ‘insider’ view could add an interesting different dimension for the academic discourse.

Fascinating stories of individuals emerged during the research, such as the story of the ‘Smith Boy’ in Nelson who left the settlement to live with Māori who were able to look after him more effectively. Engagement with Māori communities and in particular oral histories could potentially throw further light on this story, and maybe a new perspective on an extraordinary episode that has been forgotten by Pākehā. To extend my research journey and ‘wanderer between the worlds’ I hope that a further research project will enable me to go back to Nelson to find traces of this boy in Māori Histories.

761 Peter Walker did a similar project in and around Whanganui to follow the traces of an abducted Māori boy. His research, that was a personal journey, with Māori communities showed the Micro-World gives us a different view on our past. Peter Walker, The Fox Boy: The Story of an Abducted Child (London: Bloomsbury, 2001).
As pointed out in the Introduction, in some respect the colonial experiences of Māori are universal, and the scholarship points to the extensive trauma of colonisation that Indigenous People have experienced all over the world.\textsuperscript{762} An emerging critical scholarship, since Sidney Moko Mead described the Māori–Pākehā relationships in 1982 as a space of non-acknowledgment of Māori and a place with still on-going ‘Pākehāsation’, engages with the complicated colonial past of New Zealand and seeks to break the silence and to give agency to Māori.\textsuperscript{763} This project was anticipated to contribute to a softening of the colonial trauma and to fill the void of the history of the significant interactions between Māori and settlers in the contact zone of early colonial New Zealand. Māori have been an important part of New Zealand settler life, and settlers and Māori have influenced each other. In the scholarship, as well as on the communal level, the importance of these early relations between Pākehā and Māori has often been forgotten. Research into the private sphere of the early settlement period of New Zealand, using a micro-historical approach, opens up a new perspective on the difficult times when two peoples created a new living arrangement with each other. We can see how individuals, in contrast to general entities like the New Zealand Company or the Crown, shaped relations, interacted with each other on a daily basis, and created a possibly far more positive space with ‘the other’ than the officially remembered: a \textit{Middle Ground}.


8. Selected Bibliography

Secondary Sources

Books


Church, Ian. *Heartland of Aotearoa: Maori and European in South Taranaki before the Taranaki Wars*. Hawera: Hawera Historical Society, 1992.


McKillop, H.F. *Reminiscences of Twelve Month Service in New Zealand as a Midshipman During the Late Disturbances in That Colony*. London: Richard Bently, New Burlington Street, 1849.


**Book Chapters**


Hareven, Tamara. "The Search for Generation Memory." In Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology, edited by David King Dunaway, Willa K. Baum and American Association for State and


Martin, John E. "A 'Small Nation on the Move': Wakefield's Theory of Colonisation and the Relationship between State and Labour in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." In Edward Gibbon


Perkins, Elisabeth. "Distinctions and Partitions Amongst Us: Identity and Interaction in the Revolutionary Ohio Valley." In Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the


Journal Articles


Reports:


Theses

"The History of New Zealand Immigration up to 1870." Master Thesis, Victoria University College, 1900.


Other Sources


Primary Sources

Published work


———. The Six Colonies of New Zealand. London: John W. Parker & Son, 1851.


———. View of a Part of the Town of Wellington, New Zealand, Looking Towards the South East, Comprising About One-Third of the Water-Frontage Port Nicholson (Wellington): Watercolour. 442 x 620 mm on sheet 518 x 698 mm. C-025-009 ATL, September 1841.


**Unpublished work**


Betts, John "Across the North Island." Nelson and North Island: ATL, 1844.


———. "Letter to His Sister Lady Maxwell 4 May 1846." Wellington: ATL, MS-Papers-9580-08, 1846.

———. "Letter to His Sister Lady Maxwell 5 December 1844." Wellington: ATL, MS-Papers-9580-06, 1844.


SAUNDERS, A. "Reminiscence; Fragmented Diary." Nelson: Tasman Bays Heritage Trust, NPM, Fmz SAM A 2867, ca.1842.


———. "Extracts from Diary of Samuel Stephens Made by J.E. Clark." Nelson: ATL, MS-Papers-2698-1A, 1844-1854.

STEPHENS, Sarah. "Letter to Her Sister Miss Bennett of Shaftesbury." Wellington: ATL, MS-Papers-2698-1b, 1842.


Wilson, Peter ( Dr.). "Diary of a Journey from New Plymouth to Whanganui." New Plymouth: Taranaki Research Centre/Puke Ariki, ARC2002-21 Box2, 1853.


Young, William C. "A Surveyor to His Mother." In Letters from Nelson. Nelson: Tasman Bays Heritage Trust, NPM, qMS LET, 4 April 1842.
9. Glossary and Abbreviations

ATL- Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington

haka – Māori war dance

hapū- Sub-tribe, subcategory of Iwi

hui- gathering, meeting

Iwi- Tribal group, Tribe

kai- food

Kapiti- eg Kapiti Coast -Region north of Wellington at the West Coast

Kapiti Island- Island of the Kapiti Coast

kōrero- Speech, discussion

mana - prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma; (noun) jurisdiction, mandate, freedom.

manaakitanga- hospitality, kindness

Māori- Indigenous People of New Zealand

mauri- life force, life principle, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions.

Nelson Examiner- Newspaper of Nelson from 1842-1874

NPM- Nelson Provincial Museum

NZJH- The New Zealand Journal of History

Ōtamaiea- Nelson Harbour

pā- fortified Māori village

Pākehā- Māori - Non Māori that emerged into Māori culture, often living with Māori family and under the projection of the chief

Pākehā- Settlers or persons of non Māori decent

raupatu- confiscation of land, conquest

Sugarloaf Island – A set of steep little island of the coast of New Plymouth

Tā Moko- traditional Māori facial tattoo

tangata whenua- local people, hosts, Indigenous People of the land - people born of the whenua

tangi/tangihanga- Māori ceremony for a deceased, Burial

tapu- restriction, also in a supernatural sense.

Te Ātiawa- Māori iwi residing around Wellington Harbour and in Taranaki
Te Ika ā Māui - North Island of New Zealand

Te Moana o Raukawa - Cook Strait, sea between North and South Island

te reo (Māori) - Māori language

Te Tau Ihu - top of the South Island

tikanga - correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, meaning, practice

urupā - burial ground

utu - (verb) to repay, pay, make a response, avenge, reply. (noun) revenge, cost, price, wage, fee, payment, salary, reciprocity - an important concept to maintain the balance and harmony in relationships between individuals and groups and order within Māori society.

Wai Pounamu - South Island of New Zealand

Wairau - Region between Nelson and Blenheim on the South Island with a valley that of the Wairau River and the flat Wairau Plains near Blenheim and Renwick

wairua - spirit, soul, quintessence - spirit of a person which exists beyond death

Whakatū - Nelson

whānau - family for Māori also uses in a wider context of kin, Subcategory of Iwi and hapu

Whanganui ā Tara - Wellington Harbour

whare - Māori hut