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Racial difference underpinned the existence of the New Zealand colonial state. Frantz Fanon suggests that colonial societies are by nature ‘Manichaean’, founded on the division of the colonizer and colonized and on ‘belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species’. Fanon’s comment implies that more than just skin colour or cultural difference separates the colonizer and colonized – rather, that the two groups are deemed to be different according to nature.\(^1\) Indeed, assumptions about ‘natural’ racial divisions were prevalent in the colonial New Zealand press: for example, the British were said to possess an ‘innate governing capacity’ and ‘Imperial genius’.\(^2\) In contrast, newspaper contributors asserted that the inherent character of the Māori lent itself, at times, to violence, mendacity, suspicion, avarice, wastefulness, indolence, barbarism and cunning,\(^3\) although it was possible for the ‘innate ferocity of character [of the Māori] . . . [to] be worn down by contact with our matured civilization’.\(^4\) The innate superiority of the Pākehā character was paired with Pākehā cultural superiority. Through much of the nineteenth century the government pursued an official policy of ‘amalgamation’ in which Māori were to become integrated within the machinery of state.\(^5\) However the government was unwilling to include Māori in any real power-sharing relationship. For example, Māori court officials, such as assessors, remained subordinate to Pākehā judges. The government justified this position on the assumption that Māori had not reached the levels of civilization of Pākehā.\(^6\) Notwithstanding the political equality that Māori supposedly shared with Pākehā under the Treaty of Waitangi, the colonial state was constructing a racially dichotomized society under the rubric of both natural and cultural difference.

Despite William Fox’s assessment in 1851 that ‘the habits, character, and circumstances of the two races are so different as to preclude all prospect of amalgamation by marriage’\(^7\) there is indeed evidence of such relationships between Pākehā and Māori in New Zealand. According to James Belich, most of the half-castes (the offspring of parents of two different races) were born before 1850, and the European genetic heritage subsequently mixed and re-mixed within the Māori community until postwar urbanization.\(^8\)
However, ongoing research by scholars such as Angela Wanhalla indicates that inter-racial marriage continued throughout the nineteenth century, adding new genetic material to Māori communities in both islands. As waves of immigrants swamped the Māori and mixed-race populations, inter-racial marriage becomes an increasingly marginal feature of the overall national figures.

The presence of individuals who bridged the racial divide was destabilizing and problematic for the ‘natural’ contours of the colonial world. The state, whilst it could not wish ‘half-castes’ away, tried to maintain the racial dichotomy by slotting them into either the Pākehā or Māori populations. Unlike some colonies, New Zealand did not develop an over-riding taxonomy of race. A separate mixed-race society or culture, such as the Griqua of South Africa or the Métis of Canada, neither developed organically nor was constructed legislatively. The manner in which half-castes were defined and then incorporated into the state depended on the circumstances. Much legislation tended to include half-castes (and those with less than half European ‘blood’) within the Māori population. The biological distinction was obviously significant, but cultural differences appear to be a more significant factor in determining such classifications. For example, electoral law tended to differentiate between half-castes who were ‘living as a Maori’ and those ‘living as a European’. Similarly under the Police Offences Act 1884, the definition of an ‘Aboriginal Native’ included ‘any half-caste living with aboriginal Natives according to their customs and usages’. Land tax exemptions for Māori included those deemed to be ‘half-caste living as a member of a tribe’, leading the MHR for Southern Maori, H.K. Taiaroa, to suggest in 1879 that half-castes living as Europeans might revert to living in Māori whare in order to avoid taxation. Native Land Court legislation tended to be the most inclusive, with Māori rights applied to half-castes and their descendants who might, in other circumstances, have been classified as Europeans.

It was not until 1874 that nation-wide Māori censuses were conducted, but as Kate Riddell has argued, the data collected could be inaccurate. As with the definitions used in electoral law, most censuses defined ‘half-castes’ depending on whether they were living as Māori, or as Europeans. Many Māori avoided participation. Some mixed-descent individuals identified as Māori, and some ‘quarter-castes’ might be classified as ‘half-caste’ rather than as ‘European’. Some half-castes also changed category from one census to another. According to the census data, half-castes made up a relatively small percentage of the population. In the 1896 census, when the Māori population was statistically at its lowest (about 5% of the national total) half-castes made up less than 0.01% of the total population and less than 13% of Māori and half-caste combined. However these figures are almost
certainly not indicative of the actual extent of New Zealand’s mixed-race population.¹³

Damon Salesa suggested in 2000 that, unlike Samoa’s literature on half-castes, ‘New Zealand historiography seems almost to have overlooked them. The social situation, the everyday lives and interactions of half-castes in New Zealand are only vaguely understood’.¹⁴ Some progress has been made since, such as the work of Angela WanHallia, Kate Stevens, and Judith Binney.¹⁵ Despite these advances, historians investigating hāwhekaihe to date have not utilized a major historical source of information on Māori politics and social history, the Māori-language newspaper corpus (1842-1933).¹⁶ This essay attempts to bridge this gap in our knowledge by searching the corpus to reveal Māori and half-caste voices, and what these groups read about their own positions within Māori and the wider New Zealand society.

The essay first provides a quantitative over-view of the niupepa discussion of hāwhekaihe, and then discusses selected articles, in order to reveal a number of key points. First, hāwhekaihe were not generally viewed as a distinct racial group, and in many respects were well-integrated within Māori communities.¹⁷ Second, colonialism produced a number of tensions over land within Māori tribal groupings, where members at times attempted to exclude others from land rights. Divisions between Māori and hāwhekaihe over land were most apparent in the South Island. Third, the competition for mana within the parliamentary political arena at times resulted in the two groups criticizing each other from the late 1860s. This tension between Māori and hāwhekaihe over land and mana was expressed within a ‘discourse of blame’ that emerged in the later nineteenth century in which both groups blamed each other for the ills that had befallen the Māori people. Fourth, while a number of Pākehā spoke out against ‘miscegenation’, there is only one article in the niupepa specifically appealing to Māori not to marry Pākehā. Unlike the Pākehā commentators, the writer is more concerned with Māori extinction through absorption, and the loss of Māori land. Most discussion about hāwhekaihe appears in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, and tensions between Māori and hāwhekaihe appear to have largely dissipated by the early twentieth century.

Hāwhekaihe within the niupepa corpus

The niupepa corpus covers just over 90 years and an electronic search of ‘hawhekaihe’ uncovered just over 150 ‘hits’¹⁸ which were classified qualitatively then tabulated quantitatively (Table One). The paucity of references to hāwhekaihe (on average less than two a year) is significant, especially when compared to the Papers Past corpus of English-language newspapers which provided 2386 hits for the term ‘half-caste’ (or halfcaste) not counting search terms such as ‘hybrid’, ‘miscegenation’ and ‘fusion’.
Although the corpora are different in many ways, the high occurrence of ‘half-caste’ in English papers and the relatively few occurrences of hāwhekaihe in the niupepa indicate a proportionately larger preoccupation with mixed race in the English-language press than in the Māori one. The process of classifying the articles involved first categorizing them according to the attitude of the writer to hāwhekaihe. By far the largest categories are ‘neutral’ (that is, when half-castes are discussed but without any positive or negative aspersions cast) and ‘descriptor’ (when a person’s half-caste identity is mentioned but is incidental to the substance of the text) together making up over two thirds of the occurrences. The term hāwhekaihe is also used as a metaphor ten times, leaving just 35 articles which make positive, negative or defensive comments about the group. It is notable that in the 1840s when, according to Belich, most of the children from mixed marriages were being born, there is no discussion of hāwhekaihe in the niupepa.\textsuperscript{19} If we compare another early Māori-language corpus, the Māori correspondence in the McLean papers (1820-1877), we find only one letter in 1851, which discusses two hāwhekaihe youths who had stolen money.\textsuperscript{20} Clearly hāwhekaihe were not a major concern during the 1840s. Indeed it is only in the four decades from 1870 to 1909 that discussion of hāwhekaihe, including positive and negative discourse, is prevalent. This is the period when colonialism, in the form of assimilation and the Native Land Court, started to really impact on Māori communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842-49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a more nuanced reading of the texts is undertaken, the 51 descriptor references to hāwhekaihe can at times be revealing, as the following examples
demonstrate. In 1860, Te Karere Maori made known that ‘a piece of land situated at Paekakariki six and a half acres in extent is conveyed by Deed of Gift from the aboriginal owners to the half cast [sic] children of John and Peti Nicol.’ [source]. This sentence indicates that when Waikanae Māori sold the Wainui Block (and partitioned reserves for themselves) they also provided land for a family of half-caste relatives, demonstrating that they considered the Nicol children to be part of, yet also distinct from, the tribe. In 1862 Wiremu Kīngi Te Rangitāke sent a letter to his kinsman Rīwai Te Ahu (later printed in a government niupepa) writing ‘Goodbye, Rī. Write a letter to Te Keepa the half-caste to come here.’ [LP] Te Rangitāke was yet not at peace with the government, and had taken refuge with Rewi Maniapoto at Kihikihi. That he wanted Te Keepa to come and visit him suggests that in a period of high tension he considered this hāwhekaihe to be trustworthy, and able to move easily between the territories of the British Queen and Māori King. The following text from Te Waka Maori o Niu Tireni in 1877 discusses a hāwhekaihe engaging in Pākehā business practices.

Mr. WILLIAM APES, an energetic young half-caste, has, we are informed, built a large store at Karatane, [sic] Port of Waikouaiti, and is now carrying out a most extensive business. The store in question stands on ground leased from a European. We congratulate Mr. Apes on his enterprising spirit, and we trust his undertaking may be profitable to himself and advantageous to his neighbours. [source]

The government newspaper was thus using the example of Apes to encourage commercial enterprise among its wider audience of Māori readers. Finally, in 1887 the missionary Milson wrote to the religious niupepa, Te Korimako, that ‘on the coast near Horowhenua a half-caste met three Pākehā, Mormon preachers who tried to convert that half-caste to their faith. Well, that man responded to them that the religion of yours will never be agreeable to me’. [LP] At a time when Mormon missionaries were having considerably more success converting Māori than Pākehā, a half-caste, a person with connections to both races, who rejected the new faith was an excellent example for anti-Mormon propaganda. Thus, although a large proportion of the collected data references people as hāwhekaihe without elaborating on that status, nevertheless the subtexts often indicate that their half-caste identity is very relevant to the content of the texts.

When the data is further analyzed by category (Table Two), a number of trends emerge, indicating which issues were of more or less concern to Māori, or to those who controlled the niupepa content. Broadly speaking, it was the government which produced most niupepa from 1842 to the 1870s; production was then taken over by pan-Māori or regional Māori groups from the 1870s to the turn of the century; then the field was left to young Māori
Anglicans with links to the Young Māori Party. The two largest categories involving discussions of hāwhekaihe relate to land and politics, principal sites of conflict within nineteenth-century Māori society. Such discussions occur largely during the period when groups such as the Kotahitanga, seeking Māori autonomy and reform of the land laws, dominated niupepa production. Hāwhekaihe involvement in land issues and politics was of less concern to the Māori Anglicans in the early twentieth century, but it is difficult to ascertain if this was the case within the wider Māori society as well. Certainly, the spike of interest in the relationship between hāwhekaihe and alcohol in the 1900s coincided with prohibitionist campaigning within the Māori Anglican Church. Unlike Pākehā, Māori did not have the right to vote on local prohibition, and the Church’s niupepa, Te Pīpīwhāraurōa, exhorted hāwhekaihe who were on the European roll to vote against the continued sale of liquor.

The most notable feature of the hāwhekaihe data is the low number of occurrences for many of the categories. Quite unlike the settler press, there are relatively few cases of half-castes being identified as criminal offenders. Only four reports on weddings mention half-castes. One nineteenth-century myth about Māori, according to Riddell, was the belief that Māori would improve as a race – particularly in physical appearance – if they bred with Pākehā, and support for such a belief can be found within the popular settler press. As one Pākehā commentator wrote ‘it is only necessary to look at these half-castes in New Zealand to believe in the virtue and value of mixing blood — “miscegenation.”’ In the niupepa corpus however, there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two: Niupepa articles on hāwhekaihe in terms of category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were only four specific comments on the racial characteristics of *hāwhekaihe*, all of them occurring in the twentieth century. In 1901 *Te Puke ki Hikurangi*, perhaps influenced by Māui Pōmare’s lectures to Māori communities, suggested that *hāwhekaihe* had superior ‘blood’ to Māori: that ‘science has announced that the blood of the Māori race has deteriorated, and this idea is correct. We should look at the half-caste and their races, who are strong, knowledgeable, attractive, loving, and long-living’.[LP] 28 Another writer considered half-caste women particularly beautiful if adorned with a huia feather,29 while in 1930, Te Rangihīroa, influenced perhaps by his anthropological background, expressed the belief that Māori and Pākehā would eventually merge into one race, and if Māori failed to do so, their reproductive strength would diminish, like the Indians of America.30 The only negative comment came from a Māori when asked in a court case his opinion of a *hāwhekaihe*. That Māori replied, ‘He is a real half-caste, not a Māori half-caste but a Pākehā one because he’s a very greedy person. He wouldn’t drop sixpence [but] if he did drop it, due to his cleverness it would return with interest’. [LP] 31 However, it appears that comments about the ‘character’ of *hāwhekaihe* are exceptions to the rule, and that in most social spheres *hāwhekaihe* were well-integrated within Māori society.

**Land, politics and a discourse of blame**

It is in the two vital areas of land and politics that discernable dissension between Māori and *hāwhekaihe* can be found, and it is this tension that the greater part of this essay explores. In many respects, disputes between groups over land were inevitable under the New Zealand colonial system. Customary law concerning aboriginal title was complex, sometimes with various groups or individuals having competing rights to the land and its resources. The government recognized aboriginal title over unsold land, but wanted land on which to settle the flood of Pākehā immigrants. It exacerbated tensions by putting pressure on Māori to sell, which sometimes led to fighting between rival claimants. The government established the Native Land Court in 1862 ostensibly so that Māori could contest their claims peacefully before an impartial judge according to customary practices. However, the primary purpose as far as the government was concerned was to facilitate the extinguishment of aboriginal title to enable the land to more quickly pass into settlers’ hands. Parliament often fine-tuned the legislation, less to counter the many abuses than to make the courts work more efficiently.

Tensions over land ownership under the new land court system should not have created friction between Māori and *hāwhekaihe* because in most legislation relating to land, half-castes and their descendents were deemed to be Māori, and any ‘Māori’ could ask the court to investigate their claims to a piece of land. Some tribal groups attempted to manage their land cases
in-house. One example is the Kīngitanga which, after coming to terms with the government in 1881, continued to resist the land court, and to retain mana over lands as yet unsold. In the early 1890s the movement published a number of rules for its people in its niupepa, including rules related to land. It stated, ‘the Māori people have the decision making responsibility over their half-castes: it is not right, according to this law, that half-castes obtain the power to alter decisions about their land’ – although hāwhekaihe who had not caused any problems for their hapā and iwi could have some rights.32 Thus the Kīngitanga saw hāwhekaihe as problematic in terms of land ownership but still located them within the tribal structure. It is probable that other North Island iwi also were suspicious of hāwhekaihe in relation to land title,33 but they did not publish specific tikanga on the matter in the newspapers.

Ngāi Tahu proved to be the one major exception to the practice of defining hāwhekaihe as Māori in land legislation. When Pākehā sealers and whalers first came to New Zealand, this tribe was sparsely spread over most of the South Island. Particularly in the southern South Island, due to the early arrival of Pākehā and the low number of Ngāi Tahu, there was considerable intermarriage and inevitably hāwhekaihe children. Commercial and familial associations led some hāwhekaihe Ngāi Tahu to marry among themselves. At times the mixed families lived within Māori communities, although sometimes they formed their own communities.34 Unlike the more densely populated North Island where Māori generally sold land in smaller blocks, the Ngāi Tahu territory was sold in huge acreages between 1844 and 1864 on the understanding that the government would make reserves sufficient for the tribe’s future, as well as providing schools and hospitals. The reserves were so insufficient that in the early 1870s Ngāi Tahu, through H.K.Taiaroa MHR for Southern Māori, pressed for extra land to be provided for hāwhekaihe. Taiaroa argued that the government had signed the land deals with full-blooded Ngāi Tahu, who should not be expected to take responsibility for those who had descended from earlier mixed marriages, including those abandoned by their Pākehā fathers.35 This resulted in considerable legislative activity, including the Middle Island Half Caste Crown Grants Acts of 1877, 1885 and 1887, and Special Powers and Contracts Act 1880.36 Although the niupepa were all produced in the North Island, some discussion of the South Island hāwhekaihe is present, including references to Taiaroa’s work in parliament.37 There are also two letters sent from Maika Pikaka of Waikouaiti in 1878, in which he berates the government for its duplicity, and clearly states his resentment at hāwhekaihe obtaining privileges set aside for Māori:

Listen to the South Island about the half-castes, the school at Otākou has 30 [hāwhekaihe] and two Māori children, the school at Waikouaiti
40 and four Māori children, the school at Kaiapoi 40 and 15 Māori children, other schools are the same, and there are no schools on the lands of Matiaha, Horomona and Tahiaraki. Therefore I think that what the elders thought is right that the half-castes would turn and quarrel with their high chiefs, and that’s why I say that soon New Zealand will be overcome with half-caste children. The costs for the buildings and money for the schools will increase and the perhaps the government will say that its work is done with the schools. No, my friend, because the Māori children aren’t increasing. Another thing is the half-castes living on the lands reserved for the Māori. The area for them should be small because the government has an area of land [set aside] for those half-castes’ [LP] 38

Resentment against hāwhekaihe was also present in the North Island, but references in the niupepa revolve more around their perceived parliamentary aspirations. In 1876, less than ten years after Māori men gained the right to vote, Manaena Tinikiterangi wrote to Te Wananga objecting to an un-named half-caste candidate standing for parliament in the Māori seats, thundering, ‘Tribes of the South, North, East and West, listen to me. Do not vote for half-castes, never, never at all’. [LP] 39 An election had already been held in January, and as far as I am aware, none of the four Maori members elected were considered half-caste. Tinikiterangi continued: ‘[This person is] arrogant, tells lies, a broken head, a beguiler of people so they lose their thoughts, and some tribes have been taken in with the bad advice of that lowborn/ignorant person’. [LP] 40 He then moved on from the unknown candidate to attack half-castes in general, insinuating that they were of low birth, or the result of casual or commercial relations with Pākehā: ‘One has a cup of tea, fried meat, and a full belly, then gives his daughter to the Pākehā to pay for his food, and those half-castes are born, and are left as a source of dissention for us’. [LP] 41 Tinikiterangi’s final words for Māori voters were to:

. . . leave Parliament for chiefly people to give grand statements, he who is known to be a chief, a grandchild of those above in the heavens. So, what of the knowledge of a lowborn person. Who is he from, from Potato or Pumpkin. Your ancestor is of low-born lines. Eat the food just lying about, don’t grasp at taking the reins of power . . . [LP] 42

Kūware (ignorance) is a close synonym to ware (low-born) reflecting prejudices in traditional Māori society, and in the pre-wars period tension over mana began to emerge between chiefs and newly educated commoners. 43 Tinikiterangi was thus branding the potentially outsider hāwhekaihe as socially marginal tūtūā (commoners) in order to exclude them from parliament, a new site of mana.
A hāwhekaie from Ōtaki, Tamati Ranapiri, or Thomas Ransfield, responded angrily to Tinikiterangi’s accusations, but then asked the question – who was responsible for the problems, primarily over land, that were troubling Māori society?

Is it from the entry of the half-caste into Parliament that this land ails? Is the half-caste responsible for the problems of this land? Was it the half-caste who sold the land acquired by the Pākehā? Is it just the half-caste who called in the Native Land Court? Is it because of the half-caste that the land was confiscated? Is the half-caste responsible for the evil which has grown in our country? Now, if you know the half-caste who is responsible for these evils developing in our country, say who it is, so that this issue can be ended. . . . So, my friend, think on who is responsible for these troubles emerging in the country: in my opinion it is due to chiefs. You say leave Parliament to just the chiefs, but, think on what the chiefs have done.[LP]

Ranapiri quite clearly placed responsibility with Māori chiefs themselves. He used a discourse of blame that was consequently reproduced a number of times in print. This small skirmish reveals that, despite the fact that many half-castes were well-integrated into Māori communities, there was some antagonism towards some half-castes who presumed they could represent Māori in parliament. In effect this was a struggle for mana, in which ethnicity was conflated with class issues: Tinikiterangi argues that parliamentary roles should be left to chiefs, and Ranapiri counters that past problems were due to the chiefs.

Over two decades later Te Tiupiri (a Whanganui paper, edited by the hāwhekaie H.T. Te Whatahoro, with an organizing committee that included other hāwhekaie) published a letter from Hiraurau. The letter was generally positive about the newspaper, but alluded to the editors’ ancestry, suggesting that some of its strange ideas had come from half-castes. A letter in reply soon followed under the pen name ‘Nga Awhekaihe’ listing all the problems, including confiscation, prophet movements, and the land courts that had befallen Māori since 1840, for which it squarely blamed the Māori people.

So you should be clear about all the business through which this country, New Zealand, suffers: it is the actual Māori who are responsible for all those ills. Now this is what we, the half-castes say, that it is from you, the Māori people, that our country has suffered, and all the many problems are down to the Māori. . . .[LP]

The letter produced the same discourse that Ranapiri had employed in 1876. This indicates that such a discourse may not have surfaced often in print,
but was probably more prevalent as spoken discourse. Despite the outburst, which appears divisive, the letter concluded that Māori and hāwhekaihe should not be divided, as this would lead to hatred and conflict. Instead, the two groups should grow together as one. A response soon followed, signed by ‘Nga Maori’. This letter complained that hāwhekāihe dominated the Māori parliamentary seats and blamed them for a number of land sales on the East Coast of the North Island. Thus an anti-Māori discourse of blame was countered with an anti-half-caste one. We can see that Hiraurau’s letter touched a raw hāwhekaihe nerve, and their response in turn upset Māori readers.

However, the letter by ‘Nga Maori’ indicated that one person in particular was to blame: ‘you know that man, he is a Member [of Parliament] from here on the East Coast’. [LP] More than likely, the letter was pointing at Wiremu Pere. When the letter was written in 1898, Wī Pere was the MHR for Eastern Māori. In the 1870s he was one of the leading Repudiationists in Poverty Bay, with clear political ambitions. In 1878 he wrote a letter to Te Wananga in which he criticized Parliament and its legislation. He then called on hāwhekaihe to take on a leading role within Māori society:

Friends, half-castes of this land, we should turn to manage the remainder of territory of the Māori people, that is, of our mother. We have not yet sinned against the whole island in the wars, land sales and prophet movements of the country; it was our Māori parents only who did.[LP] In his letter, Pere employs a similar discourse of blame to that used by Ranapiri of Otaki, claiming that Māori were to blame for the ills afflicting their society. In 1880, in partnership with the Pākehā lawyer and politician William Rees, Pere established a company to lease out Māori land for development, in which a number of East Coast hapū vested about 250,000 acres of land. In 1884 he gained the seat of Eastern Māori. In 1887 Pere lost his seat to James Carroll, who was reluctantly drawn into becoming a trustee of the company as it collapsed. Both men were hāwhekaihe, although Pere was much more aligned with his Māori side than Carroll who was comfortable identifying with both his Pākehā and Māori heritages. When Carroll decided to contest the European seat of Waiapu in 1893, Pere was re-elected in the Māori seat despite the failure of the land company. However, it was clear that not all Māori had forgotten.

The references Carroll made to his hāwhekaihe status, like Pere’s, are revealing. In the 1884 election Carroll had unsuccessfully contested Eastern Māori against Wī Pere. In a newspaper supplement advertising that campaign, Carroll clearly identified himself as hāwhekaihe.
Don’t look at the chiefly standing of the person on their Māori side, because we have seen in days past some important chiefs who have stood in Parliament and their blindness to the procedures of that house. One good man for that work is James Carroll, a half-caste, with an equal knowledge of Pākehā and Māori custom. [LP] 50

Indeed Carroll positioned his bi-culturalism as an advantage. By asking voters to disregard his less than preeminent chiefly status, and by suggesting that chiefly members had been ineffective in the past, he also obliquely engaged in the discourse of blame.

By the 1890s some Māori were directing criticism towards Carroll, at times using an anti-half-caste discourse. His prominent position within the Liberal cabinet meant he had to support government land policies that were unpopular with Māori, including some Kotahitanga leaders. Although the criticisms against Carroll do not appear in the niupepa, it is likely that they were couched in anti-half-caste rhetoric because prominent Māori supporting Carroll refer to such sentiments. For example, Carroll was protected by the prominent Muaupoko chief Te Keepa Te Rangihiwiwiui, as reported in Te Puke ki Hikurangi: ‘coming to the year 1892 at the Kotahitanga hui at Waipatu, the voice was heard disparaging this people, the Half-castes, [and saying] that James Carroll was a bad man. Taitoko [Te Keepa] said, People, don’t abuse my child, but look after him as a means of cutting my bonds’. [LP] 51

The following year the important Kahungunu chief, Tamahau Mahupuku, defended Carroll’s record in the House at a Kotahitanga meeting: ‘The talk from that person 52 about half-castes is wrong. I voted for James Carroll in the last election because of his vigour: it was he who got rid of the Rating Act 1882 and Ballance’s Native Land Act of 1886’. [LP] 53

In 1898, Wī Pere, although closely aligned to Māori interests, also felt the need to defend his Pākehā heritage from attacks from an un-named source.

Wī Pere is my name, and it’s no secret that my father was Pākehā, and the person who is taunting, belittling and talking nonsense, his father too is a Pākehā, so what is the basis of his taunt? He has made two declarations about me. This is what his words about James [Carroll] and me are saying, that you saw the announcement by the half-castes asserting that the ills of this land were due to the Māori, not the half-caste. My friend, I haven’t spoken like that, that the half-caste has no responsibility for the problems of this country, and I haven’t circulated in the newspapers anything like the sort of thing that you say in your pronouncements. [LP] 54

This text demonstrates that the discourse of blame was powerful and common enough that Pere felt the need to distance himself from it.
A plea not to inter-marry

Despite Belich’s thesis that most Māori-Pākehā intermarriage occurred before 1850, such matches continued to occur and were regarded differently within the Pākehā and Māori communities. Some Pākehā may have believed, as discussed above, that Māori would be improved with admixtures of European genes, but not all Pākehā relished the idea of shouldering this responsibility. As one writer stated:

A marriage between the colours affirms to some extent the equality of the colours, and the affirmation is repugnant to the white man. Supported by history, he firmly believes his colour to be the mark of the hereditary aristocracy of mankind, and he regards any degradation of that aristocracy as a personal insult, to be prevented if possible, but at least to be bitterly resented.\(^{55}\)

In particular, some Pākehā abhorred the idea of Pākehā women marrying Māori men. As one newspaper noted:

It is to be hoped that the “blending of the races by intermarriage” may long be confined to its present narrow scale; at any rate, it is certainly no part of the “mission” of the white race to miscegenate the Maoris into the condition of polished gentlemen. If anyone believes so, and has sisters or daughters to devote to his idea, he is welcome to try the experiment; but I, for one, would sooner see any female relative in the grave, than sharing the residence (however palatial) or the attentions (however polished) of any Maori, even though he might be removed by three generations from the cannibalism of his ancestors.\(^{56}\)

In contrast, while some Māori used the label of hāwhekaihe as a means of attacking their political opponents, mixed-race families and individuals generally fitted well into Māori society. There was no anxiety about racial purity in the whole niupepa corpus, and indeed I found only one article arguing against any further intermarriage. At the 1907 conference of the Te Aute College Students’ Association (TACSA) a paper listed among the problems of the Māori Church ‘the fusion of the race with the pakeha’ through which ‘the Maoris were becoming more like pakehas every day’.\(^{57}\) Perhaps prompted by this statement, and by Pōmare’s predictions that Māori would be absorbed within the Pākehā population\(^{58}\), the Anglican newspaper Te Pipiwharauroa printed an article on the issue several months later:

Dr. Pōmare has spoken. He is not one who has seen it, but his voice is heard by the whole country. He has said that the Māori will disappear, disappear into the Pākehā, due to so many Māori marrying Pākehā, which is why the half-castes have increased. In the past Māori women greatly desired Pākehā men and this mistaken practice continues now.
We don’t know why Māori women rush off to Pākehā men: they are from different races; one is white skinned, the other black; they speak different languages; what things do they have in common that the Māori woman wants the Pākehā man? [LP] 59

The writer is almost certainly the editor and Anglican minister, Rēweti Kōhere. In this text he quotes the authority of Pōmare, the first Māori doctor, and highlights the ethnic difference of language and the binary opposites of white and black skins.60

However, Kōhere’s concern is not about racial mixing, so much as maintaining Māori ethnic identity. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century a key anxiety among Māori concerned racial extinction through deaths outnumbering births. Preserving the Māori race was a key motivator for the Young Māori Party, which pursued an agenda prepared to dispense with much of Māori culture in order that Māori might survive into the future as a distinct ethnic group. While this anxiety was beginning to ease by the turn of the century with a small increase in the census figures, in Kōhere’s article it was replaced with an anxiety about extinction through absorption. Some members of the Party, such as Pōmare, thought the horse had already bolted. Indeed two years later Ngata stated that ‘It is not . . . the aim of the Young Maori Party to preserve the Maoris as a separate and distinct race, or consciously combat the influences that tend to bring about the fusion of the Maori race with the European’.61 Kōhere, whose own grandfather had been a European trader, was one of the more conservative of the Young Maori Party intellectuals in terms of wanting to retain Māori language, identity, and the land. Unlike the more prominent members of the movement, Kōhere at this time was turning to the Kotahitanga ideals of the older generation.62 The vision of ‘a new Maori Anglo-Saxon race, or white race, with a dash of the best colored blood in the world’63 was not Kōhere’s, and he stressed that continuing intermarriage was the mechanism for ethnic suicide.

In our opinion, it’s great when Māori marry Māori themselves. These days many Māori youth are keen on Pākehā women. This is something that we, the Māori people, should look to, the keeping of our skin, that of the Māori. The end of the Māori will be our loss amongst the Pākehā. [LP] 64

Kōhere’s anxiety appears to be related to another perennial Māori concern – that Māori were continuing to lose land, and that Māori land was at greater risk when Māori land-owners married Pākehā. He gave two examples: Airini Tonore and Tamahau Mahupuku, both of wealthy Ngati Kahungunu aristocracy, whose lands, Kōhere predicted, would fall into the hands of Pākehā:
A couple of our chiefly people, in blood and in land, are Airini Tonore and Tamahau Mahupuku. Airini married a Pākehā, and her daughter married a Pākehā, tomorrow her grandchildren will marry Pākeha. All her wealth and land will be lost into the hands of the Pākeha, to enrich the Pākeha. Tamahau’s only descendant in the world is a Pākehā half-caste, the mother is Pākehā and her Māori father is dead. Tomorrow all of Tamahau’s lands will be gone to enrich the Pākehā.

In the case of Tamahau, his heiress, Martha Grace, is described as a ‘Pakeha half-caste’, that is, one who is more part of the Pākehā world rather than the Māori one. Köhere was well aware that passing laws to preserve Māori land would be difficult, but Māori were more likely to retain their land if the owners did not marry Pākehā.

There is no law written stopping Māori marrying Pākehā, but there is a law written in the hearts of each tribe, to hold dear. Each person can do with his land as he wishes, but because land is not something man creates but is handed down from the ancestors to the children, it is right to think that the land of us, the Māori, should be left to Māori themselves.

So in this excerpt, from an Anglican Māori-language newspaper in 1907, we see the twin anxieties of late nineteenth-century Māori being played out: firstly, racial demise. This anxiety had been a primary driver for the Young Maori party policy, in particular the improvement of Māori health. The second anxiety concerned the perennial worry over the loss of land. In the past it had been the hard edge of colonization that had been to blame for these problems: confiscation, the Native Land Court and poverty. Now Köhere feared that inter-racial marriage would also be responsible.

**Conclusion**

Data gleaned from the Māori-language niupepa corpus to investigate aspects of Māori political and social history supports some commonly-held ideas about hāwhekaihe, but also throws new light on Māori–hāwhekaihe relations. The low rate of discussion on hāwhekaihe, especially when compared to Pākehā newspaper texts, suggests that in most cases hāwhekaihe did not form a class, caste, or separate ethnic group on the margins of Māori communities, and were generally well-integrated into that society. The paucity of references to hāwhekaihe, and the extremely low rate of ascribing racial characteristics to this group also indicates that the children of inter-racial unions did not present the same ideologically racialized problem within Māori society as it did in the Pākehā world. However, hāwhekaihe were drawn into conflicts between īwi, hapū and whānau over land sales, and over parliamentary politics, both products of colonization. The issue of
hāwhekaihe and access to land was particularly divisive in the South Island, where reserves promised by the government were insufficient for Ngāi Tahu. In order to press for special reserves for hāwhekaihe, the tribe argued that it had been ‘full-blooded’ Māori who had made land deals with the Crown. Despite native land law jurisprudence tending to treat hāwhekaihe and their descendants as Māori, the Crown obliged with a number of acts establishing half-caste reserves in the South Island.

In the North Island, hāwhekaihe and land issues were interwoven with issues of parliamentary representation, with some Māori objecting to hāwhekaihe presuming to think that they could stand as candidates for the Māori seats. The accusations and counter-accusations between the two groups formed a discourse of blame, with each holding the other culpable for the various ills that had befallen the Māori people. This discourse appears in print in the 1870s and 1890s, and references to anti-hāwhekaihe statements at Kotahitanga meetings are also found in the niupepa, indicating that the discourse of blame was most likely prevalent in spoken discourse. Two leading hāwhekaihe politicians caught up in this debate were James Carroll, who as a Liberal cabinet minister was obliged to support unpopular legislation, and Wī Pere whose involvement in the failure of a major Māori land company continued to be resented by some Māori. This discourse had disappeared from the niupepa by the twentieth century, indicating perhaps that it was no longer of concern in the wider Māori society.

Despite the Māori-hāwhekaihe tensions within the political arena, only one article, printed in the Anglican Te Pipiwharauroa, specifically appealed for the cessation of further intermarriage, arguing that it would lead to the disappearance of Māori within the much larger Pākehā community. The writer was aligned with an earlier Young Māori Party discourse which promoted a distinct Māori identity, and unlike Ngata and Pōmare he was not yet ready to accept the inevitability of racial ‘fusion’. The article also reflected a more general Māori concern, that intermarriage would lead to the loss of Māori land.

Hāwhekaihe were problematic for Māori society but not in the same way as in the Pākehā world where they contradicted and threatened the ‘natural’ divisions formulated within the colonial ideology. Paradoxically it was because of colonialism, particularly through Māori being forced to convert their lands into tradeable possessions in the Native Land Court, and to compete for crumbs of power in Parliament, that hāwhekaihe posed problems for Māori. It was during the the 1870s, a period of transition for Māori society as it adjusted to new political realities after the New Zealand Wars, that most references to hāwhekaihe can be found in the niupepa corpus. In contrast, hāwhekaihe are largely absent from the niupepa columns
from 1910, perhaps because after another generation of intermarriage, Māori of mixed-race ancestry were increasingly becoming the norm within Māori society.
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66 TP, July 1907, p.2. ‘Kahore he ture i tuhituhia hei arai i te moe o te Maori i te pakeha, otira he ture ano kua tuhituhia ki te ngakau o ia iwi o ia iwi, kia u, kia mau, ki a ratou ano. Kei te tangata te tikanga mo ona whenua, otira i te mea ehara te whenua i te mea hanga na te tangata engari i tuku iho i nga tupuna ki nga tamariki, he whakaaro tika ano tenei te waiho tonu i nga whenua o taua o te Maori ki te Maori ano.’