WHEN THE EUROPEANS rediscovered New Zealand in 1769, they encountered a people who possessed no name for themselves, because they knew no other world than their own. However, they could sketch in outline their islands for those inquisitive pale-skinned visitors. The earliest known Maori map of the North Island, ‘Aotea’, was drawn in charcoal on the deck of the *Endeavour* by the chiefs at Whitianga for James Cook. A more permanent image was that sketched in pencil by Tuki Tahu for Philip King, Governor of New South Wales and Norfolk Island. Tuki and his companion, Ngahuruhuru or Te Hurukokoti, had been seized from the Cavalli Islands in April 1793, by the crew of HMS *Daedalus*, whose impatient captain was acting upon King’s suggestion that a New Zealander might be persuaded to travel to Norfolk Island to teach the convicts the art of flax dressing. In this abrupt manner, the two men were carried to Port Jackson and, subsequently, Norfolk Island. They were among the first of many Maori who, from the late eighteenth century, travel to the new Australian colonies — and beyond.

The chiefs were insulted by the manner of their removal, and at first refused to give King any information. But, he wrote, by taking ‘every pain . . . to attach them to us’, by having them eat with him at his table, and by leaving them to their own inclinations, he induced them gradually to become more sociable. King then discovered that the amount which Tuki and Huru knew about flax could be communicated in less than an hour, as they had never been taught. Flax dressing and weaving was women’s work: and although the two men attempted to teach the female convicts, the endeavour was useless. But Tuki’s chart revealed a knowledge of the physical world, and an imaginative attachment to it. He drew a land which was, in one map, both actual and mythological. It was a Maori world, and one whose boundaries, both physical and spiritual, would be utterly changed within half a century.

Tuki showed the two main islands, ‘Te Aho no Maui’ (The Fish of Maui) and ‘Pounamu’ (Greenstone), the Three Kings, and the Cavallis. He also drew the ‘imaginary road’ which runs from the south the length of the North Island to Te Reinga and along which the wairua, or soul, travelled after death. At Te Reinga he marked the pohutukawa tree, the leaping-off point of the departing spirits. He drew, in emphatic scale, the ornately carved wharenui, or chiefly houses, at Oruru in Doubtless Bay, his own tribal area. Tuki’s map had its own projection, and its own significant features. Only after Tuki had imaged his world was King able to obtain a copy of Cook’s map of the country, whereupon Tuki observed that the vast Hokianga river had been omitted. He described to King the ‘Pine Trees of an immense size’ which grew there, the trees which would become the base of New South Wales timber merchants’ enterprises of the 1830s. Tuki and King began an interchange of knowledge, built upon the trust which King had laboured carefully to establish. He returned the two
Map Opposite:
A 1798 engraving of the map Tuki Tahua sketched in 1793 for Philip King, Governor of New South Wales and Norfolk Island. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, 830ap/[1793](1798)/ Acc.42785. The map was used to illustrate David Collins, Account of the English Colony in New South Wales, London, 1798. The original is held in the Public Records Office, London.

In both scale and detail the map’s focus is on the area north of the Hokianga River, with whose inhabitants Tuki’s Doubtless Bay iwi were ‘in amity’. The Hokianga River is marked on the uppermost (western) coast. Tuki’s home is shown on the lower (eastern) coast, on the northern side of the Oruru River mouth at Doubtless Bay. Also marked pre-eminently are the two carved wharenui of the Oruru chiefs, the smaller belonging to Muriwai, and the larger to the ‘principal’ chief, ‘Tewy-te-wi’ (possibly Te Whai Te Wi). The ‘imaginary road’ to Te Reinga is marked the length of the North Island. The pohutukawa, the departure point of the spirits at Te Reinga, is shown, to the north-east of Cape Maria Van Diemen, on Cape Reinga (although here it is drawn deceptively as if it were the point at the eastern, rather than western end of Spirit’s Bay). Also shown are the places of Tuki’s capture, and his return by Governor King on the Britannia in November 1793.

chiefs to New Zealand in November 1793. While he was preparing his gifts for Tuki, this young chief and tohunga:

made a Circle of the New Zealanders round him, in the Center of which was the Oldest Chief, and recounted what he had seen during his Absence — at many passages they gave a Shout of Admiration. On telling them it was only Three days sail from Norfolk to Moodoo Whenua [Muriwhenua] — whether his Veracity was doubted, or that he was not contented with the Assertion alone, I cannot tell, but with much presence of mind he ran upon the poop, and carried a Cabbage to them, which he informed them was cut five days ago in my Garden — This convincing proof, produced a general Shout of Surprize — ¹

King’s presents were more than mere cabbages: handaxes, carpenters’ tools, scissors, razors, hoes, spades, seeds — including wheat, maize, and peas — ten young sows and two boars, which Tuki promised to keep for breeding. King was deliberately introducing items for which a demand might grow, as their use became understood. Some of the major chiefs quickly grasped the possibilities which the beginning of Pacific mercantile activity offered them. The most significant, and tragic, of these men was Te Pahi, chief of Te Hikutu² living in the north-west of the Bay of Islands.

As the first whalers began to explore this harbour for supplies, he made deliberate efforts to service them ‘with wood and water, &c., at a very cheap rate in barter’.³ He knew of Tuki’s journey and of King’s good treatment of him, and his own son Matara soon worked his passage to New South Wales in one of the whaling vessels. He returned bearing further presents from King — more tools and breeding pigs — sent to Te Pahi in recognition of his hospitality and of his local power. In response, Te Pahi and four of his sons set out, in 1805, to visit King. They were taken first to Norfolk Island by a whaler, who then abruptly seized Te Pahi’s youngest son as hostage for payment of their
fares. Rescued by the intervention of the commandant of the island, the party was sent on HMS Buffalo to Port Jackson, where King had them to stay at Government House. Te Pahi spent nearly three months with him, and King observed his intelligent interest in different social customs. He attended the trial of three men, who had stolen some food from the government stores, and later, having visited them in jail, presented a petition on their behalf to King. At dinner afterwards, he expostulated against the severity of laws which sentenced men to death for stealing pork, for as he commented, ‘a man might very justly be put to death for stealing a piece of iron, as that was of a permanent use; but stealing a piece of pork which, to use his own expression, was eat and passed off’ was sanguinary in the extreme.4

Te Pahi’s experiences were not limited to the colonial society of the Europeans; he attended the funeral of an Aborigine named Carraway, who had died of a spear wound. The formal spear-throwing, which followed, was a ritual requital for the death, and a massive display of the art, but Te Pahi seemed unimpressed. He exhorted the throwers to make a quick ‘dispatch’ of the flights (seldom less than six thrown at once) and criticized their target’s use of a shield, to divert the spears, as ‘an unnecessary appendage’. Nevertheless, he was impressed with the woomera, or throwing stick, ‘as from its elasticity he acknowledged the weapon to receive much additional velocity’. When one of his eldest sons asked to try one, as soon as he took it in his hand, the Aborigines fled and would not return until he had put it down. The exercise of tribal law, which had ended with the necessary wounding of one man, in the opinion of the Sydney Gazette, would not ‘in any wise accord with his [Te Pahi’s] sentiments of justice’.5 This view may have been correct, but Te Pahi was assessing everything he saw. He was intimidated neither by European nor by Aboriginal displays. By the time he returned home, he had also acquired a fair understanding of colonial social hierarchies, which in some aspects seemed akin to his own notions of rank. He had returned the gifts of a lady who had insulted him; he advised King against encouraging mokai, or slaves, to travel from New Zealand to New South Wales. From them, he said, ‘no good’ could be got. Generously fêted, and well equipped with iron tools, Te Pahi returned to New Zealand, with his mana high, ‘the greatest Monarch that ever left it’.6

Four years later he was dead, destroyed by the men and the trade he had been encouraged to cultivate. His pa, and the little prefabricated European house which King had given him, was burned in an assault made by five whaling vessels, in reprisal for his supposed complicity in the killing of the crew of the Boyd at Whangaroa harbour in 1809. Te Pahi, seriously wounded in the assault, died in the tribal fighting which followed. The ‘justice’ meted out to him had probably been faulty, and it arose not only from frontier brutality but from inter-tribal jealousies, emerging as a bid to acquire and control the European trade. Te Pahi had been fingered by Tara, the old ariki of Kororareka on the south side of the Bay, who was eager to establish that settlement as the major port of call for the whaling ships. Slander would be a favourite technique in the developing rivalry for a monopoly of trade with Europeans. The tactic was known as henerake, baring the anus as an act of insult to tribal competitors.

The struggle for chiefly patronage over the Europeans had begun. It would
take many other chiefs to New South Wales; most of the leading rangatira of the Bay of Islands would visit Port Jackson, ‘Poihakena’, in the next few years. Of these journeys perhaps the most significant, in terms of the outcome, were the voyages undertaken by Ruatara of Te Hikutu. He first set out as a young man, in 1805, to work aboard a whaler, which ultimately discharged him, unpaid after six months, at Port Jackson. Undeterred, he went to sea again in 1808 with a sealer, the Santa Anna, which left him and 13 others almost without provisions on Bounty Island. When the ship finally returned, he sailed on it to England, where he was found destitute by the Reverend Samuel Marsden. Marsden brought him to Parramatta, but it was not until 1812 that the wandering sailor finally returned home, now equipped by the cleric with seed-wheat and tools. Ruatara had acquired a profound respect for the Europeans’ agriculture, but less for their justice. However, he was interested in power, and he became, after Te Pahi’s death, the major chief of the north-western Bay of Islands. He calculated, along with his Ngapuhi kinsman, Hongi Hika, with whom he had shared the seed-wheat, that from now on the substance of power lay in an acquisition of a trade monopoly. Consequently, he was enchanted to receive, by the hands of Thomas Kendall, the missionary sent by Marsden in 1814 specifically to establish contact with the Maori, the following letter:

Duaterra King,
I have sent the Brig Active to the Bay of Islands to see what you are doing; and Mr Hall and Mr Kendall from England. Mr Kendall will teach the Boys and Girls to read and write. I told you when you was at Parramatta I would send you a gentleman . . . You will be very good to Mr. Hall and Mr Kendall. They will come to live in New Zealand if you will not hurt them; and teach you how to grow corn Wheat and make Houses, and every thing.7

Invited by Kendall, the chiefs Ruatara, Hongi Hika, and Korokoro, the leader at Te Rawhiti on the south-east side of the Bay, all sailed on the Active to New South Wales to help arrange for the foundation of the first mission in New Zealand. But the missionaries’ purposes and theirs were not the same. Each intended to use the other.

In New South Wales, the chiefs were shown blacksmiths’ work, carpenters’ shops, the art of building planked and brick houses, and agricultural methods. New needs were being deliberately inculcated. As John Liddiard Nicholas, who was to travel with them on their return voyage, wrote, Marsden had specifically bought the Active in order to ‘excite a spirit of trade’ amongst the New Zealanders. The barter of goods would be regularly maintained from Port Jackson, he hoped, so that he would create ‘artificial wants to which they had never before been accustomed, and which he knew must act as the strongest excitement to the exercise of their ingenuity’.8 In this manner, Marsden sought to generate a Maori dependency upon the European missionaries and their ship, and hoped gradually to persuade them to listen to their evangelical message. But on the voyage home, Ruatara revealed his ambivalence about the establishment of the mission under his patronage. In Sydney, he had been warned by a different ‘gentleman’ that the advent of the missionaries would lead to many more Europeans following, and ultimately, they would ‘possess
themselves of the whole island, and either destroy the natives, or reduce them to slavery. The gentleman, he said, desirous to convince him of the truth of this assertion, bid him look at the conduct of our countrymen in New South Wales, where, on their first arrival, they despoiled the inhabitants of all their possessions, and shot the greater number of them.” Ruatara’s sullenness was also visible in the other chiefs, and they were only persuaded to accept the missionaries’ good intentions by Marsden’s offer to turn the vessel back to Sydney Cove. Marsden knew that the survival of the mission depended upon the protection of the chiefs, and he assiduously cultivated them.

Ruatara, Korokoro, and Hongi had been invested by the New South Wales government, before they departed in November 1814, with an ‘Authority’ to prevent the kidnapping of their people by the whalers. This order had a dubious legality, but it was well-intentioned. Nicholas would comment later that the assumption of authority was ‘laughed at a good deal’. But Ruatara’s last journey to Poihakena had, perhaps more than any other visit, spun the thread which would bind New Zealand within the web of colonial and British trading interests. Governor Macquarie, by vesting authority in the chiefs, and by appointing Kendall as a justice of the peace, was making a public statement of his view that the colonial government possessed a kind of jurisdiction there. The mission’s advent was, indeed, no isolated event.

The chiefs also brought back their own selective images of power. Ruatara’s vision, which was never realized, was to build a European town at Rangihoua, with ‘regular streets’ and a European church. To the missionaries themselves he gave no active assistance after they landed. As John King complained, ‘There has been a great deal said about Duaterra and a great deal expected from him, by some . . . but his mind was much prejudiced against us . . .’ Korokoro took on a new name for himself: Governor Macquarie, ‘Kawana Makoare’. Even Te Pahi had brought back from New South Wales the memory of the gallows that had obsessed him. He built his own, which still stood in 1815. It was a tall cross on which, from the arms, he had hung six New South Wales convicts for piracy. He particularly desired that Philip King should be told of their execution, so certain was he of his approval. Te Pahi had, wrote King dryly in 1807, regarded the crime ‘in a very different point of View to the Crime of stealing a piece of Pork’. Maori interest in their European visitors had always been conditional, and was related to their visible usefulness. The chiefs, possessing the substance of local power, still set, and changed, the terms.

The survival of the mission at the Bay (existing somewhat uneasily under the patronage of Hongi Hika, its protector after Ruatara’s death in 1815), encouraged the visits of the Pacific whalers. Maori crewmen continued to sail with them. The Active itself had a regular crew of New Zealanders, including ‘Shoe-Maker’ and ‘George Murray’ (named for the Secretary of State for the Colonies), as well as taking Maori passengers on its voyages to Sydney. The muster books of vessels sailing out of Sydney also list Maori crewmen, such as ‘Jacky Miti’, who worked along the coast on the brig Glory to Port Dalrymple in 1819, or more ambitiously, ‘Touroo’ and ‘Tourowa’, who, a year earlier, had signed on the Claudine, bound for Indonesia. Maori chiefs who visited Sydney were sometimes commented upon in the Sydney Gazette. The three who arrived
on the HMS *Coromandel* in June 1821 included Te Hinaki and Te Horeta Te Taniwha, major chiefs from the region to which this ship gave its name. They were all heavily tattooed, powerful, athletic men, who seemed ‘to enjoy much pleasure in daily parading our streets’. But others found walking the Sydney streets a less comfortable experience. In December 1829 there were a number of Maori visiting, and the paper commented upon their ‘orderly, peaceable conduct’ as they passed along, in marked contrast to ‘those who boast superior civilization. On several occasions the poor Islanders have been most wantonly assaulted in the streets with stones and other missiles, in pure wantonness, until they were roused to such a pitch of fury that had their persecutors not fled, they would have received the punishment ‘they so richly deserved’. The *Gazette* used this incident to stress the vital importance of the ‘lucrative trade’ with New Zealand which had grown, and which could be jeopardized by reports of such experiences. It was, it pointed out, in the colonists’ own interests to keep on friendly terms with their visitors, lest their anger rebound upon the colonial traders in New Zealand.

New Zealand’s trade with New South Wales and, to a lesser extent, Van Diemen’s Land, had suddenly increased from 1827. Its basis was timber and flax, rather than simply the earlier off-shore sealing and whaling ventures, and Maori willingness to participate was essential if good cargoes were to be obtained. Early commercial voyages had failed because local Maori had refused to help, and some vessels had been attacked because of the behaviour of the crew or captain. But the New South Wales government’s interest in New Zealand had always been strong, and one of Macquarie’s motives in assisting the missionary venture of 1814 was to explore commercial prospects. The *Active*’s captain, Peter Dillon, had been instructed to return with a cargo of timber and flax on its second voyage, and Macquarie allowed it in duty-free as his contribution to the mission. The trade only really developed, however, when the colonial merchants settled resident agents in New Zealand, and Maori chiefs organized the labour supply. This system essentially involved pre-arranging the cargo with the local community. It was a system of calculated co-operation.

Some Maori chiefs travelled to New South Wales to establish their own agencies. Patuone, chief of Ngatihao of the Hokianga, went to Sydney in 1826 to negotiate for vessels to sail to the river for spars. He went so far as to offer to leave his son as a hostage for the well-being of the European sailors. He returned home in October with Captain William Deloitte, agent for the Sydney firm Raine and Ramsay, to arrange for the sale of Te Horeke, which would become the major centre of the timber trade in New Zealand.

Other chiefs took themselves and their hapu to new residences within New Zealand in order to gain access to European trade. Seeking to capture their share, a group of inland Te Arawa chiefs brought Philip Tapsell to reside at Maketu in the Bay of Plenty. Tapsell was backed by the Sydney firm Jones and Walker, which had acquired a colonial government contract for dressed flax. They supplied him in Sydney with the trade goods most in demand in New Zealand: muskets, powder, cartridges and bullet moulds, along with pipes, hand-axes and lead. Te Arawa negotiated with Ngaiterangi, whose land it was,
for Tapsell’s right, and theirs, to reside at Maketu. Although they only obtained
the agreement of one of the seven hapu with whom they dealt, they moved in.
The subsequent deed of sale of Maketu to Tapsell, dated 5 January 1831, was
drawn up in Sydney, probably by the legal department of Jones and Walker.
Tapsell’s other powerful contracts were his marriages. His second wife was a
woman from the Bay of Islands who had strong kin connections with Te Arawa
and was instrumental in taking him to them, while his third wife, Hineiturama
of Te Arawa, he met at Maketu. The successful resident agents were the men
who married into the Maori community which protected them.

Maori chiefs set their own terms. One of the earliest successful contracts
was concluded in Sydney in 1814, when a chief from the Bay of Islands,
probably Tuai of Paroa, who became a well-known entrepreneur and master
of prostitution in the 1820s, pre-arranged a contract with Blaxcell and Co.
As a consequence, their vessel, the *James Haye*, was able to load its cargo
of spars in five days, because all the arrangements, including the price, had
been made in advance. In 1827, Rewa, the chief at Kerikeri, pre-prepared a
cargo of flax with the view of going to Sydney to obtain a ship. Following
Patuone’s negotiations in Sydney for the establishment of Te Horeke, Thomas
Raine, now in partnership with Gordon Browne, who had conducted the
original arrangements with the chief, opened the New Zealand Timber Wharf
in George Street in January 1828. It was to specialize in the marketing of the
spars. The timber in New Zealand was cut, under the direction of the chiefs,
by Maori labour. A few Maori men also became expert sawmen, working at
the pits cutting planks. The Maori terms were usually that they loaded the
cargo, floating the wood out to the vessels and putting it on board themselves.
If the captain refused to let them load, they would in retaliation charge higher
demurrage rates than usual. Anchorage fees themselves were standard Maori
practice in the Hokianga and elsewhere from the mid 1830s.

It was not only colonial merchants who made arrangements with Maori
patrons for timber. William White, superintendent of the Wesleyan mission
founded on the Hokianga River in 1827, employed up to 100 Maori workmen
there. Moreover, in exchange for use of the mission’s pits and equipment, the
Maori at Mangungu gave him half their timber, and used him as their agent to
sell the rest. White’s success contrasted markedly with the fortunes of Thomas
McDonnell, the new owner of Te Horeke from 1831, who could not work
well with Maori. Not gaining as much access to labour or timber as White,
McDonnell engineered his dismissal in 1837.

This economic pre-eminence of the Wesleyans on the upper Hokianga,
combined with their religious monopoly, led one chief to send two young
emissaries to the Catholic bishop in Sydney, to seek out another Christian faith.
The two, a man and a woman, were baptized there in 1835, and returned with
excited reports of the new teachings and rituals. The chief was probably Papahia
of Whirinaki, who was among the first to greet Bishop Pompallier when he
arrived at Hokianga in 1838. Papahia was soon forewarning the Wesleyans
of the imminent arrival of a French warship, together with soldiers, more
missionaries, and traders for himself. In a situation of mutual manipulation,
he was seeking ways to enhance his local power. While usually supporting the
Catholics (Papahia with some other chiefs sent a contribution in 1840 to the
new Catholic church being built in Sydney), he permitted the Wesleyans to baptism his son.

The trans-Tasman trade in which the Hokianga chiefs were all hoping to participate was, however, marked by extreme fluctuations. It would require considerable agility to stay up with the play. The failure to find a way of satisfactorily using flax for rope — although it was widely used in New South Wales for stuffing upholstery — led to erratic demands for it. The timber sales proved initially to be poor in Sydney, because kahikatea, so easy to cut, was too vulnerable to the Australian borer and white ant. In 1831 Raine and Browne were forced to sell out, at a bargain price, to McDonnell, and they later closed down their Sydney wharf. The Hokianga kauri proved a better cargo, while the flax trade hit its peak in the early 1830s and then declined. The colonial merchants themselves also had to meet changing Maori demands if they wished to stay in business. Sydney traders imported from England specially heavy blankets for the Maori trade, while in 1836 a shipment of dogskins arrived, to be turned into chiefs’ cloaks in New Zealand. Parramatta cloth, a coarse mixture of wool and cotton made by the convicts there, was also very popular among Maori purchasers, and was readily produced on demand. Maori had gained a reputation for being shrewd, to the point of extortion, in making bargains. Nicholas early established a favourite comparison of Maori being ‘as keen in enhancing their commodities as the most crafty Jews on the Royal Exchange’. The word ‘hoko’, to barter or sell, was adopted by Europeans as a common term for Maori gatherings. Even the hahunga, the ceremonial display of the bones of the dead, was called a hoko, or fair, where Maori traded and exchanged among themselves in the midst of other rituals. At the hahunga for the chief Te Koki of Paihia, who died in 1829, the trader Joel Polack noticed, ‘Ever and anon . . . perched on the top of a pyramid of provisions, a stentor-lunged native, who had visited Port Jackson, and was imitating the “sayings and doings” of the auctioneers in that colony.’ By the early 1830s, from the Maori perspective, the most valuable thing to acquire was a resident European. Whether missionary or trader, his value was as the hapu’s source of supply.

It was this trade which brought to New Zealand the early Pakeha settlers. They were mostly young men from the Australian colonies. One of the more famous was Frederick Maning, who with a ‘Mr Campbell’ of Hobart, chartered the schooner Mary and Elizabeth in 1833 to bring a cargo to the Hokianga. Maning returned at least three times to Van Diemen’s Land in the 1830s, and although he disavowed any notions of commerce (except to amuse himself), he in fact acted as the first resident trader for his tribe, Te Hikutu. As he wrote, in at least part-truth:

in those days the value of a pakeha to a tribe was enormous. For want of pakehas to trade with, and from whom to procure gunpowder and muskets, many tribes or sections of tribes were about this time exterminated, or nearly so, by their more fortunate neighbours who got pakehas before them . . . . A loose, straggling pakeha — a runaway from a ship, for instance . . . was not of much account, even in those times. But good well-to-do pakehas, traders, ship-captains, labourers, employers of labour, these were to be honoured, cherished, caressed, protected and plucked. Plucked judiciously . . . so that the feathers might grow again.
When Maning first arrived in New Zealand he was immediately met by Moetara, chief of Pakanae on the lower reaches of the river, who claimed the right to board every vessel there. He inquired whether Maning possessed plenty of taonga, or goods of value, and having been ‘answered by the captain in the most satisfactory manner, came up to me and gave me the most sincere welcome’. 19

The growth of trade, as Marsden and Nicholas had rightly calculated, created vast new needs within Maori society. Whole communities worked hard to gain and keep a resident Pakeha, and the colonial merchants sent their agents to the best ports of call, and to the best sources of timber and flax. The on-shore whaling stations, established from the later 1820s, were also principal centres of employment, and at the end of the season for the black whale, April to September, the men turned their attention to obtaining cargoes of flax. There were probably at least 30 on-shore stations operating by the beginning of the 1830s, founded mostly by men from Sydney or Hobart. The shipping lists of the vessels sailing between Sydney and New Zealand were also published regularly in the *Sydney Gazette*, which itself became an advocate of closer relations from 1828. These lists reveal the marked increase in sailings which took place from that year. The peak years were 1830 and 1839, when some 60–75 vessels left Sydney for New Zealand. 20 The colonial-registered vessels were a significant part of New Zealand’s trade from the moment official records began. The first shipping summary from the Bay of Islands, which was the major port of call in New Zealand, was made by James Busby for 1833. In a list of 89 vessels, 39 were Australian colonial traders or whalers, and two more were colonial government brigs. 21 The value of New Zealand’s exports — flax, timber, black whale oil, whalebone, seal skins, dried fish, salted port, maize, and vegetables — to New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land would oscillate wildly, but it was never less than £20,000 sterling in the 1830s, and reached the dizzy heights of £83,000 in 1839. 22

Trade had become a major part of coastal and riverine Maori life. The chiefs arranged the sales of many goods, particularly timber, flax, and foodstuffs, negotiated prices, and distributed the payments which they received. Some acted directly for themselves and their hapu, others employed intermediaries, usually Pakeha or, less frequently, Maori who had acquired some English. ‘Makoare’ Taonui of Te Popoto hapu of Hokianga was one who acted for himself and his tribe. He was closely involved in the timber trade at Horeke, which was established within his tribal territory. He oversaw all the cutting, measuring, sawing, and selling for his hapu, and was said to be able to calculate the dimensions of a spar at a glance. He also ran a retail store for the sale of European goods. He, like Korokoro, took his name from Macquarie, after a visit to Sydney in 1830–1831, where he met and returned with McDonnell, with whom he remained associated despite McDonnell’s haughty personality. Taonui himself became one of the most powerful figures on the river, and he was a strong voice in the Maori debate there against the signing of the Treaty in 1840. Taonui’s interests were always his own.

But trade, in fact, brought other extensions of power. The expansion of the New South Wales seaward frontier was the primary reason that New Zealand
was drawn into the imperial net. The New South Wales governors after King and Macquarie also kept an interest in the country as a potential source of resources for the penal colonies. In 1823, Thomas Brisbane untangled some old knots when a government-chartered vessel, the *Mermaid*, returned with an experimental cargo of flax preserved in salt water, and two Maori women, who had agreed to teach the female convicts. The governors also played an important part in extending hospitality to the Maori visitors, who thus acquired personal experience of the high military and government officials, and also erroneous expectations of continuing exalted treatment. Augustus Earle’s account of his visit to New Zealand in 1827–1828 concluded with a description of the Waikato chief with whom he travelled to Port Jackson and who expected an immediate audience with Governor Darling upon his arrival. Honour was finally satisfied, but only after the chief had sat for two days on the deck without ‘being visited or sent for’, his hair oiled, and ‘his whole stock of feathers . . . arranged to the greatest advantage’.

Marsden’s long involvement with New Zealand was critical as a means of introducing the chiefs into government circles, and he wrote insistently to men like Hongi Hika inviting them to New South Wales, to stay with him. The cleric’s seminary for Maori chiefs’ sons, which he began formally in 1819 at Parramatta, was a disaster because so many of the youths died of respiratory and other diseases. Despite this, in 1827, he was contemplating creating a permanent settlement at Lake Macquarie for chiefs and their families who might emigrate. The idea of a New Zealand settlement in the colony, as a possible sanctuary for both missionaries and Maori from inter-tribal fighting, had been initiated by the Reverend Henry Williams, the head of the mission station at Paihia in the Bay of Islands. Te Koki, the protector of Paihia, was intrigued by the notion and asked two of the missionaries to go to New South Wales to view the prospective site and bring him back samples of the soil. The scheme did not eventuate, largely because the missionaries’ fears for their lives subsided. Nevertheless, such ideas, apparently supported by Maori requests to be taken there so as to ‘sit quietly’, contributed to the growing colonial demands for British concern about New Zealand affairs. From Marsden’s perspective, the question was becoming one of the need to protect the Maori from exploitation and criminal violence, while the colonial merchants emphasized their desire for a more orderly environment for their trade.

The original grant of a formal authority to the three Bay of Islands chiefs to allow the recruiting of Maori crewmen, and to check the dumping of unwanted European seamen, had been intended to indicate that the New South Wales governors held some responsibility. Both the chiefs and Kendall were, of course, ineffectual in such a role, while the dilemma of New Zealand’s legal relations with New South Wales had continued to grow with the expanding colonial interests. The decisive incident was the hiring of a European vessel by the Ngati Toa chief Te Rauparaha — the price, a cargo of flax — to take himself and a war party to the South Island, with particularly grim results.

Te Rauparaha had visited Port Jackson immediately before he made his deal with Captain John Stewart of the *Elizabeth*. At Parramatta, Marsden
introduced him to Governor Darling and his wife Eliza, who gave the visitors a sweet cake. He returned to New Zealand with three metal shovels, which he used to such military advantage in digging trenches that his son Tamihana assumed that they had been the specific purpose of his visit. After his return to Kapiti Island, Te Rauparaha negotiated, late in 1830, his contract with Stewart; he then boasted of a stand of 2000 muskets. No doubt some of them had been acquired in Sydney, but the bulk were from the already extensive European trade he had developed, centred on Kapiti. In this elaborate planning, he was following in the steps of Hongi Hika, whose journey to England and Sydney in 1820–1821 had helped equip him for his large-scale war parties. Hongi had also sent his guns across to Sydney for repairs. The *Elizabeth* took the taua of a hundred men to Akaroa, where they exacted massive revenge for the death of a kinsman and loaded the ship with Akaroa’s flax. Not only Europeans were appalled. Two men, Ahu, the younger ‘brother’ (teina) of Tamaiharanui, the slaughtered chief of Akaroa, and ‘Ware’ (probably Wharepoaka, the chief of Rangihoua), were sent by the Bay of Islands chiefs on a mission to Sydney to protest to Darling about European involvement in their war expeditions. Stewart was arrested in Sydney on the evidence assembled, allowed bail, and fled.

The delay in hearing the case had been, in part, caused by legal uncertainties as to the jurisdiction of New South Wales over British subjects in New Zealand, although this right had been claimed in criminal cases since 1823. In 1831 Darling’s solution, agreed to by the Colonial Office, was to appoint a British Resident in New Zealand. James Busby was chosen in 1832. His salary and expenses were to be funded by the New South Wales treasury. This in itself proved to be a recipe for powerlessness. Yet Busby did not do an entirely bad job in his efforts to develop a working relationship with the major chiefs of the north.

Upon his arrival at the Bay of Islands in May 1833, he held a grand gathering for 22 high chiefs, where he portrayed himself as an intermediary, or ‘kaiwhakarite’, for them. He followed up in 1834 with another gala occasion, where the assembled chiefs were to make their choice of a national flag. This decision to find a flag for the sovereign chiefs of New Zealand had arisen from problems with shipping. Vessels built in New Zealand from the late 1820s were refused registration in New South Wales, because New Zealand was not a British colony, and in November 1830 the *Sir George Murray*, built in Horeke, was arrested in Port Jackson and its cargo confiscated. On board, almost certainly, were Patuone and Te Taonui, the patrons of Horeke. McDonnell subsequently came up with the solution that a Maori register would suffice, and he persuaded the two to append their moko as signatures for the registration of the vessel after it returned to New Zealand in 1831. But when Busby arrived there were ships needing registration, while another had been seized in Sydney. He shrewdly linked the issue of registration with the notion of creating a ‘settled form’ of Maori government, part of his instructions from New South Wales, and thereby appealed to the chiefs’ strong sense of their mana. The day of the flags, however, was not without its confusions. HMS *Alligator* brought three, made
in Sydney to Henry Williams’s unimaginative designs, for the chiefs to choose from. William Marshall, the surgeon on the vessel, described the event:

the great body of the chiefs assembled in a large oblong-square tent . . . this was divided into two lesser squares by a barricade across the centre, and the Tangata Mauri [the 30 ‘heads of tribes’ selected] were called out of the one square into the other, according to their respective ranks, and to the no small discontent of the excluded. After a speech . . . by Mr Busby . . . the three pattern flags were displayed, and the votes of the electors taken down in writing by ‘Hongi . . . the one finally chosen [was] a white flag, with a St. George’s cross, and in the upper corner on the left hand, a blue field with a red cross, and four white stars. Twelve votes having been obtained for it, ten for the next, and six only for the third: two of the head men declined voting, apparently apprehensive lest under this ceremony lay hid some sinister design on our parts, and, had anything like freedom of debate been encouraged, instead of suppressed, before proceeding with the election, I have little doubt but that the real sentiments of those present would have been elicited . . . .

In this ambivalent manner, the first national flag was chosen. Its recognition by the British Crown ensured that New Zealand-registered ships (with certificates to be signed by Busby and, ostensibly, the chiefs) could freely enter Australian ports, as ships of a nation permitted to trade with England and its colonies. The idea pleased the trade-conscious rangatira. Recognition of the flag became, in Maori understanding, the recognition of the ‘mana’ of New Zealand. The flag was flown at the Bay of Islands in the 1830s, and, more significantly, at the tribal elections of the first Maori King, Potatau Te Wherowhero, in 1857–1858.

The choice of a flag was followed, in October 1835, by the Declaration of Independence of the United Tribes (Whakaminenga) of New Zealand, also organized by Busby. Its immediate origins lay with Busby’s intensifying rivalry with McDonnell, who was attempting to impose laws under his recently acquired title of honorary Additional British Resident, together with an apparent threat of a French claimant to be the ‘Sovereign Chief’ of New Zealand on the basis of a large (and disputed) land purchase on the Hokianga. But it was also the implementation of Busby’s instructions from Richard Bourke to establish a government and a ‘system of jurisprudence’, and it was recognized as such. Busby himself took it seriously. He sent the Declaration off with 34 signatures in November 1835, but continued to collect more until July 1839. He acquired a total of 52. Although most of those who signed were northerners, he gained the signatures of two major chiefs elsewhere, Te Hapuku of Hawke’s Bay and Te Wherowhero. The Declaration asserted the ‘Rangatiratanga’, the independent chieftainship of the land. It also stated that the sovereign power and authority in the land, ‘Ko te Kingitanga ko te mana i te wenua’, resided with the assembled chiefs in their collective capacity. The signatories thanked the Crown for the acknowledgement of their flag, and petitioned King William for his protection against any attempt on their independence. They also entreated him to continue to be a ‘parent’ (‘matua’) to their ‘infant state’ (‘to matou Tamarikitanga’). Thus arose the legal dilemma, that both independence and a protectorate relationship were simultaneously established, when the Crown formally recognized this document in 1836.
The chiefs who signed undoubtedly had little understanding of its ramifications in international law, as indeed did the British. But the document would become a basis for Maori assertions of their autonomy in later years, and it is still interpreted in this way. Te Wherowhero’s adherence to this document, and his refusal to sign the Treaty in 1840, would become seminal in Maori history. Busby had caught a tiger by the tail. He put forward the idea for a working committee of chiefs to draw up laws, and he even ordered the timber for their house of assembly. It was never erected, because Bourke refused to supply the funds to pay for the Maori labour, recommending instead persuading ‘the natives to perform this useful work for themselves’. Perhaps he was right, rather than just plain mean: autonomy is not usually achieved through the mediation of others.

However, some of the major chiefs were prepared to use Busby as a kaiwhakarite, particularly in disputes with Europeans. Pomare, the chief of the rowdy pa at Otuihu in the Bay of Islands, complained in 1834 about a Pakeha who had entered his house to steal some money and a woman. Te Taonui wrote about cattle trespass on his cultivated land at Te Horeke. Hakiro, a Ngapuhi chief, wrote twice in 1839, first to complain about the partiality of the Roman Catholic missionaries towards a convert of theirs who had killed Hakiro’s wife and, later, to protest against someone called Thomas, who had taken away one of his women. But Busby possessed neither money, nor troops, nor magisterial authority; he, like the chiefs, could only mediate in disputes. Consequently, he informed the New South Wales government in 1834 that Titore, the powerful conqueror and patron of the port of Kororareka, and not he, would resolve the matter of the punishment of the chief Rete, who had shot at Busby in opposition to his purchase of the land for the Residency. Titore suggested that Rete’s nearby land at Puketona should be given to Busby, but the decision was never enforced collectively by the chiefs.

There were apparently three attempts to bring Maori before the New South Wales Supreme Court for crimes against Europeans, but none succeeded. The last was aborted in 1839, when a Maori sailor, imprisoned on the Nimrod in Sydney on a charge of murder of a European seaman in New Zealand, was freed from his captivity by other Maori in the port. Imprisonment was regarded by them as intolerable: only mokai, slaves, could be treated in such a way. Nevertheless, the New South Wales government was being dragged into the murky waters of jurisdiction in New Zealand. Busby’s presence was generating a mountain of paper, as he fired off daily correspondence to Bourke (to the latter’s intense irritation) about his problems as kaiwhakarite.

The New South Wales governors could exert influential pressure on the British Crown, and Bourke’s low opinion of Busby succeeded in conveying the view that a situation of anarchy reigned in New Zealand. The decision to appoint a Resident had been Darling’s, taken after the Elizabeth affair, when he was persuaded by the arguments of the merchant Gordon Browne a few days before the news of the Maori deputation reached him from Samuel Marsden. The next step, for the Crown to seek the cession of all or parts of New Zealand, was the consequence of the cumulative despatches and reports from Busby and Bourke, as well as petitions from both New Zealand and the Sydney merchants.
A heap of these suddenly arrived together on 18–19 December 1837, and nudged the Colonial Office into its decision.

The Treaty of Waitangi was devised to obtain the transfer of sovereignty from the Maori chiefs to the Crown. William Hobson, sent out with that task but apparently without a draft of such a document, called first at Sydney. Here he made the legal arrangements with the Governor, George Gipps, and also gave him the gist of the Crown’s purposes with respect to the Maori. Gipps, in his turn, drew up a Treaty for signature by the Maori chiefs then living in Sydney. He held a garden party for them on 14 February 1840, to which seven of the ten invited guests came. He attempted to explain to them its purposes, and gave each ten sovereigns. They were to return the next day to sign. They did not. It became clear that they had been advised against it by the Sydney merchant John Jones, with whom they were staying, and who was party to a vast land purchase in the South Island then being negotiated with them. It the chiefs were manipulated by a Sydney land consortium, whose claims had been invalidated by Gipps’s proclamation of 18 January, subjecting all past and future land purchases in New Zealand to the Crown’s confirmation, they probably had also been brought to understand that they were, as Jones put it, being asked ‘to sign away their rights to the Sovereignty of the Crown’.

For Gipps’s treaty varied significantly from that which at least one of these chiefs, Tuhawaiki, would later sign in New Zealand. It ceded ‘absolute sovereignty’ to Queen Victoria, in return for which she offered only her protection to the chiefs and tribes. There was no clause which guaranteed them the possession of their ‘Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries and other properties’, as there would be in the English text of the Treaty of Waitangi. It also made it clear that they could not sell any land except to the Queen: the ambiguous phrase granting the ‘exclusive right of Preemption’ to the Crown, which Hobson adopted for the English text, intending to convey the same meaning, was not there. Yet this agreement had an extra thought, not found in the New Zealand treaties. From the proceeds of the land sales the Crown would set aside ‘adequate provision’ for the education and religious instruction of the Maori. But this would be insufficient exchange for the transfer of real power. Gipps’s treaty was unambiguous in that respect.

Hobson’s text was drawn up in the Bay of Islands, and it was from Busby’s draft that the second article of the Treaty derived. As Busby wrote it, this article guaranteed the chiefs and the tribes their ‘Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries and other properties’. This clause, translated into the Maori Treaty signed on 6 February, significantly shifted the weight of meaning, and ensured that it was signed at all. For the Treaty guaranteed ‘te tino rangatiratanga’, the full independent authority of the chiefs and the hapu over their lands, their settlements, and all that they valued (‘o ratou taonga katoa’). The chiefs, in turn, ceded the ‘Kawanatanga’, the governorship, of the country. ‘Rangatiratanga’ was the term used in 1835 as the statement of chiefly independence; while those who had been to Poihakena had seen mostly the benevolent face of ‘Kawanatanga’, governorship. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to assume that, with Nopera Panakaraeo, patron of the Anglican mission at Kaitaia, many thought that, in ceding the governorship, and by retaining their ‘rangatiratanga’, they were retaining the substance of power.
Nevertheless, there were explicit doubts voiced, and not least by those who had travelled to New South Wales and observed the realities of European colonization for the Aborigines. One of the most outspoken and pertinent voices at the meeting held on the Hokianga on 12 February 1840 was Te Taonui, shrewd controller of Te Horeke. In a series of speeches he challenged Hobson:

We are glad to see the Govr let him come to be a Govr to the Pakias, as for us we want no Govr, we will be our own Govr. How do the Pakias behave to the black Fellows at Port Jackson? They treat them like Dogs . . . . Let us know what has been said. We are not willing to give up our land. It is from Earth we obtain all things, from Earth is all our Happiness. The land is our father. The land is our chieftainship we will not give it up . . . . Ha, Ha, Ha, this is the way you do — first your Queen sends the Missionaries to New Zealand to put things in order, gives them £200 a year — Then she sends Mr Busby to put up a flag, gives him £500 a year and £200 to give to us natives, now she sends a Govr and gives him £2000 a year.35

When Hobson challenged him, in return, to speak his own views, and not those which the ‘bad men’ on the river, Pakeha settlers, had fed him, he replied sharply, ‘I do; have not I been at Port Jackson? I know Governors have salaries.’36 The debate went on all day, with Hobson stressing that the Crown did not want the land, merely the sovereignty. Taonui responded finally: ‘Lo! now for the first time my heart has come near to your thoughts. How do you do, how do you do. I approach to you with my heart. You must watch over my children, let them sit down under your protection. There is my land too you must take care of it. But I am not good [willing] for you to sell it, what of the land that is sold. Can my children sit down on it? Can they? Eh! —’37 Taonui signed the Treaty. His doubts were based on this wide experiences; this decision was a weighing-up of the explanations given to him, in which the guarantee of the ‘rangatiratanga’ over the land was probably critical. His interpretation would be proved wrong.

By 1840, Tuki’s universe had decisively changed. His islands were populated with Pakeha settlers, some 2000 of them. The boundaries of the land were sketched on English maps as a part of their Empire. The imaginary road to Te Reinga for the spirit to travel was no longer so clear to see, as the missionaries taught their truths and their myths in the Maori communities. The right to sell the land to the Crown had been written into the Treaty. ‘Te hokonga’, the hocking of it, would continue.38 Coins and cattle trespass, guns and absolute property rights, and cabbages and Kings had all become part of this new world. The many travellers to Poihakena had been entertained, and wined, and dined, and fed sweet cakes. They had entered contracts, both knowingly and unknowingly. They had brought back new images of power and of justice. They were not innocent travellers, but they could not know the extent to which their world was being altered. By 1840 Tuki’s map had been redrawn.
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