

APPENDIX III

A LEGACY OF PROTEST

Following the survey of Patutahi, Turanga Maori began to protest at the size of the land they had only now learnt, the claimants say, that the Crown was to retain. The evidence provided in the Native Land Court, to select committee hearings on petitions, and to commissions of inquiry, provides us with further insight into the deed of cession and the 1869 agreement.

THE PAPATU CASE

In 1877, Hoani Ruru brought a case in the Native Land Court claiming that the survey of Patutahi infringed on the Papatu block. Papatu had been surveyed by Bousfield in 1871 and consisted of 6500 acres, approximately 3000 of which had been included in the Government survey of Patutahi.¹

Evidence was presented to the Native Land Court, much of it discussed above (see ch 8), which referred to the understanding of Turanga Maori that the 1869 agreement had been for three blocks of 5000 acres each.

Hoani Ruru told the court how he had leased Papatu to Eruera Harete prior to giving the boundaries to the ceded block to Atkinson and Graham, and that he was unlikely to have compromised his leasing agreement by making it part of the retained lands of the Crown.² According to claimant historian Bruce Stirling, Turanga Maori made serious efforts not to impinge on their leases when selecting the lands that would be retained by the Crown.³ Hoani Ruru also told the court that they only discovered that the Crown survey of Patutahi overlapped with Papatu, in the area of the Ara Mahutahuia and Kokakonui creeks, in 1874.

Judge Rogan ultimately concluded that the claimants had not proved their case.⁴ In his decision, Rogan noted that, for the first time in the sittings of the court in Poverty Bay, a difference of opinion had arisen between the judge and the assessor. Ordinarily, such a matter would be referred to the chief judge to decide the matter or direct a rehearing. But the minute book recorded that although Rogan was unable to give judgment under such circumstances:

1. Document A23, p 293

2. *Ibid*, p 295

3. *Ibid*

4. Document A23, p 299; doc A10, pp 471-472

APPIII

he would state that in his own opinion, based on the evidence given by the several witnesses, more particularly by Mr Bousfield, who was acting as Government Surveyor at the time of the cession, and had made a sketch map of the district at that time for the information of the Court of Commission, the Natives had failed to prove their case.⁵

Rogan informed Locke by telegram that the decision was in favour of the Government. Locke advised the Native Department accordingly. However, Under-Secretary Clarke identified the discrepancy between Rogan's telegram to Locke and the actual decision. Rogan denied there was a discrepancy: the claimants having not proved their case, no decision could be reached, and therefore the Government had won.⁶

In 1878, Hape Kiniha, Hoani Ruru, Wi Pere, and other Turanga Maori gave evidence before the native affairs select committee in support of further petitions regarding Patutahi and Papatu.⁷ Locke, called as a witness, relied greatly upon the 1869 sketch map. This sketch map, Stirling noted, was 'prepared merely to assist the Poverty Bay Commission and by no means a final survey of named boundaries agreed at that time'.⁸

TE ARAI MATAWAI

As a result of the confiscation, some Rongowhakaata had, by 1873, become almost landless. An area beside the Arai river, called Te Arai Matawai, was returned to Rongowhakaata. While ostensibly to ensure that the iwi did not remain landless, it is clear that Rongowhakaata sought the return of the land on the basis of it having been wrongfully confiscated.⁹

KAUANGAROA

In 1878, Eru Takihi and others filed a petition claiming that the Kauangaroa block had been wrongly included in the Patutahi confiscation. The petitioners stated that they had remained loyal, that they had not signed the deed of cession, and that they had never agreed to part with the Kauangaroa block.¹⁰ Keita Wyllie told the committee that the petitioners were correct that this land was not part of the land to be retained by the Crown, but 'Captain Porter went out in a secret manner with his surveyors and had the land surveyed'.¹¹

5. Document A23, p299

6. Document A10, pp 471–472; doc A23, pp 299–300

7. Document A23, pp304–306

8. Ibid, p304

9. Ibid, p284

10. Ibid, p310

11. Ibid

The committee rejected this petition, and a similar one filed in 1880, on the basis that the land had been given up to the Crown in 1869 and the parties had understood this at the time.¹²

From 1878 to 1879, the native affairs select committee heard the Kauangaroa petitions. Seemingly in contrast to all the other evidence presented by Maori in this and other select committees and Native Land Court hearings, Keita Wyllie's evidence referred not to an agreement for three blocks of 5000 acres to be retained by the Crown, but that the agreement was for 50,000 acres.¹³ The committee does not appear to have pursued this point, which, considering its contrast to the otherwise consistent testimony on this agreement, is notable.¹⁴ We further note Stirling's contention that the 50,000 acres of Patutahi that Keita Wyllie appears to have been referring to could not have come from the Government's original interpretation of the boundaries, since this land had only come to 30,000 acres.¹⁵

In 1879, the native affairs select committee made an inquiry into a petition that claimed that excess acreage had been taken at Te Muhunga. Wi Pere again gave evidence before the committee, and repeated his understanding that the agreement had been for three separate blocks of 5000 acres to be retained by the Crown, but that the Government had joined the Arai and Patutahi blocks and retained more than 50,000 acres.¹⁶ The committee rejected this petition. Locke himself placed great store in the 1869 sketch map, telling the committee that the land taken was 'as near as possible' to the boundaries given on it.¹⁷

The petitions continued. In 1893, for example, Ngapera Kokino submitted a petition claiming that 'all the lands of her forefathers had been taken from them' in the Patutahi confiscation, despite the fact that they had remained 'loyal'.¹⁸

THE CLARKE COMMISSION, 1882

In August 1882, Henry Tacy Clarke was appointed to head a royal commission to investigate a number of land claims and petitions from Turanga. One of the petitions considered was related to a claim to the Tapatoho (or Tapatohotoho) portion of Patutahi.¹⁹ In the late 1860s, Tapatoho had been given to the Government to build barracks, but no barracks were ever built. The petitioners sought the return of the land.²⁰ Furthermore as we have noted, one of the leading petitioners, Eruera Harete, had not signed the deed of cession and believed he should not be bound by it.

12. Ibid

13. Ibid. Stirling has queried Keita Wyllie's statement, noting that it was inconsistent with her claim that Porter had acquired extra land in Patutahi only by stealth in his carrying out of the survey.

14. Ibid, p311

15. Ibid, p310

16. Ibid, p311

17. Ibid

18. AJHR, 1893, 1-3, p2 (doc A23, p320)

19. Document A23, p314; doc C1, p33 (Henry Harris, Rutene Te Eke, Mihi Pahura, Hana Te Hemohaere, and Ihaia Tamaikahakina)

20. Document A23, p314; doc C1, p33; doc A10, pp 489-490

Locke, who had proved to be a central figure throughout, gave evidence relating to the 1869 agreement. We note that Locke's denial (that there had ever been an intention to form a military settlement in this area) 'seems to fly in the face of the oft-stated government goal in the period of 1866–1869'.²¹ Questioned by Eruera Harete, Locke conceded that the acreage for Patutahi in the minutes of the Poverty Bay Commission was not written at the same time as the rest of the minutes:

The acreage in the minutes of the Commission held in 1869 do not appear to have been written at the same time as that other part of the minutes; 57,000 acres appear to have been filled in by some one else; but I would remark that the acreage was shown on the sketch-plan at the time it was produced before the Commission. The sketch-plan referred to now shows fifty thousand and some odd acres, and there is also the mark of an erasure having been made. I am not prepared to say when the erasure was made further than it now corresponds with Mr Bousfield's later survey.²²

Clarke declined to recommend this petition for favourable consideration. Clarke considered that the tribes as a whole had ceded the land and made the subsequent agreement, and that the individual members were bound by this collective decision. Clarke asserted that it was consistent with Maori custom for individuals to be bound by such a tribal decision.²³ Clarke also declined to make a recommendation on an 1877 petition from Ema Katipa, who likewise argued that she had not signed the deed of cession, nor participated in the proceedings of the Poverty Bay Commission. Clarke maintained his position that the cession was made at the tribal level, with the collective decision and action overriding individual rights.²⁴

Clarke did, however, criticise the tampering with such an important document, saying:

one of the maps handed in in evidence in this case – the map produced before the Commission of 1869, and bearing the signature of one of the Commissioners – has been altered by erasing partially the figures indicating the acreage, and other figures substituted so as to accord with the actual survey afterwards made. I think this is a very wrong proceeding, by whomsoever authorized. No document or instrument of such importance – the record of judicial proceedings – should be tampered with in any way. In this case, fortunately, the original figures are discernible, and it does not affect the subject of this report.²⁵

The commission also inquired into seven separate petitions, including one from Wi Pere. Pere's petition covered three grounds: the first related to the claim that excess acreage had been taken in Te Muhunga; the second was in regard to a portion of Te Muhunga named Waitawaki, which Pere wished to have returned to him personally; and the third sought land for Te Whanau a Kai, who

21. Document A23, p314; doc C1, p33; doc A10, pp489–490

22. Document A23, p315; doc A10, pp490–491

23. Document A23, p316; doc C1, p34

24. Document A23, p316; doc C1, p40

25. Document A23, p315; doc C1, p35; doc A10, p491

had been rendered virtually landless by the combination of confiscation and the joint tenancy tenure of the land returned by the Poverty Bay Commission.²⁶ Pere told the commissioner of the effect of the cession of Patutahi on Te Whanau a Kai: ‘No portion of Patutahi’, he said, ‘was returned to the loyal Natives’.²⁷ Pere did not repudiate the cession itself. Rather he appealed to the Government’s sense of compassion: owing to the confiscation of Patutahi, the hapu no longer owned any flat land in Turanga. Pere agreed to give up claims to Patutahi if land could be made available to Te Whanau a Kai.²⁸

Pere’s request impressed Clarke, who recommended that ‘five hundred acres of land be set apart in the Patutahi Block, if possible on the Patutahi Stream, of fair average quality (having due regard to fair proportions of flat and hilly country)’.²⁹ Pere submitted a list of 113 named individuals to be placed on the title of the block.³⁰

In his evidence before the Clarke commission, Pere repeated his understanding that the agreement between Turanga Maori and the Crown had been limited to three blocks of 5000 acres each, and any excess was to be returned.³¹ Pere told the commission that:

The government at first asked us to hand over the land under the deed of cession, to be protected by them. Afterwards, they stated that the land had been ceded by us absolutely to the Queen . . . I admit that the natives consented to cede 15,000 acres to the government, which were at Patutahi, Te Muhunga, and Te Arai . . . I remember a Court sitting here in 1869 . . . I know that they awarded these lands to the Government. I made no objection, as I thought that judgment only affected the 15,000 acres.³²

26. Document A23, p317; doc c1, p37; doc A10, p493. We have discussed Pere’s issues in our discussion of the claim before this Tribunal by Te Whanau a Wi Pere – see chapter 6.

27. AJHR, 1884, sess 2, G-4, pp13–14 (doc c2(b)). Pere also referred to the detrimental effect of the joint-tenancy awards, particularly the way in which individuals had sold their interests, apparently without approval from chiefs like himself. In this, Pere appears to have been referring to the alienation of land in neighbouring blocks, such as Makauri and Repongaere.

28. Document A10, p499

29. AJHR, 1884, sess 2, G-4, p12 (doc c2(b))

30. Ibid, p16. We note that there are two lists, one which follows Wi Pere’s evidence and another which is signed by HT Clarke (p13). Aside from some differences in spelling and the order of names, the two lists are identical. We note that neither list is made up solely of individuals who belonged to Te Whanau a Kai. This matter was raised in the cross-examination of Te Whanau a Kai witness Brian Gilling: see transcript 4.4, pp29–30, 39–42, 47–48; doc c1, pp37–38. Rather, names were differentiated between three groups, the majority being described as ‘Hapu o Ngatikohuru’. The two other groups listed, Ngapotiki and Ngai Tuketenui, are well-recognised hapu of Te Aitanga a Mahaki: see doc A25, pp182–183. We note that Ngapotiki, Ngai Tuketenui, and Ngati Kohuru were also described by Pere as holding rights in the ceded Te Muhunga block: see AJHR, 1884, sess 2, G-4, p13 (doc c2(b)). Both spellings – ‘Ngatikohuru’ and ‘Ngatikahuru’ – are used.

It appears, therefore, that the individuals listed constituted some kind of community selected by Pere from various Te Aitanga a Mahaki hapu that held rights in close proximity to one another. The community was possibly those who were living on Pere’s land in the Makauri block, although this too is uncertain. Some may have been people who Pere believed had lost land through the cession of Te Muhunga or who had been excluded from lands by the Poverty Bay Commission. A number of the names on the list are also on the original blocks that came to constitute the ceded Te Muhunga block. We note also the inclusion of Hira Uatuku (probably Te Hira Te Uatuku), a member of Ngariki Kaiputahi, who does not appear on any Poverty Bay Commission awards but whose main residence was at Mangatu.

31. Document A23, p317; doc c1, p36

32. Document A23, p317; doc A10, p496

Pere acknowledged to the commission that he had made no protest at the Poverty Bay Commission in 1869, believing that only 15,000 acres would be taken.

Pere based his personal claim to Waitawaki on the basis of a gift from the owners, dated 3 August 1841. Pere's father, Thomas Halbert, had asked for two pieces of land for the benefit of his son. Pouparae and Waitawaki were the pieces given. Halbert sold Waitawaki to Bishop Williams. Williams had initially agreed to return the land to Pere, but changed his mind following the events at Waerenga a Hika.³³ On the basis of Atkinson's undertaking personally to later return Waitawaki to Pere, that block was included in the Te Muhunga block to be retained by the Crown. Locke confirmed that McLean had promised Pere 'the Orchard' (an 11-acre portion of Waitawaki), and had also instructed him to ascertain whether there was sufficient land available in the bush reserve of Te Muhunga to provide Pere with a further 25 acres.³⁴ Clark recommended that Pere be granted 91 acres, consisting of 'the Orchard', with the remainder to be made up of bush reserve.³⁵

On the basis of charity or compassion, rather than as of right, Clarke recommended that 500 acres of reserves of 'fair average quality' be provided for Te Whanau a Kai, saying that had Wi Pere:

demanded consideration as a matter of right, or with a disposition to repudiate the arrangement made in 1869, and confirmed before the commissioners on the 30th June in the same year, I could not have entertained the question; but as he has thrown himself and hapus on the compassion of the government, I shall have a recommendation to make in his favour.³⁶

Pere also made the following statement, which Crown witness Brent Edwards believed related to the additions to the Te Arai block, but which Whanau a Kai witness Bryan Gilling believed related to the Kaimoe-Patutahi block:

When the land was handed over in 1869, Rongowhakaata and Taitangamahaki were the tribes who made the arrangement. It was a tribal matter; every individual consented to it. The only person who objected was Tamihana Ruatapu; it was about Patutahi. He did not object in Court; no one did. In my own case, when I found that all the chiefs consented, I was obliged to consent also.³⁷

PETITIONS FOLLOWING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CLARKE COMMISSION

In 1903, Turanga Maori lodged three petitions concerning the excess land taken in the Patutahi block. Again, the Crown took no action on these petitions. As Stirling noted:

33. Document A10, pp 494–495. See also our discussion of settler land claims in chapter 7.

34. Document A10, p 495

35. *Ibid*, p 498; doc F18 app B, p 210

36. Document A23, p 318; doc C1, p 37

37. Document F18, p 119; doc C1, p 40

The Native Department had been disestablished and such was the state of the institutional memory of the 1860s that officials confused the Atkinson referred to by the petitioners with his more famous brother, the former premier, Sir Harry Atkinson. The inquiry thus did nothing to address the petitioner's grievances.³⁸

In 1914, Winiata Moeau and 47 other Rongowhakaata petitioned the Government to compensate them for the loss of their land in Patutahi. The petition stated that only three blocks of 5000 acres each were to have been taken 'for the part your petitioners and their tribe, the Rongowhakaata, took in the Hauhau troubles'.³⁹ The confiscation of lands in Patutahi (presumably Kaimoe) was attributed to 'the crime of a different tribe namely the Whanau-a-Kai'.⁴⁰ For their part, the petitioners believed that 'there was no understanding that the Rongowhakaata should also lose their interests in the Patutahi block'.⁴¹

Following the Clarke commission, Whanau a Kai, like Rongowhakaata, again petitioned the Government to have their lands restored to them. The Government received a number of petitions in 1914. Among them was one filed by Wi Pere and 39 others regarding the land taken in excess of the 15,000 acres that had been agreed to be given up.⁴² In it, the Patutahi block was described as being given up 'in payment for those members of Te Whanauakai, who had joined the Hauhaus'.⁴³ However, the petitions failed to achieve any redress.

THE JONES COMMISSION, 1920

In 1920, a number of Turanga petitions (including the 1914 petitions) were referred to a native land claims commission, along with numerous other petitions from around New Zealand. Robert Jones, the chief judge of the Native Land Court and under-secretary of the Native Department, headed the 1920 commission. The Jones commission sat for three days in Turanga and for one day in Wellington to hear evidence on the Turanga petitions.

Both Stirling and Gilling refer to the terms of reference given to the commission, which prevented it from examining the wider issues of the confiscation process. Instead, the commission was limited to inquiring into the claimed discrepancies between the acreage ceded and the

38. Document A23, p320

39. Petition 450/14, Le1/1914/9 (RDB, p1149); see also AJHR, 1916, 1-3, p6 (doc A23, p321)

40. Petition 450/14, Le1/1914/9 (RDB, p1149)

41. *Ibid.* There appears to have been some confusion between Patutahi as the larger, 57,000-acre block, and the more specific area described as Patutahi (Kaimoe), purportedly given up by Te Whanau a Kai. Presumably, the Rongowhakaata petitioners were objecting to the loss of the balance of the land (which was neither the Kaimoe nor the Te Arai portions of the block), which they felt was a loss principally suffered by Rongowhakaata. Alternatively, these individuals may have been Rongowhakaata who were 'loyal' but who also had interests in the Kaimoe area. They did not receive compensation for their loss. There is insufficient evidence to determine the issue either way.

42. Petition 616/14 (RDB, p25,193)

43. *Ibid.*

area actually retained by the Crown.⁴⁴ Captain Wiremu Tutepuaki Pitt represented Te Aitanga a Mahaki, Rongowhakaata, and Ngai Tamanuhiri, while Te Whanau a Kai were represented by a local solicitor, Mr Dunlop.⁴⁵

Pitt repeated what had almost become a mantra to petitioning Turanga Maori; the agreement had been for the Crown to retain three blocks of 5000 acres each.⁴⁶ This arrangement had unravelled when the survey of Patutahi and Te Arai merged those blocks into one large block. Pitt referred to the altered Poverty Bay Commission minutes, and described those minutes as ‘rather vague, and appear to have been altered and subsequent notes inserted’.⁴⁷ He also referred to the 1869 sketch map plan, pointing out its absence of detail with regard to the Te Muhunga, Patutahi, and Te Arai blocks, and noting that it too had been altered with the acreage surveyed in 1873 having been inserted, rather than the acreage given in 1869 when the map was made.⁴⁸ Pitt acknowledged that Turanga Maori could have been more vigilant in protecting their rights, but had ‘relied on the integrity of the parties they were dealing with’. Since then they had been persistent in their protest and requests for ‘rectification for what was done either wrongfully or under misapprehension’.⁴⁹

Pitt explained that it was understood that the 15,000 acres taken by the Crown was to have been divided equally amongst the Crown, Ngati Porou, and Ngati Kahungunu. However, a much larger area had been taken ‘and given to the highest bidder’.⁵⁰ Pitt calculated that, after discounting the 5137 acres returned to Turanga Maori and the 15,000 acres that the Government was entitled to, the Government had retained an excess of 38,809 acres out of the 56,945 acres that it had taken.⁵¹

The commission identified two examples of the ‘quite evident’ confusion on the part of the Poverty Bay Commission regarding the exact size of the area to be retained by the Crown. The first example was the description of Patutahi as land ‘of very good quality’. While the commission accepted this as a description of Patutahi proper, it ‘could in no way apply to the greater proportion of the 57,000 acres’.⁵²

The second example of confusion on the part of the Poverty Bay Commission was their misunderstanding that Te Arai adjoined Patutahi on the western side. The commission had mistakenly considered that Te Arai and Tapatoho were same block.⁵³ It noted that, if the ‘restricted area, 735 acres refers to Tapatohotoho, as assumed, then it nowhere adjoins Patutahi proper, and only adjoins the remaining 50,000 acres on the east’.⁵⁴

44. Document A23, p323; doc C1, p46

45. Document A10, p510; doc A23, p324

46. Document C1, p48; doc A10, p510

47. Document A23, p324; doc A10, p511

48. Document A23, p328; doc A10, p518

49. Document A23, p325; doc C1, p49; doc A10, p511

50. Document A23, p324; doc A10, p511

51. Document A23, pp324–325

52. Document A10, p518; doc A23, pp328–329

53. Document A23, p329

54. Document A10, p519; doc A23, p329

The commission also referred to Richmond's comments in Parliament in August 1869 that he had envisaged 'something like 20,000 acres', and no more than was necessary to fulfil the Government's promises to the defence force.⁵⁵ In trying to explain why the Crown had retained almost three times this amount, the commission concluded:

The only explanation we can offer is that the Poverty Bay Commission, in error, adopted at some later date the outside tribal boundaries of the Rongowhakaata tribe as showing the boundary of the land arranged to be given by that section of the people. This is the only way we can account for them taking nearly 51,000 acres from one tribe, and only 5,395 acres from another tribe which, according to records, contained an equal if not greater number of rebels, and owned a great deal more land than the first named tribe. According to the Poverty Bay Titles Act, 1874, there was returned to Rongowhakaata 4,000 acres, and to Te Aitanga a Mahaki 185,000 acres, out of the lands ceded to the Governor on the 18th December 1868. Such a proceeding would be in direct conflict to Mr Richmond's assurance to His Excellency the Governor and his explicit instructions to Mr Atkinson.⁵⁶

The commission concluded that the Crown had retained more land than it should have.⁵⁷ The commission noted the absence of a written record and lamented that the Government had not formally confirmed the agreement, since this 'would at least have given an opportunity to have the matter properly investigated at the time, and, if an error had been made, to have corrected it'.⁵⁸

The commission noted that Turanga Maori had been consistent in their view that the agreement had been for 15,000 acres, but found that a larger area was to be retained by the Crown:

There is some evidence that Patutahi proper was only to be 5,000 acres. Patutahi (or Kaimoe) had originally contained 3,546 acres, and part of Rakaukaka was added, making it up to over 4,500 acres. It was said the balance was made up at Tapatohotoho. The person who owned Rakaukaka afterwards claimed and was awarded compensation for the part so taken. There must have been some special reason for increasing the flat land in that way. We can find no definite evidence that Te Arai, or the inland block was to be so confined. To make it only 5,000 acres and join it to Patutahi, as the minutes, would make a very awkward-shaped piece of land, and would by no means cover the boundaries which we understand to be pointed out by Wi Pere. We are therefore inclined to think that something larger than 15,000 acres in all was to be awarded, though the Natives may well have supposed that the boundaries as pointed out would not cover more than that.⁵⁹

55. Document A10, p519; doc A23, p329

56. Document A10, p520; doc A23, p330. Te Aitanga a Mahaki received 400,000 acres, not 185,000, and Rongowhakaata received 5000 acres, not 4000, plus 185,000 acres of back country, to be shared with a Ngati Kahungunu hapu. These acreages were not returned to the iwi concerned but were instead processed through the Native Land Court and awarded to various individuals: doc A23, p330; doc A10, p520.

57. Document A10, p521; doc A23, p331

58. Document A10, p521

59. Ibid, p522

On the basis of Richmond's reference to 20,000 acres for the Government and Ngati Porou, plus an equal share for Ngati Kahungunu, the commission concluded that the agreement had actually been for some 30,000 acres:

unless, indeed (which is unthinkable), the Government was knowingly departing from its solemn engagement and was proposing to take 35,000 acres for itself, and leave the other two parties, who it had agreed should share equally with the Crown, not more than 10,000 acres each.⁶⁰

The commission stated that 'We also think that, while there is much to be said in favour of the Natives' claim that only 15,000 acres was intended to be reserved, there is no evidence sufficiently conclusive for us to find it to be so'.⁶¹

The commission's findings ultimately resulted in compensation being provided for the land taken in excess of 31,000 acres. The negotiations and distribution of this subsequent compensation agreement led to conflict between Rongowhakaata and Te Whanau a Kai, which this Tribunal heard about in some length (see ch 6).

60. Document c1, p57

61. Ibid

GLOSSARY

<i>hapu</i>	kin groups claiming common descent
<i>kaimoana</i>	food from the sea
<i>kainga</i>	villages
<i>kaitiaki</i>	trustee or guardian
<i>kaitiakitanga</i>	trustee or guardian of the people
<i>karakia</i>	prayer
<i>kaumatua</i>	elder
<i>kawanatanga</i>	government, government forces
<i>kingitanga</i>	kingship movement
<i>kohuru</i>	murder
<i>kokiri</i>	war party
<i>kokopu</i>	native trout
<i>komiti</i>	committee
<i>kotahitanga</i>	accord or unity
<i>kowhaiwhai</i>	scroll painting on rafters
<i>kuia</i>	elderly lady
<i>koura</i>	freshwater crayfish
<i>mahinga kai</i>	vegetable garden, cultivation
<i>manu</i>	bird
<i>matakite</i>	visionary
<i>momokino</i>	base born
<i>niu</i>	ceremonial pole
<i>ope</i>	war party
<i>rahui</i>	embargo
<i>rangatira</i>	chiefs
<i>raupatu</i>	confiscation
<i>rohe</i>	territory
<i>runanga</i>	assembly
<i>tangihanga</i>	mourning
<i>tapenakara</i>	tabernacle
<i>tapu</i>	sacred
<i>taonga katoa</i>	all things treasured
<i>taurekareka</i>	slavery
<i>tikanga</i>	custom
<i>tukutuku</i>	ornamental panels
<i>tuna</i>	eel
<i>waiata</i>	song or psalm
<i>whakapapa</i>	network of possible relationships
<i>whakarau</i>	the followers of Te Kooti
<i>whakatauki</i>	proverb
<i>whanau</i>	multigenerational extended family units
<i>whanaunga</i>	company of travellers
<i>whenua</i>	the land
<i>whareniui</i>	meeting house

