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Ngati Raukawa in Tauranga Moana

This Commission requires a report covering:

a) Ngati Raukawa relations with Maori of Tauranga Moana; and their collective relations with the Crown from initial contact to the present day;

b) Crown acquisitions of Ngati Raukawa lands and resources in the Tauranga Moana district;

c) Ngati Raukawa experiences of the Native Land Court and associated and successor organisations in Tauranga Moana;

d) Ngati Raukawa lands and resources in Tauranga Moana today.

Evidence already before the Tribunal, however, covers those points about as well as practicable for purposes of assessing Treaty-issues between the Crown and Ngati Raukawa in Tauranga Moana. This is not to say that further research into Crown-Maori relations in Tauranga Moana may not help assess wider Maori claims in the area -- only that further research is unlikely to clarify these Tauranga-specific claims insofar as they are unique to Crown-Ngati Raukawa. ¹

¹For example, suppose the facts remain unresolved regarding the adequacy of consultation with Maori on the Mangapapa Power Scheme. This point might be researched further on behalf of all interested parties, but given the nature of Ngati Raukawa interests in the area, it would hardly be possible to improve on our
To date, all observers trace Ngati Raukawa interests in Tauranga Moana to (at most) seven hapu, located in two broad areas:

1) in the upper Kaimai area --
   a) Ngati Motai,
   b) Ngati Kahu,
   c) Ngati Rangi,
   d) Ngati Te Apunga,
   e) Ngati Kirihiki, and
   f) Ngati Pango;
2) and in the Katikati area --
   a) Ngati Tara [aka Ngati Koi].

Some also characterise Pirirakau interests -- at Te Irihanga and Waimanu -- as partially Ngati Raukawa. We will discuss these separately from the above hapu and interests.

Through the above hapu, there are recognised Ngati Raukawa claims/interests in (at most) five particular places:
1) several of the confiscation Reserve Lots at Wairoa (Bethlehem),
2) Mangatotara No 2,
3) Poripori Block,
4) Kaimai block, and
5) Katikati/Te Puna.

O'Malley and Ward, Kahotea, and Stokes all emphasize that customary claims/interests in all of these areas are unusually obscure, fluid, and/or complex compared to most areas.

current understanding of how consultation affected Ngati Raukawa interests as distinct from other Maori interests. This paper argues only that, while there might (or might not) be more research to do on issues in Tauranga Moana, it would be inaccurate, inefficient, and arguably inequitable to devote further research to them as "Ngati Raukawa issues" per se.
Despite this, though, they appear to have sketched-in Ngati Raukawa’s place in the overall Tauranga Moana Treaty claims admirably well.  

I will very briefly summarize each of these hapu’s claims to each of the sets of interests, to clarify these other commentators’ mutual conclusion of ‘vagueness.’

Ngati Rangi and Ngati Kahu

Ngati Rangi is today "incorporated into" Ngati Kahu. Ngati Kahu live at Tauranga and retain part of their confiscation Reserve Lot. The awards of these lands under the Tauranga District Lands Acts 1867 and 1868 have been carefully described several times, especially by Stokes and Coffin. Stokes has also transcribed all of the minutes of these Commission awards, and these are now on record at the Tribunal. These minutes and awards gave only rudimentary explanations of why people were awarded which spots, and so they conceal more than they reveal about customary interests.

Ngati Motai and Ngati Apunga

Ngati Kahu are intermarried with a Ngati Raukawa hapu from Kuranui (west of the Kaimai’s), named Ngati Motai. Ngati Motai and another Ngati Raukawa hapu, Ngati Te Apungu, were two of the many "principal owners" to which Commissioner Brabant awarded interests in the Kaimai block. When people speak of Ngati Motai having interests in Tauranga Moana, they apparently are speaking mainly of these Ngati Kahu links and this Kaimai block award.

---

3 Kahotea, p 1.
5 Stokes, Vol 2, pp 143-144.
6 See eg Kahotea, p 8.
Now, Stokes identified two distinct *kinds* of land blocks in the upper Kaimai area: those "clearly identified with their hapu" *versus* those with "numerous and complex" claims.\(^7\) She places the Kaimai block amongst the latter. Regarding the nature or extent of Ngati Motai interests, other than the Commissioner's award itself (above), the primary evidence of Ngati Motai's interests in Kaimai block appears to be the Ngati Kahu-to-Ngati Mokai whakapapa, given by Billy Henry (of Ngati Kirihika).\(^8\)

Likewise, it appears difficult to assess the nature of the Ngati Te Apunga part of the Kaimai award much further than has already been done. The Commissioner lists them as claiming by a tipuna named Tumoana. In my reading of Land Court minutes for the Patetere area (up to 1882 so far – well past the initial block hearings containing the freshest and most sustained testimonies of hapu histories and movements), I have not learned any further background on Ngati Te Apunga.\(^9\) Below, though, I describe Stokes' and Kahotea's coverage of *Kaimai block* issues; by covering the issues relevant to the only Tauranga block in which Te Apunga was awarded interests, these authors have probably covered most of the Tauranga-related issues peculiar to that hapu.\(^10\)

**Ngati Kirihiki**

The Kaimai block also houses two of the other recognised sets of Ngati Raukawa interests in Tauranga Moana. The Commissioner permitted the "principal awardees" to "allow in" others to his awards. They allowed in one individual, Hori Ngatai, and eleven hapu, one of which was a Ngati Raukawa group, Ngati Kirihiki.\(^11\)

---

\(^7\) Stokes, Vol 2 p 143.
\(^8\) Kahotea, pp 38-41.
\(^9\) Having read the Minute Books for this region up to 1882, Ngati Apunga only appear so far in the June 1880 owners' lists submitted by James Russell for the Whaiti Kuranui block, which was being heard primarily to determine the proper recipients of the proceeds from the nearly-completed sale. Waikato MB 6 fol 13-15.
\(^10\) Any further relevant information that turns up in my research into lands closer to Ngati Te Apunga's traditional rohe can be submitted later.
Ngati Kirihiki's award seems almost certainly in recognition of their occupancy in the area since the 1830's, when they fled there as a refuge from Ngati Haua and Te Arawa fighting in their usual Kirihiki homeland, Patetere.

Regardless, the main 19th century Treaty issue at Kaimai block is the lifting of the restrictions on alienation, enabling the rapid sale of the block – and Kahotea has described this quite thoroughly. Further, Professor Stokes' report on the Ngamanawa Forest Incorporation gives a detailed and balanced history of the partition, sale and modern administration of all the remaining Ngati Raukawa interests in Kaimai block (as well as for the other interests comprised in the current Ngamanawa amalgamation -- none of which are Ngati Raukawa-based).  

Ngati Pango

The last upper Kaimai group, Ngati Pango, today consists of six households in Tauranga. The Commissioners last century awarded Ngati Pango interests in two blocks: Mangatotara No 2 and Poripori. These interests were sold in the 1880's; Kahotea has suggested further research is needed to assess the impact of the removal of these alienation restrictions. These, however, would not appear to differ significantly from the impacts of landlessness generally, which is the focus of Coffin's report.

Kahotea's other main concern here is to examine whether Commissioners and later Land Courts wrongly dispossessed Ngati Pango by awarding Ngati Kuku interests in the Poripori block. This issue does not seem possible to decide at this remove, at least by reference to written sources.

12 Kahotea, pp 128-133.
15 Kahotea, p iv. Coffin, passim.
16 Kahotea, pp 133-140.
Summary of Issues around Kaimai and Wairoa

The consistent strand linking these Upper Kaimai and Wairoa hapu and lands is that their customary interests are unusually obscure, fluid, and vague. This arises from three different reasons:

1) The act of confiscation legally extinguished the customary interests, which were then replaced by the Commissioners' awards described above. This has been researched very well, and it has been repeatedly pointed out that as a result of their extinguishment, these same customary interests were forcibly obscured. This has been widely recognized as a blatant breach of the Treaty of Waitangi.

2) The boundary "line" from Weraiti to Puwhenua separating Patetere from Tauranga Moana is such an effective physical barrier (preventing easy East-West movement of any large groups), that it is, paradoxically, a very poor social barrier (allowing great fluidity back and forth across it, with minimal threat of 'conquest' either way). Hence the "complexity" of interests Stokes and others speak of in the upper Kaimai blocks.17

3) Kahotea emphasizes the modern hapu's ancestral roots to Ngati Raukawa via Ngamarama.18 The difficulty here is as observed by MacKay in the 1860's: there are about two hundred years of non-occupancy and/or subordinate occupancy intervening between any "original" Ngati Raukawa/ Ngamarama interests in Tauranga Moana and the mid nineteenth century.19 In terms of their respective self-images, Ngati Kahu, Ngati Pango, and Ngati Rangi might well emphasize their particularly ancient origins in Ngamarama. It seems implausible, however, to base land claims too narrowly on these grounds, and to ignore the centuries of 'grace' of their large and powerful invaders, neighbours, and in-laws, Ngati Ranginui and Ngaiterangi.

17 Note that Stokes, Vol 2 p 141, treats Ngati Raukawa as essentially an "adjacent tribe" that "encroaches" into the Tauranga side of the Kaimai bush.
18 See e.g. Kahotea, pp 19-21 and 38-44.
Summary of Issues around Katikati

This last point applies also to the Ngati Raukawa interests to the north at Katikati. The minutes for the 1870 hearing of the Owharoa block (near Ohinemuri) describe how a Ngati Raukawa hapu called Ngati Tara migrated east in the time of Ngamarama, and invaded as far south as Katikati. On the basis of occupation dating from this time Ngati Tara were awarded the Owharoa block. The same hearings make clear, though, that by all accounts this Ngati Raukawa group did not succeed in holding its spoils at Katikati. Around 1700, a Ngamarama hapu named Ngati Remu forced Ngati Raukawa from Katikati. Ngati Tamatera's interests in Katikati apparently then arose when they (at the behest of the Ngati Tara remnant at Ohinemuri) drove Ngati Remu/ Ngamarama finally from the area.

The Ngati Raukawa roots, therefore, were deemed "good" for purposes of interests at Owharoa, but not for Katikati, where they had lost possession for so long -- despite their kin- and social-ties with those who regained possession, Ngati Tamatera.

Conclusion

All of this suggests that further research is unlikely to clarify Tauranga-specific claims insofar as they are unique to Crown-Ngati Raukawa into Tauranga Moana claims. This is not to say that further research into Crown-Maori relations in Tauranga Moana may not help assess wider Maori claims in that region; only that any such further research should be focused geographically and topically, not genealogically.

20 Hauraki MB 5 fol 1-167.
21 The Land Court minutes do not appear to give any good chronological clues for when Ngati Remu drove back Ngati Tara from Katikati. However, according to O'Malley and Ward, pp 6-7, the 1867 Commission awards rejected Ngati Raukawa claims for Katikati on the basis that they had not occupied Katikati for 200 hundred years.
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