IN A PADDOCK, surrounded by old trees not far below the bushline on the western slopes of the Kaimai Ranges, there stands a tall, squared totara post. A carving near its base represents Rupe, a dove or symbol of the Holy Spirit, transmitted by the angel Gabriel to the followers of the teachings of Te Ua Haumene who chanted their karakia as they processed around the niu pole. The location is Kuranui, an old kainga of Ngāti Motai, a hapū of Ngāti Raukawa, one of several villages that once existed along the bush margins on both sides of the Kaimai Ranges. The pole, Te Pou o Motai, has been restored, with the assistance of a grant from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, and on Anzac Day 1983 it was rededicated in a ceremony which included Pai Mārire karakia. It has lost its cross-pieces and the upper portion derived from the mast of the ship *Meri Heeni*, owned by Ngāti Hangarau of Tauranga Moana.\(^1\) There were once similar niu poles in other villages. Only Te Pou o Motai at Kuranui still stands as a monument to the unsuccessful efforts of civil and military authorities in the 1860s to stamp out a religious and political movement, dubbed a Hauhau rebellion, which in Tauranga, more than anywhere else, was millennial and pacifist in its expression.

Some Tauranga people had gone to support Waikato when British imperial troops invaded in July 1863 but there had been no ‘rebellion’, or confrontation, between Māori and Pākehā at Tauranga. In January 1864 the British landed troops at Tauranga and blockaded the harbour. On 29 April 1864 at Pukehinahina (Gate Pa) 230 local Ngāi Te Rangi and Ngāti Ranginui repulsed 1700 British troops and naval forces. On 6 June 1864, in a partly constructed pa at Te Ranga, local people were surprised and overcome by British troops. On 6-7 August 1864, at a hui in Tauranga, Governor George Grey warned that land would be confiscated, but to mark the chivalrous manner in which the fighting had been conducted Grey also promised that three-quarters of Tauranga Moana tribal lands would be returned.\(^2\) At the time, an informal arrangement was made with a few ‘Ngaiterangi chiefs’ for the Crown to acquire a large area that became known as the Katikati-Te Puna Purchase (Figure 1). There was an understanding
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that the area to be confiscated and allocated to men of the First Waikato Regiment as part of the scheme for military settlement would lie between the Waimapu and Wairoa Rivers, and that military settlers would also be located on land west of Te Puna River on the Katikati-Te Puna Purchase. Although surveys had been started at Tauranga, there was still no final agreement in December 1864 as to the boundaries of the lands to be confiscated or purchased by the Crown.

During the latter half of 1864 the teachings of the Taranaki prophet Te Ua Haumene were carried throughout the central North Island. In August, a party of Waikato and Maniapoto people travelled to Taiporohenui, where the Māori King was given the name Tawhiao by Te Ua. A letter sent to Wiremu Tamihana, son of Te Waharoa of Ngāti Haua, from Taiporohenui on 6 September 1864, fell into the hands of H.T. Clarke, Civil Commissioner at Tauranga, who presumably made the following translation:
To Te Waharoa, and his Tribes at that place.

Friends, Salutations to you and the tribe. O the tribe! Salutations to you, the people who have been made holy by Jehovah for His Holy mountain. Yes! salutations to you, oh friends, beneath the shadow of the Almighty. The words of greeting end. The subject stands (commences). Friend, Te Waharoa, a word to you and your tribes on the side to the East throughout your boundaries, to request you to shut all the doors of the sword whether there or beyond you, so that they be stopped up; cease to lift the sword during these days; though he perish yet what will be the result of his persistence. Friend, here is the sword which has been given by Jehovah of Hosts, the sword he gave to Sampson and Gideon, the sword which saved Israel from the hand of the Philistines and Midianites, that is Gabriel Rura [Ruler] the angel. Friends, he has appeared at this place like a torrent upon his people and upon his man annointed [sic] by him. Wherefore I say unto you, fasten up all the doors of the Island Canaan. Enough, then, incline your ears hither my friends to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in a proverb, I will speak to you of the secret things of ancient times. Which are the hidden things? The precepts which he now sends to you to close the four doors — that on the East, that on the West, that on the North, and that on the South — in order that your faces may be turned hitherward, that we may all enter and vote (take the same side).

O, tribe, turn hither. Your God has descended to the untouched soil (papatupu) of the Canaan because of his love to his sacred people, because he is bringing you back to your Rock, even Jehovah.

Enough, O Waharoa, do you send (this) to Hakaraia, and his tribes, that they may do likewise; do you also send (this) to all fighting men in your boundaries. It is for you to consider attentively the appearance of these words (purport), for they are not uttered by human man, but given of his own 'Paimarie' (good will). Ended.

From Tehanatana, from Ahitana, from the Tribes of all the winds (quarters) of Tamarura (The sons of Rura).  

Although this missive can be interpreted as an invocation for peace, there was some official consternation that Tamihana appeared to have joined Pai Mārire. James Mackay Jr., civil commissioner for the Hauraki district, reported a similar letter and suggested Tamihana had arranged for it to be sent 'to the Hauraki natives'. Clarke reported on 14 November 1864: 'I regret to say that there is every reason to believe that William Thompson has become a convert to this new faith. This will give the whole movement additional weight', but Grey maintained that he had information that Tamihana 'has not joined the faith of the false prophet, and that he desires the continuance of peace, and has no wish for war'.
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Clarke depicted the atmosphere in the Tauranga area:

Various rumours are current amongst the Natives — some of the most extravagant kind were in circulation, to the effect that the Angel Gabriel had appeared upon earth, and had interposed on behalf of the Native race. That a wonderful deliverance was to be wrought for them: that those Natives who did not remain faithful to the Maori King, nor become believers in the ‘Pai Marire’ religion, should be involved in one common ruin with the Pakeha . . . .

The great day of deliverance, in which all the Pakehas are to be destroyed, is to be in the latter part of December.  

On Christmas Day the Europeans in the mission station and military camp at Te Papa were left in a state of panic when it became known that almost all the Māori occupants of the villages around Tauranga harbour had gone inland to await the day of deliverance. The Tauranga people later returned to their homes but the fears of the Europeans seemed to be confirmed by news of the murder of the Church Missionary Society missionary Carl Volkner at Ōpōtiki on 2 March 1865, soon after the arrival of Pai Mārire emissaries there, led by Kereopa Te Rau. The local issues leading to this murder were complex, but for officials like Clarke the murder was an expression of rebellion, a barbaric rejection of Christian teachings.

European settler reaction to Pai Mārire ‘superstition’ and Hauhau ‘rebellion’ (the terms were synonymous) was little short of hysterical. Grey issued a proclamation which asserted the powers of the governor to ‘resist and suppress, by the force of arms if necessary’ the ‘fanatical doctrines, rites and practices of Pai Marire’, and concluded: ‘I call on well-disposed persons, whether Native or European, to aid and assist me herein to the best of their ability’. Clarke’s reaction to the proclamation was expressed in a personal letter to T.H. Smith, the civil commissioner at Maketu:

The Arawa now have an authority (I will not give an opinion as to the legality of the proclamation) for pitching into their troublesome neighbours provided that they can satisfy themselves as to their holding ‘fanatical Doctrine’ — The Governor says or is made to say that he will suppress by force of arms if necessary all ‘fanatical doctrines’ of the Hauhau character — I feel curious to see the working of this — I should like to see one of the above ‘genus homo’ caught and operated upon. I am seriously thinking of writing to Colonel Greer enclosing a copy of the Proclamation and asking him what assistance he is prepared to give in the event of a stand up resistance on the part of cantankerous individuals.

Clarke, son of a Church Missionary Society missionary, remained intransigent
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in his attitude toward Pai Mārire. In another letter, he reaffirmed his view that Tamihana had become a Pai Mārire: ‘He has given up his Christianity’. At no stage did Clarke appear to consider the biblical origins of the message of peaceful living in Te Ua Rongopai, consistently interpreting Pai Mārire as a political instrument of the King movement intended to foment rebellion. He wrote: ‘I do not — I never have trusted a Hauhau’.

The term Hauhau was being applied by European officials to anyone with any connection with Pai Mārire or to those who expressed their opposition to land sales.

Although the millennium did not occur, Pai Mārire ritual continued in the villages of the Kaimai ranges in 1865. The rugged bush clad hill country inland of Tauranga became a refuge area. Niu poles like Te Pou o Motai at Kuranui were erected in several inland kainga. Local oral tradition in Tauranga and among Ngāti Haua maintains that Wiremu Tamihana was involved with the niu at Kuranui and that he provided the karakia at the time it was erected early in 1865. In September 1865 he told the resident magistrate in the Waikato, R.C. Mainwaring, that ‘there was nothing at all in the Pai Marire “Karakia” or service to instigate or encourage men to commit murder or any other crime. That on the contrary the very name of the sect meant nothing more than living quietly and peaceably together. That the outrages recently committed did not originate in the Pai Marire religion, but in the heart of Kereopa and his associates, and that therefore no blame was to be attributed to those who professed the new religion.’

Until a decision was made on the boundaries of the land to be confiscated, and arrangements made in the various Māori claims in the Katikati-Te Puna Purchase, including allocation of promised ‘Native reserves’, no land could be distributed. The Tauranga district surveyor, Theophilus Heale, reported on 7 April 1865 that he could do nothing further, and withdrew his teams. He expressed his concern at the ‘disastrous condition of excitement and discontent’ among local Māori at the delays, and pleaded for government action. ‘The non-settlement of the land question is looked upon by some of the Natives as a deception and a wrong, while others affect to regard it as an abandonment by the Government of the intention to confiscate any portion of their lands’. There was a further problem of speculators seeking desirable coastal land. They offered up to £4 an acre (compared with the government offer of three shillings per acre). In 1867, Mackay attributed the rising Māori opposition to surveys to Wiremu Tamihana, commenting:

A good deal of this opposition was caused by land speculators going to the Natives and trying to purchase choice pieces of land at prices higher than that offered by the Government and by their telling them the Government were not giving enough for the
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land, these persons and the Natives overlooking the fact that about one half of the land in
the Puna and Katikati Blocks will never be of much use to anyone, and the price offered
by the speculators was for the front land only. Some persons even wished to give the
Natives a sum of £1,000 to enable them to return to the Government the deposit paid on
the land. After this it suited the policy of the Hauhau party to keep up and foment a bad
feeling between the Ngaiterangi and the Government in order to distract attention from
Whakatane, Opotiki and Waiapu, which soon became the seat of war.17

However, Mackay provided no evidence for this assertion, made with hindsight
following the renewed military campaigns in the Tauranga district.

Although the survey of the district for military settlement began in September
1864 it was not until 18 May 1865 that an order-in-council18 brought the
Tauranga district under the provisions of the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863
and thus allowed confiscation of land and military settlement to go ahead. The
total area confiscated was some 86,590 hectares, of which three-quarters were
to be returned to Māori owners ‘after due inquiry’. The government had already
made arrangements to acquire 32,375 hectares of this in the Katikati-Te Puna
Purchase. The proclamation of 18 May defined an area described as lands of the
‘Ngaiterangi tribe’. But Ngāi Te Rangi, comprising several hapū of Mātaatua
descent, were only one group of the several tribes with rights in the district. Ngāi
Te Rangi rights were derived from conquest of the coastal area in the eighteenth
century. The Ngāti Ranginui hapū, of Takitimu descent, and other inland hapū
with Tainui connections occupied a large part of the district west of the Waimapu
River. To the east Waitaha and Ngāti Rangiwehi of Te Arawa descent also
maintained occupation rights. Regardless, Clarke and other officials persisted in
describing all the Tauranga people as ‘Ngaiterangi’, even though Clarke recog-
nized the complexity of ancestral claims in Tauranga Moana:

Most of the difficulties in settling the claims in this district will arise from the fact that the
Ngaiterangi claim only by conquest. They did not destroy the original inhabitants, but
allowed them to remain as cultivators of the soil (not slaves), subject to the conquerors.
Some of the principal chiefs took the best of the women as wives, and in some cases, some
of the Ngaiterangi women married men of the conquered tribe—the pure Ngaiterangi are
now in the minority. The issue of these intermarriages have, when they thought it would
suit their purpose, ignored their claims through Ngaiterangi, and have fallen back upon
the claims derived from the original occupants, this has been the cause of much bloodshed,
even down to a very late date, and is now frequently the cause of angry debate. If any
trouble arises in carrying out the plans of the Government it will arise from those who
support the claims of the original inhabitants many of whom have never come in
[submitted to Crown authority].19

Curiously, in the ‘arbitration’ on the claims of Hauraki tribes to the Katikati-
Te Puna Purchase in December 1864, Clarke and Mackay accepted descent from
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Ranginui as the basis for acknowledging Hauraki rights. The most vociferous group in disputing 'Ngaiterangi' claims were the Pirirākau and other inland hapū, who challenged their right to dispose of the Katikati-Te Puna Block (Figure 2).

Heale suggested that government inaction had contributed to the current uncertainty: 'The Pirirakau, and other outlying hapus, have adopted the Pai Marire faith (but without any offensive disposition). Wm. Thompson, who, in his letters to the writer, had fully assented to the surveying of Te Puna, has since written to Colonel Greer announcing his intention to dispute its occupation; and affairs appear to be drifting back into the confusion which first led the Ngaiterangi into the King party, in despair of obtaining a solution of their difficulties by any other means.'

There had not yet been any confrontation, but opposition to European settlement was increasing, and threats to survey parties were being taken seriously. No further progress had been made in establishing the boundaries of the confiscated block. Nor had all the claims in the Katikati-Te Puna purchase been settled. Māori complainants alleged that some who had not fought would lose land, not all owners had been consulted nor had they consented to the Katikati-Te Puna purchase. Only nine 'Ngaiterangi chiefs' had signed the receipt for the deposit of £1000 in Auckland in August 1864. 

There was some correspondence on the question of jurisdiction of the newly-established Native Land Court, but no effective decisions were made during the second half of 1865. Māori dissatisfaction was voiced at a meeting at Tauranga attended by the Defence Minister, Colonel Haultain, on 26 February 1866. Enoka Te Whanake responded to Haultain's question about the boundaries of the land given up at a meeting held with the governor in August 1864:

All I gave at the surrender was from Katikati and along by the mountains to Wairake[i]. I explained to the Governor that there were certain lands at Katikati disputed by the Thames Natives. The Governor replied: Give me the land; bye and bye I will give you every third acre and keep the fourth acre. The fourth acre was taken for the sin (hara) I had committed, my land only was taken because I had sinned: it was not taken from the men who did not fight. The Governor said, let there be one piece (i.e. of land). I objected, and said it would not be just that another should suffer for me; let me pay with my property at Katikati and Wairake[i]. Also, those who own the forest land, let them do likewise. Then the mana of the land was given to the Governor, and the conversation ended; I have repeated all that was said then.

Enoka complained that while the mana of the land had been given to the governor in 1864, it seemed that he was now demanding an excessive amount of their land. 'Why has the governor raised his demands? Why is the amount
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Hapū and their Kainga on the Confiscated Block at Tauranga
increased?' Haultain maintained that the amount had not been increased. Pene Taka of Pirirākau commented: ‘How many men were in arms that the Governor should take so many acres?’ Haultain’s reply was that ‘Government will require certain lands of friendly Natives, on which to put settlers for the protection of the district. What they take they will pay for’. Pene Taka was not impressed and replied: ‘When you have taken these lands you will keep returning and taking more and more’. Enoka, who had not gone to Auckland nor signed the receipt, questioned the Katikati-Te Puna purchase agreement and £1000 deposit as ‘the work of the men who went to Auckland’, stating that he ‘knew nothing of the arrangement’ and wanted to know the boundaries. ‘Some of the people who lived peaceably on the land would object to being involved in that manner’. 24

Grey and Frederick Whitaker, Agent of the General Government in the Auckland Province, came to Tauranga on 26 March 1866. Enoka reiterated that he understood that they had ceded the mana of the land, but that government demands for land for settlement were excessive. Moreover, other Māori claimants to land in the Katikati-Te Puna purchase had not been consulted. Reserves for Māori had been promised in the confiscated block between the Wairoa and Waimapu, but the promises had not allayed suspicions. A major cause of dissension was the suggestion that land would also be confiscated west of the Wairoa river, while local Māori had understood the river to be the boundary. The resident magistrate, W.G. Mair, who had acted as interpreter for the governor’s meeting, reported retrospectively from Opōtiki on 20 March 1867, giving his version of proceedings:

The Natives were informed that the Eastern boundary should be the Waimapu river for a considerable distance, and then a line over a hill on which a single tree was visible, and on to the wooded country about Waohu [Waoku]; but Mr Civil Commissioner Clarke was to decide upon the exact course the line should take.

The survey was then to extend westward as far as would be necessary to include an area of 50,000 acres; the Natives were distinctly informed that no point could be named as the probable limit on that side, but that it might extend as far as Te Puna. They were rather excited at this, and said that they would not consent; but upon being informed by the Governor that they had been treated better than any other tribe, but if necessary they should again be put down by force of arms, they accepted the proposals made to them. The words of their principal speaker Enoka being ‘Governor, we have consented to your acres’. 25

Mackay had not attended the meeting, but had certainly heard about it: ‘I am told by the Natives’ that the governor had said ‘he wanted 50,000 acres of land, and if they would not give that then he would take the whole of it’. 26 Tauranga Māori were thereby left with little choice.

The survey of the confiscated block west of the Waimapu river commenced almost immediately. The township of Te Puna had already been surveyed west
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of the Wairoa in April 1865. The coast had also been surveyed and some farm sections marked off near Te Papa and at Otūmoetai. The new district surveyor, H.J. Utting, commented on the work of survey parties on the ‘Waimapu Block’: ‘They report however that nothing like an adequate quantity of “good agricultural land” can be obtained within the limits of the confiscated block, as the greater part of it is of so rugged and broken a character, that scarcely any practicable road at all can be laid out upon it, and that roads laid out as required by the Specification would be impassable.’

The confiscated block would include land west of the Wairoa river, not because the 50,000 acres could not be found between the Wairoa and Waimapu rivers, but because 50,000 acres of ‘good agricultural land’ were required for the farms promised to the men of the Waikato militia garrisoned at Te Papa.

Meanwhile, the negotiations on the Katikati-Te Puna purchase had to be completed. Following the March meeting, Whitaker instructed Clarke and Mackay to call a meeting to settle outstanding claims. Although Clarke wrote to the Native Minister questioning whether there might be any conflict in taking instructions from ‘the Government Agent in this Province’, the meeting proceeded. At Te Papa, between 29 June and 19 July 1866, Clarke and Mackay investigated various tribal claims in the Katikati-Te Puna Purchase. Apart from Mackay’s retrospective summary in 1867, no record of these proceedings appears to have survived. The Hauraki claims in the Katikati-Te Puna Purchase were settled by cash by Clarke and Mackay. Between 10 August and 3 September 1866 final payments were made to Tāwera, Ngāti Pāoa, Ngāti Tamaterā and Ngāti Maru to extinguish their claims to land at Tauranga.

Mackay expressed the hope that the settlement of all the Hauraki claims would ‘be found to have finally and effectually removed one of the great obstructions to the completion of the long outstanding and troublesome question’.

The final payment to ‘Ngaiterangi’ awaited completion of the survey of the boundary of the confiscated block, to include land west of the Wairoa river. Pirirākau, claiming the support of Ngāti Haua, objected to this move and stopped the survey by taking away the surveyors’ instruments. Wiremu Tamihana had written to Clarke on 23 August offering his services as a mediator, provided a government inquiry into the dispute was held. He also wrote to the surveyors: ‘Stop your surveying, the place of blood [confiscated block] is on the other side of Te Wairoa; the place of money [Katikati-Te Puna purchase] is at Katikati’. The land between Te Puna stream and the Wairoa river was not to be surveyed. Clarke was not prepared to accede to Tamihana’s request, ‘in the face of the arrangement made by His Excellency the Governor and Mr Whitaker with the
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Tauranga Natives on his late visit’.  

Tamihana also wrote to the governor about the survey of Te Puna and asked for this ‘survey to be discontinued, lest we all again become confused, because we are all now sitting in peace’.  

Grey replied, noting that he had seen Tamihana’s letters to Clarke and to the surveyors, ‘I have ordered an inquiry to be made into this matter, that it may appear whether wrong has been done or not . . . . If wrong has been done by the surveyors I will see that the wrong be redressed, when fair inquiry has been made, but the taking away of the surveyors’ instruments is an act which is not right. I wish you therefore, to write and tell the Pirirakau to give them up. In this way a quiet solution of the difficulty will be effected.’

William Rolleston, also wrote for the government to Tamihana, indicating that they had seen his letter to Grey, and assuring him that there was no intention to ‘put any new conditions upon the word of the Governor which he spoke to the Ngaiterangi in 1864. The Governor’s promise at that time will be faithfully kept’. Rolleston also explained ‘that to survey land does not mean with the Europeans to seize it’, and suggested local Māori should ‘wait quietly till the Governor comes, and if any mistake has been made in surveying the land it will then be rectified’. This letter was not delivered to Tamihana; the governor did not come; and there was no inquiry.

Apparently Clarke did not consider an inquiry was needed, because Pirirākau and other inland hapū were Hauhau and unsurrendered rebels. He knew their grievance was that not only did they object to surveys west of the Wairoa river but they also refused to acknowledge the right of ‘Ngaiterangi’ to negotiate on their behalf. An ‘agreement’ with the Pirirākau chief, Maungapōhatu, was really an acknowledgement of his rights in the Katikati-Te Puna purchase. The western boundary of the confiscated block was a separate issue. Clarke intended to proceed with the survey and had already dismissed Pirirākau and other inland hapū claims in September: ‘It could be easily shown that they are of the inferior people of Ngaiterangi, and that they were always kept in a state of vassalage’.  

On 3 October he wrote to the acting Native Minister, J.C. Richmond: “These Natives fully relying on the countenance and support of William Thompson [Wiremu Tamihana], have assumed a very defiant attitude very prejudicial to the peace and quiet of the district, and unless they are at once checked the disaffection will I fear spread and cause much future trouble.” Mackay’s attitude toward Pirirākau had been expressed in an earlier report:

This tribe were very much inclined to be troublesome when I was last at Tauranga. I would point out that with the exception of some two or three persons they have all been in

33 ibid., p.20.
34 11 October 1866, ibid., p.23.
35 22 October 1866, ibid., p.24.
37 ibid., p.23.
38 ibid.
rebellion, and have not returned to their allegiance to this day. In my opinion it would only be just to confiscate all their lands, reserving about 2,500 acres for their use and occupation. Their lands are principally between Te Puna [stream] and the Wairoa, and I would suggest that a portion of these should be given to those friendly Natives who have lost land in the [confiscated] block of 50,000 acres.39

H. Halse, Assistant Under-secretary for Native Affairs, reprimanded Mackay for not transmitting Rolleston’s letter to Tamihana, informing him ‘that the detention of this letter has the very unfortunate effect of making the action of the Governor almost inexplicable to Wiremu Tamihana Tarapipi except in the theory that they are absolutely indifferent to their word. His Excellency’s letter, of an earlier date which has been duly forwarded, promises an inquiry without speaking of carrying out the survey in the meantime, whereas the letter you intercepted qualifies that promise by indicating that the survey will be proceeded with.’40

Halse was also confused because Rolleston had told Clarke on 30 October that the surveys were to be stopped ‘for the present’. The issue for Halse was not whether Tamihana’s grievance was ‘without foundation’ but that he also spoke for Pirirākau. The minister considered that he could not ‘admit the principle of any officer of this department placing himself between a complainant and the Government, and begs that in future such action may not be repeated’.41 This mild reprimand had no effect on Clarke’s and Mackay’s actions but the failure to fulfil the governor’s promise of an inquiry no doubt exacerbated an already tense situation. Clarke had expressed unease about the relations of Ngāi Te Rangi with neighbouring hapū and the rumours of hostile intentions, ‘but without wishing to be an alarmist I believe there is some important movement in contemplation. . . . The greatest vigilance will be required’.42 Although ‘Ngaiterangi’ representatives were said to have agreed to the continuation of the surveys, Pirirākau refused to attend any meetings between Mackay, Clarke and ‘Ngaiterangi’, or accept any decisions made there.

Whitaker instructed Clarke and Mackay to proceed with settling the Katikati-Te Puna purchase with ‘Ngaiterangi’ and a meeting was called on Motuhoe, beginning 31 October 1866. Pirirākau were invited and given assurances of protection, but did not attend, with the exception of Maungapōhatu, although the ‘influential men of the various hapūs of Ngaiterangi’ were present. The meeting continued the next day when discussion moved to consider the inclusion of land west of the Wairoa river in the confiscated block. Mackay reported:

The Natives were informed that all the Government required was the 50,000 acres agreed on at the time His Excellency the Governor last visited this district; that I had inquired as to the quantity actually surveyed, and found that between the rivers Waimap[u] and Wairoa, and including Captain Heale’s survey of Otumoetai west, there were 40,800
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acres; and between the rivers Wairoa and Te Puna 14,200 acres, or a total area of 55,000 acres, being 5,000 acres in excess of the quantity arranged.

I then proposed to give back the 5,000 acres, and to make the Ruangarara Stream and Te Puna River the inland boundary of the last-named block, and leave those of the Waimapu and East Wairoa as surveyed, to include 38,000 acres.

After some discussion my suggestion was unanimously assented to. Maungapohatu, the old and principal chief of the Pirirakau, consented on behalf of that hapu, and was exceedingly pleased at a reserve of 300 acres being made for himself and people at Epeha and Waikaraka.

The next two days 'were occupied in negotiating with the Ngaiterangi hapus for their claims to Te Puna and Katikati blocks'. Maungapohatu's 'reserve' was outside the purchase area, on the disputed Te Puna land. Other reserves for individuals and hapū listed in the deed were apparently decided at this time but there was no survey yet of the Katikati-Te Puna purchase, nor the 'Native reserves' to be excluded from the 'sale'. Since this land was already included in the proclamation of 18 May 1865 it was technically Crown land, and in effect, Clarke and Mackay were paying off certain 'Ngaiterangi' leaders and only allocating reserves to individuals for themselves and/or hapū as compensation for loyalty. A number of reserves were subsequently allocated in the disputed Te Puna land to individuals belonging to hapū who had never held any Māori customary rights there. Pirirākau did not respond to further invitations to attend the meeting and Mackay proceeded with settling a purchase agreement. On 3 November 1866 a deed was signed by 24 people on behalf of the 'Chiefs and people of the Tribe Ngaiterangi and its Hapus'.

Pirirākau still refused to participate and so Mackay decided to go to Waiwhatawhata on 6 November, accompanied by 'Te Kuka (Native Assessor) Ruka, Ruato and Hohepa, Native police'. They talked with about 25 men of Ngāti Rangi and Pirirākau but they were not to be persuaded. Among the speakers Rāwiri Tata replied: 'From Te Wairoa to Waipapa belongs to me. I will not give it up'. He admitted that while there may have been some Pirirākau obligations to Ngāi Te Rangi, the customary rights of Pirirākau on the land had been maintained. Rāwiri Tata told Mackay: 'William Thompson [Tamihana] has given orders to stop the surveyors, and the whole affair is in the hands of Thompson and the Governor'. He also said they were willing to give up the surveyors' instruments. Mackay responded that reserves for Ngāti Haua would be allocated at Omokoroa, where they had been given occupation rights generations earlier, and therefore there was no need for further involvement by Tamihana and Ngāti Haua. 'As far as the Governor was concerned I knew he had taken 50,000 acres of land for military settlement; and I also knew that he intended to retain it. That as to William Thompson and the Governor having to arrange the question I knew nothing of that. I considered that I was quite as well
acquainted with the views of the Governor and the Government, as William
Thompson, and they might take my word as binding the Government." It
is difficult to interpret Mackay's denial of knowledge of the governor's promise of
an inquiry to Tamihana as anything other than a convenient lie.

At a further meeting with ‘Ngaiterangi’, Mackay told them he intended to cut
the survey line between Ruangārara stream and Te Puna, with military protection
if necessary. While Mackay arranged military support with Colonel Harrington
on 8 November, several ‘Ngaiterangi chiefs’ met with Pirirākau and Ngāti Rangi
at Te Irihanga. The same afternoon they reported back to Mackay that Pirirākau
‘had agreed not to interfere with the survey themselves, but said another tribe
would probably do so’. Mackay interpreted this to mean Ngāti Porou from
Mataora, a bay on the Coromandel coast near Whangamatā, who were associated
with Pirirākau. On 9 November, Mackay went with the survey party and ‘200
men of H M 12th Regiment as a covering party’. They were accompanied by
several ‘Ngaiterangi chiefs’. The survey of the boundary of the confiscated block
between the Te Puna stream and Ruangārara stream, a tributary of the Wairoa,
was completed without further incident. Mackay noted that the Pirirākau
opposition numbered ‘about thirty men’. The fears of both Clarke and Mackay
seemed to be augmented by concern about the presence of a small group of Ngāti
Porou from Mataora, reports of ‘disaffected Arawa’ led by Hakaraia of the
Waitaha hapū in the Te Puke district, and rumours of possible alliances with
tribes in the Waikato. Consequently Mackay met with Haultain, who agreed that
100 men of the Waikato militia should be posted at Omanawa redoubt to protect
the surveyors subdividing the confiscated block into farm sections. The acting
district surveyor, H.N. Warner, reported that he had warned survey parties in the
Ōropi-Ōmanawa area of ‘the danger of a meditated attack upon them by 13
armed men of the Ngāti Porou tribe which will doubtless cause them to refrain
from further operations at present’.

Mackay’s meeting with Pirirākau at Waiwhatawhata on 6 November had
fuelled Pirirākau opposition. According to Mackay, ‘Pene Taka made a violent
speech’. He would not give up land, opposed the survey and ‘would fight against
the Ngaiterangi; he considered them to be worse than the Government’. It
was more convenient for Clarke and Mackay to deal with a small number of Māori
leaders, and opposition could be played down if it came from ‘unsurrendered
rebels’ who were ‘Hauhau’. Mackay reported that: ‘Ratima indulged in a speech
full of paimarireism, and fierce invectives against the Government. He said that
the day would yet come when the Maoris would regain possession of the country.
The God had protected them so far. When the Europeans first commenced the
war at Waikato, they said all the Natives would be exterminated in the time it took
to boil a kettle of water. They were still in the country and we could not conquer
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them. If they trusted in their God they would yet regain their former Sovereignty of Canaan."\(^5\)

Mackay probably intended his report of this speech to indicate continuing Hauhau rebellion in the hills. But Ratima’s speech can also be interpreted to mean a belief among Pirirākau that there would be a day of deliverance when Māori would regain control of their affairs without harassment by Pākehā officials. Mackay had also noted on 9 November, the day the survey line was cut, ‘Pirirakau had a Pai Marire flag flying at Waiwhatawhata’ but was told it was ‘not a fighting flag, only a Pai Marire one’\(^5\).

At the end of November the surveyors were told they could not expect any further military protection in the field, but if their work was interrupted by Māori they should at once fall back on the military post at Te Papa for protection. Clarke reported that ‘everything has remained perfectly quiet in this district. Many rumours of hostile movements have reached us, but upon close inquiry they have proved to be greatly exaggerated’. He expressed his concern about the intentions of Hakaraia and ‘a party of twenty Natives from Puhirua (disaffected Arawas)’, that is Ngāti Rangiwewehi, who were visiting him at Kēnana in the Te Puke district. ‘Small bands of Natives are known to be wandering from place to place in the disaffected country, but no information transpires on the object of their visit’. Clarke also reported on ‘good authority that Wiremu Tamihana Te Waharoa has signified his disapproval to the Pirirakau Natives for inviting the assistance of the lawless Ngatiporou’.\(^5\) Tamihana was already very ill and died at the end of December 1866. It is tempting to speculate whether the outcome of events in the Tauranga district would have been different if the government had accepted Tamihana’s earlier offer of mediation, or carried out the governor’s promise of an inquiry. As far as Clarke and Mackay were concerned, the time was now past for any negotiation with the unsurrendered rebels in the ‘Hauhau country’ inland. Mackay returned to Auckland and reported on proceedings of the past month to Grey at his home on Kawau island. Clarke remained at Tauranga over Christmas 1866.

The news that a survey party had been warned to move out of the Ōropi area as ‘rebel Hauhaus were on their way to seize both surveyors and camp’ reached Clarke on 31 December.\(^5\) All the survey parties were ordered back to Te Papa and the survey of the Ōropi-Omanawa area was abandoned for the time being. Rumours abounded of an imminent attack by ‘Hauhaus’ who lived in the inland villages, supported by the Ngāti Porou party, and Hakaraia’s Waitaha people from the Te Puke area. Clarke wrote to Richmond on 8 January:

'It is with great regret that I have again to report, for the information of the Government, that the repeated threats of the Ngatiporou Hauhaus to stop the surveys of confiscated lands in the district have at length been carried out.'
A party of Hauhaus under Ropata and Kewene... have again put a stop to the surveys, this time in the Waimapu Block, on that portion of the survey left incomplete by Mr Gundry. Mr Gundry left, having been warned by Mr Mackay that it was unsafe for him to continue the work....

The property of the surveyors has been carried off, and but for the timely warning given by the friendly Natives to the surveyors, I have very little doubt that murder would have been committed. The surveyors took a hasty departure having left their camp half an hour before the Hauhaus came up....

After carrying off the goods and instruments of the surveyors, the depredators went on their way on a visit to old Hakaraia, it is said on an invitation from that chief.

This morning I have heard that these [Ngatiporou] Hauhaus were the bearers of a letter from the King to Hakaraia, the purport of the letter is reported to be as follows: 'This sick man has recovered, he will soon move his feet, the sword is unsheathed'. Hakaraia is said to have acquiesced and that we are all to be attacked on the 15th instant.

All the surveys are at a standstill. I do not think it safe for the surveyors to go on with their work, unless made under the protection of a sufficient armed party.  

The Ngati Porou party, led by Ropata, were from Mataora, and included five Taranaki men. On 12 November Clarke had advised Richmond that reports of support offered to Pirirākau 'have been very much exaggerated', that only 'the Ngatiporou and Taranaki party', headed by Ropata and Kewene respectively, were with Pirirākau. Some referred to them as 'Te Kaumarua', literally 'the twelve', sometimes translated as the 'Twelve Apostles'. District Surveyor H.L. Skeet reported that 'the Te Kaumarua party', who had seized the survey instruments, comprised about 30 armed men, 'being a portion of the Hauhaus' from different tribes 'but principally of the Ngatiporou and Ngaiterangi'. From the names listed, these people belonged to inland hapū and were not Ngāi Te Rangi, although they were frequently referred to inaccurately as 'disaffected Ngaiterangi'. Clarke's estimate of the 'Hauhau party' which visited Hakaraia, was a total of 74, 'all armed with double barrelled guns'. A statement made by Te Rau of Ngāti Hangarau on 11 January, following a visit to the inland village of Paengaroa, suggested the number of 'Hauhaus' was about 24, led by Ropata of Ngāti Porou, and including Kewene (there identified with Ngāti Porou) and representatives of Pirirākau, Ngāti Rangi and other hapū of the Kaimai ranges.

Mackay heard that 'twenty-four men of the Ngatiporou tribe (of Mataora, near Katikati), having proceeded on to the confiscated block... with the intention of murdering the persons engaged in the survey of the same'. Mackay also reported

---

54 ibid., pp.37-38  
55 ibid., p.38.  
56 ibid.  
57 ibid., p.39.  
58 ibid., p.37.  
59 ibid., p.42.
his discussions with 'the chief Tioriori Te Hura and several Natives of Ngatihaua' and others who had attended the tangihanga for Wiremu Tamihana. 'They tell me that several of the Ngaiterangi and Pirirakau tribes of Tauranga were at the meeting; also Te Hira and his people from Ohinemuri (Thames). All present objected to the proceedings of the Ngati Porou in stopping the survey at Tauranga; and ascribed it to the fact of the removal of the covering party of Militia (100 men) who acted as a guard to the surveying parties.'

Various suggestions were made to go to Hakaraia and ask that Ngāti Porou be sent away, and the 'chief Tioriori says that he has persuaded the Pirirakau to remain quiet'. Mackay also said that at a 'large political meeting of friendly Natives' held at Taupiri on 4 January it had been unanimously decided that 'friendly Natives would not go out of their own district to fight any rebels; but in the event of any attack within it, they would assist their European neighbours in repelling it'. At this stage the dispute was over the survey of the confiscated block in the Tauranga district and there was no evidence of any threatened uprising west of the Kaimai ranges.

Nevertheless, the troops were ordered out on 17 January 1867. On the 19th Colonel Harrington reported to Haultain that he had occupied the Ōmanawa redoubt and had left one subaltern and 20 men at Poteriwhi 'to watch the ferry of the Wairoa River'. Simultaneously Harrington returned to headquarters at Te Papa, leaving Captain H. Goldsmith in charge at Ōmanawa. Goldsmith reported that he had patrolled along the bank of the Wairoa, found a whare had been burnt but no other damage. One patrol had gone up the Ruangārara stream in a whale boat and found a 'War Canoe' hidden on the bank and brought it back to the redoubt up the Ōmanawa stream. Goldsmith then described his encounter to the west of the Wairoa river, near the village of Te Irihanga: 'On approaching some Tupaki bushes fire was opened by the Maoris from behind the bushes — the Sergeant Major was shot through the shoulder — upon this I extended the men in the fern and returned the fire — the Maoris retreated, occasionally stopping to deliver their fire, we followed and drove them into the bush. We then retired in good order. Two Natives were seen to fall but were carried off by their comrades.'

Harrington’s response was to ride out to Ōmanawa and arrest Goldsmith 'for leaving his post and bringing on a collision with the enemy without my instructions'. Clarke also described this incident:

On the 18th, unfortunately the officer in charge of the Omanawa Redoubt either mistaking his orders, or for some other cause, crossed over the Wairoa River to its west bank, with a force of forty men, they followed up the track to the first Maori village, Te Irihanga. The party, as it approached Te Irihanga, could see the Natives walking about, apparently without arms; presently one man was seen to advance; Corporal Willis, of the Militia,
remarked to Sergeant-Major Ennis, of the Militia, who was leading the advance guard, that he thought he saw a rifle in the Maori’s hand, the Sergeant-Major replied, ‘never mind, let them fire the first shot;’ hardly were the words out of his mouth when the Maori fired, and the Sergeant-Major fell, mortally wounded. The Militia were then extended in skirmishing order across the track, and a heavy fire was kept up on both sides for about three quarters of an hour, with what loss to the Natives is not known.65

According to Clarke, the military force had been moved to Ōmanawa redoubt as ‘a preparatory step towards making an attempt to catch the perpetrators of the late outrages upon the surveyors’. The expedition could be interpreted as an armed force out to arrest a few Māori who had obstructed the survey. Clarke noted: ‘A warrant was made out in due form commanding the apprehension of Pene Taka and others of Ngaiterangi [sic], and Kewene and others of the Ngatiporou’.66 But Pene Taka was a chief of Pirirākau not Ngāi Te Rangi. That this unauthorized military action occurred on land already in dispute would have conveyed the message to Māori that military action, not talk, was the way to resolve the matter. Clarke, already prejudiced in his attitude toward Pai Mārire, was prepared to believe in a conspiracy to drive the Pākehā into the sea. Pirirākau claims had not been acknowledged in the confiscated block because Clarke had accepted the explanation of Ngāi Te Rangi who said the Pirirākau were a conquered people, an assessment that was both inaccurate and unacceptable. Pirirākau were closely related to Ngāti Haua, and had appeared to heed Tamihana’s earlier plea, not long before his death, to remain calm. The arrival of the small Ngāti Porou group appears to have confused the issue. There was no evidence of large-scale support in the form of fighting men from Waikato or Hauraki. The taking of the surveyors’ instruments was used as a pretext by Clarke and Mackay to clear out ‘the Hauhau rebels’. By definition, in Grey’s proclamation, adherents of Pai Mārire were rebels to be suppressed wherever found.

Over the next three months all the Pirirākau and Ngāti Ranginui villages from Whakamārama to Waoku were burned, crops dug up and destroyed. The details of military strategy and guerilla warfare recorded in Harrington’s and other reports were not specific as to who the ‘enemy’ were, beyond describing them as ‘Natives’, or ‘Hauhaus’. James Bodell, one of the recently-discharged Waikato militia called into action in this ‘Tauranga Bush Campaign’, described his experiences as a soldier in his Reminiscences:

A fortnight after [his discharge] the Natives again mustered in force and for the next six months another little war was carried on and several engagements took place within 14 miles of Tauranga. In about a month we had 800 men comprised of the 12 Regt. [and Waikato] Militia and native allies, the tribe known as the ‘Arawas’ professed to be Queen Natives, and fight for Her Majesty. On several occasions sharp engagements took place and several militia men were killed. All native villages that we came across were burnt and their crops destroyed. The Natives never made a stand but took to the Bush and we
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never seen above 20 at a time. Every European in the District was compelled to take Arms and all men under 40 years of age went to the front. The 3rd class Militia men married over 40 years protected the Town. At this time I was 36 although I did not belong to the force, still I had to carry Arms and do military duty. One Native settlement we looted a fine Lot of Poultry and the best Potatoes I had seen in New Zealand. We destroyed several Villages, could not tell how many of the Enemy we killed, they being in detached Parties, being in dense Bush. Their Presence were made known by the Ping of their bullets and a loud report. One of our men were killed who had volunteered, a Storekeeper, he left a Wife and 6 Children. I was told by a Native Chief some years after the enemy did not muster above 50-60 and they harassed fully 800 men for months. About July 1867 this little war ended and Peace reigned Supreme.  

James Cowan’s narrative of the campaign in contrast magnified the exploits of the military and played down the grievances of local people. He called them ‘Hauhau rebels’, and the ‘enemy’. There are significant differences between Cowan’s version, which almost romanticizes the ‘Tauranga Bush Campaign’, as he labelled it, and Colonel Harrington’s matter-of-fact account. Cowan exaggerated Māori numbers, reporting that in one incident near Whakamārama in mid February ‘several hundred Hauhaus were engaged’. His narrative of the initial engagement at Te Irihanga described it as ‘premature’, and he omitted Harrington’s arrest of Goldsmith for crossing the Wairoa without orders and so precipitating military action. James Belich did not investigate the Tauranga Bush campaign in detail, inaccurately identified Hakaraia as a leader of Pirirākau, and dismissed the action as part of the ‘small-scale fighting’ that occurred in the Tauranga, Rotorua and Opōtiki districts from November 1866 to July 1868.  

In a report of 28 January 1867 Clarke commented that he was having ‘great difficulty’ in assessing the attitude of ‘the notorious old chief Hakaraia’. At this stage, however, Waitaha do not appear to have been directly involved with the dispute over survey, although Clarke reported that Hakaraia had given instructions to construct a large whare at Ōropi ‘on the undisputed confiscated land ... for the purpose of accommodating a large party of hostile Natives’. Following the attacks on the Whakamārama villages, Clarke had left notices suggesting that those who were responsible for ‘robbing the surveyors and firing into our men’ should ‘give themselves up at once’. Clarke also sent Ranapia of Ngāi Te Ahi to sound out the situation at Ōropi:

He has returned, and states that old Hakaraia with his contingent is in the district, that he is resolved to drive the Pakeha into the sea; he has with him, it is reported this evening, a force of 150 men; that he is expecting large reinforcements from Puhirua, Patetere, and Waikato, he has not yet joined forces with Pirirakau. It is contemplated that they will be
able to muster in all about 400 fighting men.

Te Kuka, Native Assessor, at my request, has held communication with Rawiri Tata, Wiremu Kepa, Pene Taka, and the rest of this party. In reply to my letters left at the Irihanga and Waiwhatawhata, Rawiri Tata said, 'go and tell your Pakeha that I have never surrendered, and will not surrender; I will yet drive them all into the sea'.

Pene Taka's language was even more violent; so that I do not see the least hope of their listening to reason.

The Pirirakau are expecting large reinforcements from the Thames and Mataora. . . .

I fear that this struggle will not be brought to a close without much bloodshed. The prestige of Hakaraia's name and his influence with all the surrounding Hauhau tribes will gain him many followers, and from the old man's obstinate and determined character the contest will be a fierce one. Hakaraia is said to be acting quite independently of Pene Taka and the Pirirakau party. I have no hesitation in stating that these hostilities have for a very long time been in contemplation. It is estimated that the Natives have supplies enough in the ranges for a force of five hundred men for twelve months.

These large crops would never have been intended for sale to Europeans, as they have no means of getting them out to the coast.73

Haultain, who had met Clarke in the Tauranga district the previous week, instructed Major W.G. Mair to go to Rotorua 'to raise a force of two hundred Arawas, to act in the rear of the enemy's position, first visiting Te Puke, the headquarters of old Hakaraia'.74 In the event, only about 40 Te Arawa troops marched to Te Puke, but the village had been abandoned. The 'houses were destroyed as ordered' and 'a large portion of the surveyor's tools and instruments, taken at Oropi' were discovered.75 This discovery must have reinforced Clarke's perception of a conspiracy as Hakaraia had moved to Oropi. However, the majority of Te Arawa troops under Mair, 154 men, refused to advance on Te Puke unless they received 'higher pay' and so were marched along the beach from Maketū to Tauranga to meet with Haultain, who renegotiated their pay and rations.76 The following day, 2 February, they took possession of the abandoned Kahakaharoa pa and on 4 February joined with the militia in a combined attack on Ake Ake and Taumata. Clarke noted that a 'great number of Hauhau flags had been seen flying at Taumata'. Following the attack,

Taumata village was then destroyed, and three days were employed in destroying the cultivations, which are most extensive.

While the Militia were engaged in destroying the cultivations, the Arawas scoured the
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forest. One body advanced upon Oropi, which they completely destroyed. It was unoccupied.

A great quantity of loot and a considerable supply of gunpowder fell into the hands of the Arawa.

Hakaraia’s great flag, said to have been a gift from the King [Tawhiao], was also discovered, together with a large number of Hauhau flags. All these things were found concealed in the woods.

On the following days the Arawas extended their expeditions to Paengaroa, where they were met by a body of Hauhaus, but after a few heavy volleys they as usual retired.

They had, as at the other places, removed all their goods to the woods. The village was destroyed.77

Clarke also enclosed a translation of a letter from Hakaraia to Ngāti Kereru and Te Arawa tribes asking them not to come to Tauranga to fight. It suggested that an additional motive for Hakaraia’s involvement in hostilities was ‘to revenge the deaths of those who fell at Te Ranga’ (killed by British troops on 6 June 1864). A similar motive was attributed to Pene Taka.78

Through February and March the campaign of destruction of the inland villages and cultivations continued. There were also many rumours and a few intercepted Māori letters. Clarke adhered to his conspiracy scenario. On 12 March he reported:

On the afternoon of the 28th ultimo fires were seen to burst forth in almost all the villages from which the Natives had been driven. These fires were observed by both Europeans and Natives, and were interpreted to mean that the hostile Natives were in force, and were prepared to meet our men.

From information we have received it was supposed that a large body of Ngatiraukawa were in occupation of Kaimai [sic], the nearest Tauranga Native settlement to Patetere.

The Arawas who remained in the district numbered 120; with these Mr Mair was directed to march to Paengaroa with the double object of covering the surveyors, who have been again set to work on the ‘undisputed’ confiscated block, and to watch the movements of the hostile Natives then supposed to be in occupation of Kaimai.79

By 5 March the Arawa contingent in Tauranga had been increased to 280 men, who embarked on an attack on Kaimai and Te Kaki villages over the next few days. At Te Kaki, ‘Large and productive cultivations of potatoes and maize were found in this neighbourhood sufficient to maintain a large force for a long time. This is said to be the position Hakaraia intends to occupy. It is one most difficult
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of access and in the face of a large opposing force would be almost impregnable.”

Mainwaring also reported from the Waikato that there were ‘large cultivations
about Patetere, and I know Hakaraia’s idea is to remain there and increase his
numbers’. Three days later Dr W.K. Nesbitt reported from Ohinemutu that a
party of about 300 ‘Waikato Hauhaus arrived in this neighbourhood yesterday’,
and were camped in the Mamaku ranges; it was rumoured that Te Arawa villages
around Lake Rotorua would be attacked.

By mid-March 1867, according to Clarke, Te Arawa forces in the Tauranga
district were being pressured to return home to defend their lands against the
rumoured Hauhau attack. Clarke decided to visit Rotorua, and sent a note to
Haultain ‘requesting that no time might be lost in sending assistance, both
European and Native, to our faithful friends the Arawas’. There were ex-
changes of fire at Te Koutu between local people and ‘a party of about sixty
Hauhaus’ on 17 March. The Arawa contingent and the militia, commanded by
Major Thomas McDonnell, arrived at Ohinemutu shortly afterwards and the pa
at Puraku was attacked. There were further exchanges of fire in the surrounding
forest in late March. On 12 April Clarke returned to Tauranga and reported that
while the ‘hostile Natives’ seemed to have abandoned their positions in the
Mamaku forest, another report suggested ‘that the Hauhaus were again collect-
ing in the neighbourhood of Whakamarama’, and ‘an attack was threatened on
the township of Te Papa itself as soon as the troops were removed and the enemy
could assemble sufficient force for that purpose’. This was considered justifi-
cation for transferring most of the Arawa contingent, 170 men, back to Tauranga,
leaving about 100 in Rotorua ‘to act on the defensive in the event of another
eruption of the enemy, which is not very improbable’. Clarke also reported that
Ngāti Haua efforts ‘to induce the Ngaiterangi to join in the disaffection have for
the most part failed’, though a few ‘sympathised’. Clarke did not, however, have
sufficient faith in Ngāi Te Rangi commitment ‘to the side of the Government’ to
recommend that arms be issued to them.

A few days later Clarke reported again on his Rotorua visit and the conflicting
attitudes among Te Arawa toward Ngāti Rangiwewehi at Puhirua, who had been
supporters of the Kingitanga. Wi Maihi Te Rangikaheke and others who were
closely related maintained that Ngāti Rangiwewehi ‘were opposed to the present
hostile movement’ and would remain in peace. Ngāti Whakaue leaders, how-
ever: ‘contended that the Puhirua Natives were the source of all trouble in
Rotorua. They had propagated Hauhauism; that the notorious Kereopa was one
of the tribe, and that even now many of them were actually bearing arms against
the Queen’s Government, and were assisting the Waikato party in desorating the
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country, and that it was well known that food and other supplies were also furnished to the hostile party by the same people.

Clarke had called a hui of Te Arawa leaders to consider ways to resolve the uncertainty caused by rumours of threatened Hauhau attack.

Why, said they, does the Government act thus; why do we lop at the branches instead of digging up the root. Here we are cutting off the branches. There is the root at Waikato untouched. The King is the root, he is the centre and strength of the Hauhaus. If we could only get leave to dig him up all would soon be peace, for the branches for want of support would wither of themselves. We are tired of the fighting . . . We wish for peace . . . and the only way, in our opinion, that this can be done is by digging up the root.

Clarke acknowledged he felt sympathetic toward this attitude of Te Arawa rangatira. However, it was also significant, but not mentioned by Clarke, that only a generation earlier, in the 1830s and 1840s, Tauranga and eastern Waikato tribes were fighting Te Arawa, and old animosities no doubt remained. Clarke could not be unaware of this and cynically allowed the Arawa contingent to continue their old feuds.

The village of Kuranui was a rallying place and refuge for people involved in this conflict. In March 1867 Mainwaring reported that Ngāti Porou were living at Kuranui, and it had been suggested to them by the Ngāti Haua chief Tioriori that they give up their guns and make peace. ‘This they declined to do and said they were in the hands of God and would be guided by him (Kei a Ihowa Te Tikanga)’. Twelve Ngāti Mahuta, who were called ‘Matutaera’s Apostles’, appeared and ordered Tioriori away from Kuranui. Clarke commented that his informant, Te Pakaroa of Ngāti Haua, was ‘a staunch Hauhau’. On 12 April 1867 Clarke reported ‘that the efforts of Riki and Te Pakaroa, with other Ngati Haua chiefs, to induce the Ngaiterangi to join in the disaffection have for the most part failed. Some of the hapus are reported to sympathize with the enemy, and a few individuals have left, but as a tribe they appear determined to remain quiet’.

The last detachment of the 12th Regiment left Tauranga on 8 April 1867, leaving only 283 men of the First Waikato Regiment based at Te Papa, reinforced a few days later by the returning Arawa contingent. Harrington ‘moved the Magazine and ammunition into the Monmouth Redoubt’ and made ‘all necessary arrangements’ in the event of ‘sudden attack’, but was reluctant to ‘incur additional expense of calling them out unless it is absolutely necessary’. He also reported, ‘Enoka still persists in stating that an attack is to be made on this township’ and advised that ‘the friendly natives at Bethlehem and Otūmoetai have all left their settlements and come to the village of Matapihi’. Harrington responded to Clarke’s concern that Te Papa was insufficiently defended: ‘I consider that force under my command sufficient for the protection of the place’,
and refused to respond to Ngāi Te Rangi requests to provide them with arms and ammunition to defend themselves. In a subsequent report Clarke reflected on Pai Mārire and the Kingitanga:

It is hardly necessary for me to again repeat that I have never looked upon Hauhauism in the light of a religion at all. I have now been, as it were, face to face with the Hauhau fanaticism ever since it was introduced into these districts, and my belief is confirmed, that it is a cleverly contrived political institution in support of the Maori King. Stronger by far than the old combination, from the circumstances that its inventors have brought to their aid the blind and superstitious belief of their followers. In fact some of their leaders are looked upon with as much reverence and fear as the old Maori Priesthood, and their beliefs implicitly obeyed. The one common object ridding the 'New Canaan' of the Samaritans.

It may excite surprise that all their reverses have not tended to check the aggressions of the Hauhaus. I believe the true solution is as the Arawa chiefs have stated, 'We have lopped at the branches, while the root is allowed to remain untouched'. I am forced into the belief, that until Hauhauism and Kingism are both put down, with a strong hand if need be, we shall not have permanent peace. Indeed it would be the most merciful course towards the Natives themselves to put it down without loss of time. If it is allowed to go on, I see nothing for it but the total destruction of the race.

The government had been convinced by Clarke and Mackay that there was a threat of a general Hauhau uprising, and that Pirirākau were Hauhau, unsurrendered rebels and aggressors. There is little evidence of this. Pirirākau were fighting for their land; the government had refused to acknowledge their claims to it. Yet Harrington recognized that

No aggressive movement has been made on the settlers of this district since the departure of the Imperial Troops [on 8 April 1867] and I therefore deem it most inexpedient to renew hostilities at a time when a large meeting is being held to discuss the question of peace or war.

I enclose copies of correspondence between Mr Clarke and myself but as the fact of the Hauhaus being at Whakamarama is so uncertain, I do not feel justified in again crossing the Wairoa for the purpose of looking for and destroying crops, which may be intended for a hostile Force or not.

I have arrived at this conclusion after mature and careful consideration of the instructions contained in your letter, which do not authorize my forming an expedition to look for provisions. I think it right to add that several of the men have been working on their land between Te Ranga and Pyes Pa (about 9 miles from this Township) during the last week and have received no obstructions. I therefore think it inadvisable to do anything at the present moment which could be construed as an act of aggression on our part. As this large meeting has not yet decided what is to be their line of action, I have determined to keep 100 Arawas here till I receive further instructions, or more definite information is received.
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regarding the rebel natives and I have requested Mr Clarke to send the remainder to their own homes.\textsuperscript{94}

Clarke maintained his opinion that ‘the stores of provisions they have collected [at Whakamārama] ought to be destroyed’ so that ‘a large hostile force’ could not be maintained in the district. He wanted to send out an expeditionary force in the Whakamārama area, and consequently refused to take responsibility for Harrington’s decision not to send a force. Harrington responded by confirming his decision to ask ‘McDonnell to retain 100 Arawas at Judea and acquaint the remainder that they may return home’,\textsuperscript{95} and asked Clarke to arrange for their rations. On 23 May Haultain replied to Harrington:

I have to express my entire disapproval of your inaction, which was in direct opposition to the advice and remonstrance of Mr Clarke, who distinctly informed you that Hauhaus were there, and that he had reason to believe they had collected surplus provisions and that it was most desirable to strike a blow whilst the Arawas were available.

I disapprove also of you having retained (contrary to Mr Clarke’s advice) the 100 Arawas in the District, they must be immediately sent back to their home, unless new circumstances should have arisen, which will make it in Mr Clarke’s opinion (to whom you will refer this question) expedient that they should be retained.\textsuperscript{96}

Clarke still believed in a Hauhau conspiracy inland of Tauranga. In a private letter dated 29 May 1867 to Mackay, now Civil Commissioner in Auckland, Clarke expressed his views on the situation. Mackay passed on the following extract to the government, signed by himself and dated 31 May 1867: ‘News has been brought in by Te Moananui that the Hauhaus in this District have been largely reinforced by Natives from Ohinemuri, chiefly Ngatiporou, there are also several new faces from Waikato — they make no secret of their intentions. Fires have been seen every morning at Paengaroa, Te Kaki, and Kaimai, and it is my belief that the Hauhaus are making preparations.’ The information that the Hauhaus were disposed to terms is incorrect. ‘I have sent for more ammunition. I see nothing for it but to go at it and settle the matter. At the very time they were here in Tauranga asking for Hauhaus to make peace, the latter were laying a deep scheme for the destruction of the Pakeha. It has just become known that five of the Opotiki were here, and that their first act of aggression was committed immediately on their return home. Two men of the Waikato settlers have been either taken prisoner or killed. I am afraid the latter has been their fate.’\textsuperscript{97}

On 11 June 1867, Haultain wrote to the ‘Officer Commanding, Colonial Forces, Tauranga’, noting a report that ‘hostile Natives are assembling in the
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neighbourhood of Tauranga with the attention of making an attack'. He directed him 'to consult with Clarke and should you be mutually agreed as to the necessity for reinforcements, you are to employ a sufficient number of the Arawas and Ngaiterangi to take the field with the Militia and to expel the Rebels from the District'.

Goldsmith (restored to his post with the First Waikato Regiment) sent a report of his reconnaissance of the inland villages which had earlier been destroyed and thus abandoned:

The result of my proceedings here — that the only places on our Frontier in which Natives are present is at Whakamarama, these are a small party who are engaged removing into the interior the corpses of their country men who had been buried at or near Whakamarama. With this exception not one openly hostile Native is on our Frontier.

I have consulted with Mr Civil Commissioner Clarke on all Native subjects and his information entirely concords with mine.

The Tauranga District Lands Act was passed on 10 October 1867 to validate all land transactions since the order-in-council of 18 May 1865, which had proclaimed the confiscation of Tauranga lands. The 1867 Act specifically named 'Ngaiterangi' as owners of the confiscated lands, thus validating the original order-in-council, which differed from other confiscations under the New Zealand Settlements Act of 1863 in specifically naming a tribe. An amendment was added in 1868 so as to include a large area of back country not included in the earlier Act. The effect of this legislation was that Pirirākau and various Ngāti Ranginui, Ngāti Raukawa, Waitaha and other inland hapū claims were not acknowledged. It also meant that all government transactions to date were legal, and there could be no appeal against them. Clarke was appointed Commissioner of Tauranga Lands but did not conduct any further inquiry, merely allocating land grants to those he deemed eligible. The 'Hauhaus' were regarded as 'unsurrendered rebels' and not eligible for any grants of land. In 1871 a belated government recognition of Pirirākau and other claims was made in a money payment of £471 to chiefs of Pirirākau, Ngāti Hinerangi and Ngāti Tokotoko to extinguish their claims in the Katikati-Te Puna purchase.

The teachings of Te Ua Haumene were not destroyed by military action. Pai Mārire rituals continued in several inland villages in the Tauranga district for many years. Among Waikato tribes Pai Mārire also survived and was given new status by Te Puea in the 1920s to become, in a modified form, the basis for Kingitanga rituals. When the niu pole, Te Pou o Motai, was rededicated at Kuranui in 1983, kaumatua from Waikato, Ngāti Haua, Ngāti Raukawa and the tribes of Tauranga Moana were present. Pai Mārire karakia were heard again at Kuranui. There have been many petitions to parliament complaining about
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raupatu, confiscation of land. While government acknowledgement of these grievances has been made in a settlement with Waikato Tainui, the claims in the Tauranga confiscated lands are yet to be heard by the Waitangi Tribunal.
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