

“To His Majesty, King Edward the Seventh”

ANARU EKETONE

At the turn of the twentieth century, Māori had given up the gun and turned to politics and petitions to Parliament to get resolution for the unjust, often illegal actions of the Crown. This essay discusses the evolution of a petition from Māori in the early twentieth century, which was originally addressed to King Edward VII, outlining a number of grievances with the settler government regarding their treatment of Māori in violation of guarantees made under the Treaty of Waitangi.

I was named after my great-grandfather, Anaru Eketone, who was said to be a member of “the Young Maori Party”, a group of educated politically active young Māori men at the beginning of the twentieth century.¹ He was a licensed interpreter and, with his father Pēpene Eketone, ran a small business in Te Kūiti, a small town in the western middle of the North Island, primarily dealing with Native Land Court business. They were heavily involved in Te Rohe Pōtae/King Country affairs in the North Island amongst their principal tribal groups of Ngāti Maniapoto and Waikato, helping landowners navigate the processes of the courts, as well as promoting improved Māori rights.

Anaru died young in 1917 at the age of 37 and a few of his ledgers with land records and whakapapa were passed on to my grandfather. After my grandfather’s death, these ledgers just sat in an apple box that moved around various houses until my aunt recognised them in the porch of an uncle’s house in 1982. She asked for them and a year or so later, because of my interest in whakapapa, she let me have a look at them. They were 15 handwritten books and ledgers with extensive records of whakapapa, land court hearings, waiata, whaikōrero and tribal history. One of the documents I found that was of particular interest was a copy of a petition to King Edward VII. As a budding activist, the reason it stood out to me in 1984 was that many of the issues mentioned in this petition were still current then. There had been almost nothing resolved in 80 years.

The petition was written in a ledger of Māori land court records dated between 17 July 1906 and 14 August 1906 and was referred to in the index as “petition to his majesty from p”.² “P” almost certainly refers to Anaru’s father, Pēpene Eketone, as it mentioned several specific issues Pēpene had spoken about in submissions to a parliamentary select committee six months earlier. Pēpene had presented a large petition on behalf of Te Wherowhero Tāwhiao, the younger brother of the Māori King, King Mahuta, and 276 others, calling for greater Māori control over their lands, and to protect it from “pakehas ... advocating the general confiscation of Native Lands” because Māori were being too slow to open up land in the King Country for European occupation.³

It would be useful at this stage to explain who Pēpene Eketone was. There were a number of sometimes competing leaders in the late nineteenth century in the Waikato Maniapoto area. There was King Mahuta, the head of the Kīngitanga movement and Tupu Taingākawa who had inherited the title of ‘King Maker’ from his father Wiremu Tamehana Tarapīpipi te Waharoa. Other hereditary leaders included Rewi Maniapoto in the north of Te Rohe Pōtae, Ngāti Maniapoto’s tribal territory, Wētere Te Rerenga from Mōkau, and Wahanui based in Te Kūiti, who were all prominent regional leaders of the nineteenth century. However, there was also a

growing group of leaders who came to prominence, not because they came from rangatira families, but because they were the first to get a formal education. Pēpene Eketone was one of these. He had whakapapa connections to many of the Tainui tribes in the Waikato but was not born to be a rangatira. His father, Hone Eketone, was the very first student at the Wesleyan Native Institution in 1844, which was set up to train young Māori leaders for the Methodist ministry.⁴ Hone was eventually sent as an assistant native missionary with his wife Heramāhina, to Mōkau in 1858 where Pēpene was born. With the death of his father in 1862⁵ Pēpene, with his mother and brothers, moved to Kāwhia to a school run by his cousin Erueti Rāpata.⁶ Within months the British had invaded the Waikato region, effectively declaring war on the Tainui tribes. All Pākehā, including mission staff, were forced to leave the King Country and Heramāhina took over as matron of the school her sons attended.⁷ They were educated behind the aukati, the border with the King Country where uninvited Pākehā could not go on pain of death.⁸

After seven or eight years of attending the school there his mother remarried and Pēpene moved to Karakariki, just west of Hamilton,⁹ where he attended the Methodist Mission school run by Maata Pātene.¹⁰ In 1874, when Pēpene was 15 years of age, Cort Schnackenberg, a local missionary, persuaded the Native Affairs Minister, Donald McLean, to subsidise Pēpene's education at Auckland Grammar School,¹¹ where they were going to experiment with allowing Māori boarders into the school. The cost to attend Auckland Grammar was expensive and it was recorded that the family paid ten pounds, Schnackenberg paid two pounds with the Government picking up the balance.¹² Pēpene commenced at Auckland Grammar in May 1874¹³ and quickly showed himself to be an able student; by the end of the year he won his year's prize for spelling¹⁴ and by the end of the following year (1875) he had won the senior high school prize for Geometry.¹⁵

The Methodist missionaries eventually pulled him out of Auckland Grammar as they wanted able students to restart their own secondary school at Three Kings.¹⁶ He was thus taken out of a promising academic environment and put in a school where he had to spend the afternoons of the school day working on the school farm. This led Pēpene to give up on further formal education.

By 1885 Ngāti Maniapoto had made an agreement with the Government to allow the construction of the main trunk railway through Te Rohe Pōtae/King Country. Michael Belgrave's book *Dancing with the King* highlights that Ngāti Maniapoto saw that in "drawn out negotiations a sacred compact had been reached, one where the agreement to accept the sovereignty of Parliament had been made because of a number of clear assurances given to the tribe's leaders".¹⁷ According to Ngāti Maniapoto, they wanted certain guarantees to prevent the loss of their lands, including protection from unfair local government rates and taxes, as well as consultation over legislation that would be applied to them.¹⁸ However, the Crown proved to be an unreliable partner, ignoring guarantees and promises when doing so could benefit the Government's colonising agenda.¹⁹

As the Rohe Pōtae was opening up to the outside world, Pēpene Eketone arrived on the scene fluent in written and spoken English and Māori. He was closely related to many Māori of the Tainui tribe²⁰ and had previously worked as a competent translator. This conjunction of skills, connections and experience meant he was able to take up a large number of opportunities with iwi and the Crown. He was appointed as an assessor to the Native Land Court in 1886,²¹ providing expert advice to the Pākehā judge, and was also involved in representing cases for

Māori there. He appeared before the Land Court hundreds of times, sometimes spending months away from home as far afield as Invercargill in the lower South Island of New Zealand.²²

At the time Māori were becoming increasingly disillusioned with the Crown over its shifting dealings, where promises and guarantees could be discarded with a change in Government, Prime Minister, or, simply in policy.²³ In the 1890s Pēpene argued that the original agreement between the British and Māori in 1840, the Treaty of Waitangi, that allowed British to settle in New Zealand, was the foundation upon which all the laws pertaining to Māori were founded. Pākehā had failed to honour their side of the Treaty by not treating Māori landowners equally with settlers.²⁴ He increasingly became angry at what he called “the deceit of the Pākehā”.²⁵

In 1877 the Chief Justice, Sir James Prendergast, ruled that the Treaty of Waitangi was “a simple nullity” and could be disregarded.²⁶ However, the Crown had the discretion to apply certain parts of the Treaty when it was of benefit to the settler colonialists. The Crown reinstated the right of pre-emption within Article 2 in the 1880s to ensure that Te Rohe Potae/King Country land could only be sold to the Government rather than on the open market.²⁷ This meant that the Crown, the only permitted buyer, did not have to compete, buying land at minimal prices, which they would then sell on the open market for huge profits. By doing this the Government’s burden of paying back New Zealand’s development loans was removed from the taxpayer, with Māori effectively subsidising the building of the railway with profits from Māori land sales reflecting 89.7% of the costs by 1903.²⁸

The deliberate undervaluing of Māori land which prevented just prices, caused a great deal of anger amongst Māori.²⁹ Pēpene fought for Māori to hold onto their lands, use them profitably and if there was any land not required then it could be sold to Pākehā at a fair price.³⁰

With the deaths of the traditional Ngāti Maniapoto leaders and three successive marriages to the daughters of influential chiefs, Pēpene increasingly became a significant leader for Ngāti Maniapoto and became a ‘go to’ person when dealing with the Crown. In 1903 he was an author and organiser of the “Maniapoto Covenant” that sought to return unity to the tribe.³¹ He also ran unsuccessfully for Parliament eight times and met with numerous Māori and Pākehā leaders.³²

At this time colonists were putting considerable pressure on the Government to open up more and more land for settlement and many Māori, like Pēpene Eketone, were advocating for leasehold arrangements so as to hold on to their ancestral land. To many settlers this was unacceptable; as the *Auckland Star* reported, “the English people did not immigrate into New Zealand for the purpose of becoming tenants of a Maori committee”.³³ In 1897 Pēpene Eketone and 163 others petitioned Parliament asking that all restrictions be removed from the Māori lands of Te Rohe Pōtae/King Country “in order that they may deal with them as they deem fit”.³⁴ The Government refused, saying that they were trying to protect Māori from land speculators;³⁵ in fact they needed the right of pre-emption, and the cheap land it provided, to pay back the large loans they had arranged to pay for the building of the railway.³⁶

In 1904 Pēpene, on behalf of himself and 388 others, forwarded another petition to Parliament “praying that the Maoris may be placed on the same footing as Europeans with regard to dealing with their lands.”³⁷ The chairman of the Native Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives replied with a common response at the time that, “I am directed to report that, as these petitions refer to a question of policy, the Committee offers no opinion as to their

merits, but recommends that they be referred to the Government for consideration”.³⁸ However, the Government did nothing.

Pēpene was elected on to the Hikairo-Maniapoto-Tuwharetoa Maori Land District Council from 1902-1905.³⁹ The Land Council (created under the Maori Lands Administration Act 1900) was established to both lease land and sell excess land on behalf of owners. However, the Government decided in 1905 that the Council was not disposing of land quickly enough and so chose to replace the three elected Māori members with two Pākehā and one Government-approved Māori representative.⁴⁰ In response Pēpene led a delegation to Parliament and presented evidence on behalf of the now renamed Tuwharetoa-Maniapoto council.⁴¹ His defining statement was “we want to be treated by legislation as though we were responsible human beings; we do not want to be treated as we have been hitherto under every Act passed by the Legislature as mere things”.⁴² He argued that the Treaty of Waitangi protected Māori rights, that Article 3 promised equality with Pākehā, and that they should have the same access to cheap Government loans to develop land as Pākehā had. They wanted a Land Council that could have two Pākehā members but must have three elected Māori owners. They also offered 42-year leases rather than freehold sales so that settlers could have security of tenure, while Māori had time to develop western farming practices. They wanted Māori villages to be inalienable and immune from local government rates and taxes, as many were not part of the cash economy and so were unable to afford these expenses.⁴³

The committee’s reply was again “That as this petition refers to a question of policy the committee has no recommendation to make.”⁴⁴ They may not have understood fully the nuances of parliamentary processes, but yet another “brush off” would have been humiliating as well as disheartening. The regularity with which such petitions were treated in this way is one of the major complaints mentioned in the petition mentioned below. Māori had been encouraged to make petitions, but the petitioners felt they were being continually dismissed by a Government who had no interest in dealing fairly with Māori. In response Ngāti Maniapoto decided to try a personal approach, to write a petition to King Edward the Seventh. Pēpene probably drafted the petition, a copy of which sits in one of Anaru Eketone’s ledgers between Māori land court records dated 17 July 1906 and 14 August 1906.⁴⁵

The petition starts off by laying a framework for why the King should look at it. Firstly, that in 1834, the British had recognised that Māori were independent and had encouraged Māori to select a national flag that was under British protection.

It skips past the 1835 Declaration of Independence, presumably as Ngāti Maniapoto never signed it, and moves straight to the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840, acknowledging the Crown’s sovereignty over the islands of New Zealand. It spells out the guarantee of property rights under Article 2 of the Treaty and reminds the King of Article 3 and his mother Queen Victoria’s protection over them imparting to them “all the rights and privileges of British subjects”.

The petition then goes on to say that the settlers had “passed oppressive laws” and complains about how various laws had ignored and swept away Māori property rights, and how the pre-emption clause of the Treaty was reintroduced so that the Crown could buy an acre of King Country land for only three shillings (30 cents) then on-sell it for up to four pounds (eight dollars).

The petition also draws attention to how Māori, although having four seats in Parliament, had no political power, claiming that they always had to vote with the Government of the day; how rates that did not apply to Pākehā land could be imposed on Māori land to force them to sell; how legislation was passed to force Māori to sell land without their consent, and how a lot of Māori lands were placed in the hands of a ‘trustee’ who could lease them in perpetuity and place administrative charges for handling the land so little money ever made it back to the owners.

The petition highlighted how all these actions violated Article 2 of the Treaty and that Māori had exhausted all means for obtaining redress in the colony. It states, “That your petitioners have thus suffered grievous injustice in the past by harsh and harassing restrictive legislation and have borne with patience those unjust laws ... [and] humbly pray your Majesty’s intervention to restrain the Government of New Zealand from compulsory taking remnants of our lands without the consent of all the native owners.”⁴⁶ After they have secured what they need for themselves, in the same way Pākehā trust lands are, Pēpene then offers to release excess lands for settlement. The document also stressed the Māori desire for more agricultural education, and for equality in Parliament based on equal representation.

Pēpene finished off by reminding the King that the Treaty of Waitangi was between the independent chiefs and the Crown, and they had not been consulted or informed that the “sovereign might delegate the powers of the Treaty to a third party”,⁴⁷ namely the settler government.

Despite the range of issues covered, the petition was relatively succinct, at 2,249 words, very well written with comprehensive punctuation.

What happened next, I can only surmise. Pēpene had little influence outside his tribal connections. As mentioned above, he tried eight times to get into Parliament over his lifetime but, lacking support outside his own tribe, was defeated each time.⁴⁸ At the same time other more charismatic and influential leaders, like Tupu Taingākawa from Ngāti Hauā, were traversing the country in support of taking his own petition to King Edward VII.

Pēpene’s son Anaru became associated with Taingākawa, sometimes accompanying him,⁴⁹ even representing him on several occasions in 1907.⁵⁰ Taingākawa, splitting from the official Kīngitanga candidate, also became one of Pēpene’s political supporters, travelling with him on the political campaign for the 1909 election.⁵¹ It appears they started to meld their petitions together with Taingākawa continually making amendments and alterations to attract other iwi to the cause. Emissaries were sent to the Northland tribal group of Ngā Puhi, although they were reluctant to work with their old enemies from the Waikato region.⁵²

An abbreviated version of this new petition was sent to the Governor, Lord Plunket, in September 1907 because they were told, for some reason, they had to hurry up and get one in on the understanding that they would send the fuller document later. Plunket, however, sent the abridged version off to King Edward but told Taingākawa it would not do much good because it lacked detail.⁵³

The Prime Minister read it and sent a memo:

“His Excellency’s memorandum (No. 53) of the 30th August, respecting the petition to His Majesty to disallow certain Native Acts, begs to observe that the Acts in

question are in conflict neither with the Constitution Act nor the Treaty of Waitangi. They are the deliberate expression of the will of Parliament on matters well within its constitutional powers."⁵⁴

Almost a year later the *Waikato Argus* reported that:

*The chief Taingākawa has just received a reply from the King, through the secretary for the colonies, that the king was assured that the New Zealand Government would act in the best interests of the native people.*⁵⁵

Ngāti Maniapoto did not greet this response favourably and as a result the Governor, the Prime Minister and all four Māori MPs went to Waikato to meet with Taingākawa. Governor Plunket told the iwi gathered that it was a waste of time going to visit King Edward as they would just be told to go back and sort things out in New Zealand as the British did not have the authority to overrule the New Zealand Parliament.⁵⁶

However Plunket did admit that the Treaty of Waitangi had not been honoured stating:

*As to the Treaty of Waitangi not being carried out in the original terms; that is perfectly true and no one denies it; but times have changed, what was suitable at one time is certainly not suitable for another.*⁵⁷

Governor Plunket went further saying:

*I would remind you that the governor of the colony is a perfectly independent person, with no axe to grind, no one to serve and absolutely uninfluenced by any political situation.*⁵⁸

This is probably when Taingākawa decided to send the full petition to the Governor, rather than to the King, as he was the highest authority in the land.

In October 1909 the petition, with the names of nearly 30,000 of its supporters, finally made its way to the Governor.⁵⁹ Taingākawa again said that if "the New Zealand Government did not deal with the matter to their satisfaction he would go to England and present the petition to King Edward himself."⁶⁰

The petition in Archives New Zealand is an English translation of the 1909 petition. It starts off the same as Pēpene's petition outlining the historical reasons for the Crown's relationship with Māori, the choosing of the flag, and the signing of the Treaty. Although not 'word for word' it looks like the first page of Pēpene's petition had been translated into Māori and then back into English because it says the same thing, although there are some differences in the English phrasing.

It argues the case for why the King had the authority and responsibility to respond to them, then the petitioners set out their grievances: that the "sacred guarantees"⁶¹ of the Treaty of Waitangi "have been trampled upon"; that their lands were "plundered" and rights taken away and "nullified", with Māori people being "suppressed and killed".⁶²

They then set out specific reasons for their petition:

- that the Treaty of Waitangi had not been adhered to;
- large areas of land that were to be protected had been lost;
- land confiscations through war had taken place;

- lands were purchased in breach of the right of pre-emption;
- missionaries had acquired their land wrongly;
- the Native Land Court was trampling “the mana [prestige] and the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi”,⁶³
- and that laws were made to deliberately “plunder” Māori lands.

All this had led to a great deal of Māori poverty and the loss of mana with the Government setting out to “destroy the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi”. The petition then set specific complaints against the Government, regarding pre-emption, land confiscations, various land and mining acts, native land administration and land court activities. This petition also included issues such as the restrictions on shooting native birds, gathering shellfish and fishing, and the imposition of dog taxes.

Taingākawa’s petition was around 4,700 words and a bit repetitive. For example it restates Article Two six times:

*Article the second of the Treaty confirms and guarantees by Queen Victoria to the Chiefs, Tribes, Families, and Individuals of New Zealand, the full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their LANDS, ESTATES, FORESTS, FISHERIES, and other properties, which they, collectively, or individually, possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession.*⁶⁴

Each time it emphasises something different, one time focusing on forests, the next time on sea fisheries, and so on. This was presumably an oratorical device, where the reading of the complaint, followed by the second article contradicting it, would have reinforced the argument. Unfortunately, in a written document it becomes tedious. The overarching theme was that the Treaty of Waitangi was signed on behalf of Queen Victoria and was a solemn covenant between herself and the Māori people, that her Government had violated that agreement in their rush to plunder New Zealand, and that they expected her son, King Edward VII, to fulfill her guarantees.

Governor Plunket replied on the 7th December 1909, although the Government actually wrote the response, with the Governor merely signing it. He asked for only one change that emphasized that he and the Government were in agreement. The reply, directly contradicting the statements and guarantees that they had made at Waikato, included such responses as:

*I have read your petition and have carefully studied the several questions you have raised and the claims you make in respect thereof. I have always found the Maoris to be fair and reasonable, but it is clear to me that you have not had the soundest of advice when you assert that the Maoris have been plundered of their lands and otherwise wronged by the Parliament and Government of New Zealand.*⁶⁵

*The spirit and intent of the Treaty of Waitangi has been well observed. Many laws have been passed for that purpose and in no case have the Maoris been deprived of their lands or possessions.*⁶⁶

*It is true that some of their lands were confiscated in the time of the war, but that was because of the war. Maoris who fought against the Queen could not complain if they lost their lands. It was an old Maori law for the conquering people to take the land of the vanquished.*⁶⁷

*European laws must prevail, but in passing them the uniform aim and purpose of both the Parliament and the Government have always been to safeguard the interests of the Maoris.*⁶⁸

*Their lands were never taken from them except for public purposes and on payment of full compensation. It is true that in certain cases public roads have been laid off through their land, but they opened up the land and made it more valuable.*⁶⁹

*You complain that Europeans have purchased your land. If they did, you sold it.*⁷⁰

*Whilst I have been Governor of New Zealand, the welfare of the Maoris has always been dear to me, and both the Parliament and the Government have striven to promote it. And, as in my time, so also was it in the time of the former Governors. They have all striven to promote the happiness and prosperity of the Maoris and preserve to them their lands and possessions.*⁷¹

It is hard to see how they could have been more dismissive or condescending. The petition was said to have been signed by 30,000 Māori, but Āpirana Ngata, the Member of Parliament for Eastern Maori, was also disparaging saying there was not 30,000 Māori able to sign their names.⁷² And this has always been a controversial side of Ngata regarding Māori land policy. On one hand he is known to have been protective of Māori lands, and yet in other instances he was part of the wider Seddon-Ward Liberal Government's schemes to alienate lands from Māori. And this needs to be fully explored by scholars in the future.⁷³

Ngata's comments were possibly true, but even if individuals did not sign their names, they had their names recorded. For example, one of the pages for Ngāti Koata at Whangarae had five of the Elkington family; John, Hēmi, Rātapu, Parehauraki and Ruihi all seemingly written in the same hand.⁷⁴ This of course could have been a family member writing all his family to boost numbers, but could just as easily have been at their instigation.

Taingākawa had found the Government immovable when trying to force them to honour the commitments made in the Treaty of Waitangi. After the failure of the petition, he accompanied the Māori King Te Rata to London in 1914 to press their case. They got to meet King George V, but were again told their claims would be referred back to the New Zealand Government.⁷⁵

In 1924 Taingākawa and Pēpene went with T.W. Rātana's delegation to London to again see King George V.⁷⁶ However, Sir James Allen, New Zealand's High Commissioner, blocked access to the king by lying to the British that the petitioners did not have support from Māori.⁷⁷ Taingākawa, Pēpene and Rātana also went to meet with the League of Nations in Geneva to seek justice there, but again James Allen was able to block them and a low level secretary was directed to send them off.⁷⁸

Pēpene's life was very much a rear-guard struggle, fighting a losing battle. The major issues that Pēpene fought for were:

- the preservation of the land for present and future generations;
- that enough land for Māori to live off would be inalienable;
- training for Māori in western farming techniques;
- that land Māori did not require would be leased;

- the sale of any land to be treated equally with land owned by Europeans;
- Māori being able to access the same development loans as Pākehā;
- and land could only be passed on (inherited) by whakapapa (blood relations).⁷⁹

It would be a sad story if it ended here.

While Pēpene was unable to persuade Parliament or the Governor to listen to his calls for the honouring of the Treaty and equal rights and treatment for Māori, it was Pēpene's great grandson, Koro Wētere, as the MP for Western Māori and Minister of Māori Affairs, who was able to get the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act passed through Parliament in 1985. This empowered the Waitangi Tribunal to address Māori claims of breaches of the Treaty back to 1840 allowing for the Treaty settlements that subsequently occurred.⁸⁰ Geoffrey Palmer, the Deputy Prime Minister in 1985 also wrote of how he and Wētere put together a Cabinet paper that required Government departments to look at their Treaty of Waitangi obligations. In June 1986 Cabinet agreed that all future legislation referred to Cabinet at the policy approval stage should draw attention to any implications for the recognition of the Treaty.⁸¹ Koro Wētere's other work included legislation that led to the passing of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 that ensured the protections over Māori land that Māori had been calling for over 100 years.⁸²

The changes achieved by Koro Wētere and others have changed the world we live in from what it was in the early 1980s. So while in 1984 when I had discovered Pēpene's original petition very few of the issues of Pēpene raised had been resolved, by the time of the death of Koro Wētere in 2018, much had been achieved through the large number of claims settled by the Waitangi Tribunal and the increased protection of Māori land.

For Ngāti Maniapoto, finally in September 2022, after 30 long years of negotiations, (and might I add, 130 years of activism by Pēpene and his descendants) the New Zealand Parliament passed the Maniapoto Claims Settlement Act. The Act purports to "settle all historical Treaty of Waitangi claims of Maniapoto resulting from acts or omissions by the Crown before 21 September 1992", and provides financial and commercial redress of \$165 million.⁸³ The settling of this claim means an end to the struggles of Pēpene Eketone and countless other Ngāti Maniapoto leaders to have the Crown adhere to the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi. While in dollar terms the settlement is a small proportion of what was lost, it does mean that the iwi can put even more effort into developing a promising future for the iwi.

¹ "Local and general news", *New Zealand Herald*, 14 November 1917, 6.

² Unpublished papers held by Anaru Eketone (Eketone whānau papers), Book 11, 007.

³ "Native Affairs Committee: Report on the Petition of Te Wherowhero Tawhiao and Two Hundred and Seventy-six Others re Maori Land Councils Bill, together with Minutes of Evidence. (Mr. R.M. Houston, Chairman)", *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (New Zealand)* [AJHR], I-3b (1905), 3.

⁴ R. Hobbs, *Wesleyan Native Institution: Established in 1844 by Rev. W. Lawry, General Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions and Rev. Thos Buddle* (Auckland: Brett Printing & Publishing, 1906).

-
- ⁵ Letter, Rev. Cort H. Schnackenberg to Rev. Thomas Buddle, 8/1862, in *Manuscripts and Typescripts of Letterbooks etc.* 11 May 1846–19 July 1880. Methodist Theological Archives, St John’s College, Auckland.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁸ Tony Simpson, *Te Riri Pakeha: The White Man’s Anger: The Destruction of Maori Identity* (Martinborough, New Zealand: Alister Taylor, 1979), 185.
- ⁹ “A Maori wedding”, *Daily Southern Cross*, 17 March 1871, 3.
- ¹⁰ Maxine Stephenson, “Setting the record straight: the selection, subordination and silencing of Maata Patene, teacher”, *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 41, no.1 (2009): 11.
- ¹¹ Letter, Rev. Cort H. Schnackenberg, to D.M. MacLean, 18/3/1874, in *Manuscripts and Typescripts*.
- ¹² Letter, Rev. Cort H. Schnackenberg to Rev. H.H. Lawry, 8/9/1874, in *Manuscripts and Typescripts*.
- ¹³ Letter, Rev. Cort H. Schnackenberg to Rev. H.H. Lawry, 19/5/1874, in *Manuscripts and Typescripts*.
- ¹⁴ “Auckland College, Distribution of Prizes”, *New Zealand Herald*, 8 December 1874, 3.
- ¹⁵ “Auckland College”, *New Zealand Herald*, 16 December 1875, 3.
- ¹⁶ Letter, Rev. Cort H. Schnackenberg to Rev. H.H. Lawry, 29/8/1876, in *Manuscripts and Typescripts*.
- ¹⁷ Michael Belgrave, *Dancing with the King* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2017), 364.
- ¹⁸ T.J. Hearn, *Māori Economic Development in Te Rohe Potae Inquiry District c. 1885 to c.2006* (Wellington: Ministry of Justice, 2014), 50. Commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal for Te Rohe Potae Inquiry (Wai 898).
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*
- ²⁰ Anaru Eketone, “Land Politics and Faith: Pepene Eketone 1858-1933”, *By Their Fruits You Will Know Them: Early Māori Leaders in the Mormon Church*, ed. Selwyn Katene (Wellington: Steele Roberts, 2017), 76.
- ²¹ *New Zealand Gazette*, 21 October 1886.
- ²² Eketone, “Land Politics and Faith”, 82.
- ²³ *ibid*, 83.
- ²⁴ “Maoris and the law”, *Auckland Star*, 23 July 1904, 5.
- ²⁵ Francis W. Kirkham, *Francis Kirkham Journals 1896–1899*, vol 1-12, 10 April 1897, Harold B. Lee Library Brigham Young University, Provo: Utah, United States. at lib.byu.edu/collections/mormon-missionary-diaries/ (accessed 7 December 2022).
- ²⁶ Claudia Orange, *The Treaty of Waitangi* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1987), 187.
- ²⁷ Hearn, *Māori Economic Development*, 60.
- ²⁸ *ibid*, 70.
- ²⁹ Unpublished papers held by Anaru Eketone (Eketone whānau papers), Book 11, 029.
- ³⁰ “Native Affairs Committee”, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, I-3b (1905), 4.
- ³¹ Tom Roa, Translation of Te Kawenata o Ngati Maniapoto me ona hapu maha, Appendix I - Wai 898, H009 (b) (1), 2014, 14, *Te Rohe Potae Claim*, Wai 898, Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington.
- ³² Eketone, “Land Politics and Faith”, 75-97.

-
- ³³ “The Evening Star”, *Auckland Star*, 16 February 1885, 2.
- ³⁴ “Native Affairs Committee (Reports of the). Ngā Kupu a te Komiti o te Runanga mo nga Mea Maori. (Mr. Houston, Chairman)”, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, I-03, (1897), 5.
- ³⁵ “Maori Lands”, *The Colonist*, 5 April 1898, 2.
- ³⁶ Hearn, *Māori Economic Development*, 70.
- ³⁷ “Native Affairs Committee (Reports of the). Ngā Kupu a te Komiti o te Runanga mo nga Mea Maori. (Mr. Houston, Chairman)”, *AJHR*, I-03 (1904).
- ³⁸ “Native Affairs Committee (Reports of the). Ngā Kupu a te Komiti o te Runanga mo nga Mea Maori. (Mr. Houston, Chairman)”, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, I-03 (1904), 28.
- ³⁹ Hearn, *Māori Economic Development*, 60.
- ⁴⁰ Donald M. Loveridge, *Maori Land Councils and Maori Land Boards: A Historical Overview 1900 to 1952*, (Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1996), 61.
- ⁴¹ “Native Affairs Committee”, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, I-3b (1905), 3.
- ⁴² *ibid.*
- ⁴³ *ibid.*, 2.
- ⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 1.
- ⁴⁵ Unpublished papers held by Anaru Eketone (Eketone whānau papers), Book 11, 013-021.
- ⁴⁶ *ibid.*, 018.
- ⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 020.
- ⁴⁸ Angela Ballara. “Eketone, Pēpene”, *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, first published in 1996, updated March, 2014. Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/3e3/eketone-pepene> (accessed 7 December 2022)
- ⁴⁹ *Auckland Star*, 22 August 1907, 2.
- ⁵⁰ “Chief Taingakawa Te Waharoa’s Opinion”, *Bay of Plenty Times*, 6 July 1908, 2.
- ⁵¹ “District Pars”, *King Country Chronicle*, 5 November 1908, 2.
- ⁵² “The Waikato Maori Movement”, *New Zealand Mail*, 24 July 1907, 63.
- ⁵³ “Despatches from the Governor of New Zealand to the Secretary of State for the Colonies”, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, A-01 (1908), 6-7.
- ⁵⁴ *ibid.*
- ⁵⁵ “Road Construction”, *Waikato Argus*, 2 September 1908, 4.
- ⁵⁶ “An Historic Gathering”, *Auckland Star*, 19 March 1908, 3.
- ⁵⁷ “A big Maori meeting”, *Waikato Argus*, 19 March 1908, 2.
- ⁵⁸ *ibid.*
- ⁵⁹ Much of the historiography relating to the beginning of the twentieth century largely ignores Ngāti Maniapoto land issues. For example, Michael Bassett’s biography of Joseph Ward who was Prime Minister (1906-1912) at the time of the petitions only briefly mentions Māori land issues in Northland and the Bay of Plenty. See Michael Bassett, *Sir Joseph Ward* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1993) 160-164.
- ⁶⁰ “Maori Chief’s Petition”, *The Colonist*, 18 October 1909, 4.
- ⁶¹ ‘T. Taingakawa, For his Excellency the Governor. Translation of the Petition, Presented to his Excellency on the 7th Inst. By the Maori Chiefs T. Taingakawa, and others October 1909’, 4, Item R12726579, MA24, Archives New Zealand, Wellington,
- ⁶² *ibid.*
- ⁶³ *ibid.*, 5.

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 2.

⁶⁵ ‘Lord Plunket, To Taingakawa, Te Mete Rau Kawa and the other Maoris whose petition was presented to me on the 7 December 1909’, 1, Item R12726579, MA24, Archives New Zealand, Wellington, 1909.

⁶⁶ *ibid.*

⁶⁷ *ibid.*

⁶⁸ *ibid.*, 2.

⁶⁹ *ibid.*

⁷⁰ *ibid.*

⁷¹ *ibid.*, 4.

⁷² “Mr Massey and the Natives”, *Poverty Bay Herald*, 6 September 1910, 5.

⁷³ See Ranginui Walker’s discussion on the fine lines that Ngata had to navigate in regard to Māori land legislation, and also Judith Binney’s references to Ngata’s stances towards Tūhoe lands in the Te Urewera. Ranginui Walker, *He Tipua. The Life and Times of Sir Āpirana Ngata* (Auckland: Penguin, 2005); Judith Binney, *Encircled Lands. Te Urewera, 1820-1921* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2009).

⁷⁴ ‘T. Taingakawa, For his Excellency the Governor. Translation of the Petition, Presented to his Excellency on the 7th Inst. By the Maori Chiefs T. Taingakawa, and others October 1909’, page unnumbered Item R12726579, MA24, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.

⁷⁵ Michael King, *Te Puea*, (Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1982), 75.

⁷⁶ “Ratana’s Party en Route to England”, *Evening Post*, 12 April 1924, 11.

⁷⁷ Newman, Keith, *Ratana Revisited: An Unfinished Legacy* (Auckland: Reed, 2006), 132.

⁷⁸ *ibid.*, 139.

⁷⁹ Eketone, ‘Land Politics and Faith’, 91-92.

⁸⁰ Alan Ward, *An Unsettled History: Treaty Claims in New Zealand Today* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1999), 30.

⁸¹ Geoffrey Palmer, “Maori, the Treaty and the Constitution”, *Maori Law Review*, June 2013. <http://maorilawreview.co.nz/2013/06/maori-the-treaty-and-the-constitution-rt-hon-sir-geoffrey-palmer-qc/> (accessed 19 March 2019).

⁸² Mason Durie, *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination* (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1998), 136.

⁸³ ‘Maniapoto Claims Settlement Bill, 2022, Commentary’, <https://legislation.govt.nz/bill/government/2021/0104/latest/whole.html#LMS295669> (accessed 7 December 2022)