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Abstract

Māori urbanisation and urban migrations have been the subject of much discussion and research, especially following World War Two when Māori individuals, whānau and communities increasingly became residents of towns and cities that were overwhelmingly Pākehā populated. However, Māori urbanisation experiences and urban migrations are difficult topics to address because kaumātua are reluctant to discuss ‘urban Māori’, especially considering its implications for Māori identities. The original contribution this thesis makes to histories of Māori urban migrations is that it explores these and other understandings of urbanisations to discover some of their historical influences. By discussing urbanisations directly with kaumātua and exploring historical sources of Māori living in, and moving to, the urban spaces of Wellington and the Hutt Valley through the twentieth century, this thesis is a ‘meeting place’ for a range of perspectives on the meanings of urbanisations from the past and the present.

Although urbanisation was an incredible time of material change for the individuals and whānau who chose to move into cities such as Wellington, the histories of urban migration experiences exist within a scope of Māori and iwi worldviews that gave rise to multiple experiences and understandings of urbanisations. The Wellington region is used to show that Māori in towns and cities used Māori social and cultural forms in urban areas so that they could, through the many challenges of becoming urban-dwelling, ensure the persistence of their Māoritanga.

Urbanisations also allowed Māori to both use traditional identities in urban areas, as well as develop new relationships modelled on kinship. The Ngāti Pōneke community is used as an example of the complex interactions between these identities and how many Māori became active residents in but not conceptually ‘of’ cities. As a result, the multiple and layered Māori identities that permeate throughout Māori experiences of the present and the past are important considerations in approaching and discussing
urbanisations. Urban Māori communities have emphasised the significance of varied and layered Māori identities, and this became particularly pronounced through the Māori urban migrations of the twentieth century.
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Papakupu / Glossary

This glossary provides definitions of Māori words, terms and phrases according to the contexts in which they were used in this thesis. The definitions are drawn from W.H. Williams, *Dictionary of the Māori Language, Seventh Edition.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahi Kā</td>
<td>To keep the fires burning; used to mean the continuous presence of a whānau, hapū or iwi in a certain area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>A Māori name for New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroha</td>
<td>Affectionate regard, caring, love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Section of a tribe, group of families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hau Kāinga</td>
<td>The home area or the people of that home area (tangata whenua); true home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heke / Hekenga</td>
<td>Travel, mobility, migrate or migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōhā</td>
<td>An expression of impatience, weariness; frustrated, annoying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>People, tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikaranga</td>
<td>A person (usually a woman) who gives a karanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikōrero</td>
<td>Speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanohi ki te Kanohi</td>
<td>Face to face, eye to eye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kao</td>
<td>A preparation of kūmara, dried in the sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapa Haka</td>
<td>Artistic Māori performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanga</td>
<td>Call, summon of welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumātua</td>
<td>Elder/s, male or female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa</td>
<td>Protocol/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kete</td>
<td>Basket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero</td>
<td>Discussion/s, narrative/s; to speak, talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroua</td>
<td>Male grandparent or male relative/elder of that generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuia</td>
<td>Female grandparent or female relative/elder of that generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūmara</td>
<td>Sweet potato.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupu</td>
<td>Word/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahi</td>
<td>To work, perform or do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki / Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Kindness, care, hospitality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana</td>
<td>Authority, influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>An authority or significant relationship with regards to a specific area of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuhirī</td>
<td>Visitor/s, guest/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māoritanga</td>
<td>The things related to being Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Shortened form of marae ātea, an open space in front of a wharenui. Sometimes also refers to a complex of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
buildings used as a community centre, including dining hall, bathrooms and so on.

Marae Ātea  The open space in front of a wharenui.

Mātauranga  Knowledge, understanding, education.

Maunga  Mountain.

Moemoeā  Dream, visions or experiences of ‘seeing’ something not otherwise present.

Motu  Island/s.

Ngā Atua  Gods or spiritual, supernatural or extraordinary beings.

Ngā Hau e Whā  Literally, ‘the four winds’. Used to refer to people from varied backgrounds.

Ngāmotu  A Māori name for New Plymouth. Refers to the islands located just off the coast.

Nikau  A type of New Zealand palm tree.

Noa  Something that is known or profane.

Nuku  To extend, move or migrate.

Pā  Stockade, fortified place or village.

Paepae  Threshold, lines; an area on a marae for speechmaking.

Pākehā  A non-Māori New Zealander, usually of European descent.

Papa kāinga  Original home place or base.

Papakupu  Glossary, dictionary.
Pito  Navel or section of umbilical cord.

Pounamu  New Zealand greenstone.

Pōwhiri  A process of welcoming or being welcomed onto a marae guided by tikanga and kawa.

Rangatira  Chief or leader.

Rangatiratanga  Authority, autonomy.

Raupō  A type of New Zealand bulrush.

Ringawera  A behind-the-scenes worker, such as a kitchen hand. Literally translates as ‘hot hands’.

Rohe  Region or area.

Taha Māori  The side that is of Māori descent.

Tangata Whenua  People or iwi belonging to or with a significant historical relationship to a specific landscape, local/s, or home people.

Tangata Whenuatanga  The things related to being the home people.

Tangi  Sound or cry out; and cry for or weep.

Taniwha  A type of spiritual or tapu, non-human being, sometimes guardian, sometimes more dangerous.

Taonga  Something highly prized.

Tapu  Sacred, restricted.

Taurahere  Māori who reside outside of their iwi boundaries, immigrant iwi, sometimes used to mean urban Māori; translates to ‘the rope that binds’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Ao Māori</td>
<td>The Māori world, an intellectual or emotional viewpoint based in tikanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ika a Māui</td>
<td>The North Island of New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Reo Māori</td>
<td>The Māori language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Īpoko o te Ika a Māui</td>
<td>The lower North Island of New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Waipounamu</td>
<td>The South Island of New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whanganui ā Tara</td>
<td>The Wellington Harbour and the area around surrounding it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Correct behaviours, customs or precedent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipuna / Tipuna</td>
<td>Ancestor/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohunga</td>
<td>An expert or a knowledgeable and skilled person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupuna / Tūpuna</td>
<td>Ancestor/s, especially including more recent elders, sometimes still alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūrangawaewae</td>
<td>Tribal home place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiata</td>
<td>Song or sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>Canoe or transport vessel. Also, when referring to a tribal social category, a conglomeration of tribes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakaaro</td>
<td>Thoughts, understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakairo</td>
<td>Artistic Māori Carving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaikōrero</td>
<td>Oration, formal speech or speeches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>Place in layers or recite in order – used to refer to descent, connections, genealogies or histories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakataukī</td>
<td>Proverb, saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whāngai</td>
<td>Nourish or feed, and adopt or foster, usually customary adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Family or family group including relatives who are related vertically (generational) and horizontally (aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, nephews).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whare / Wharenui</td>
<td>A building, house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>Land or landscapes; country or nation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identities are a foundation of this thesis. I am a descendant of Te Ātiawa from Ngāmotu and my hapū is Ngāti Te Whiti. My hapū has long-standing and meaningful connections to the Taranaki region. We also have an historical and present-day relationship with Te Āti Awa and other Taranaki iwi that migrated to Te Whanganui ā Tara during the 19th century.

However, although this background arguably underlies everything I do (and write), it was not the objective of this thesis to be limited to any one tangata whenua perspective in discussing histories of Te Whanganui ā Tara. Instead, this thesis is a history in which multiple lines of descent and backgrounds can sit respectfully beside one another. This includes recognising shared experiences and identities whilst not requiring any participant to compromise their (often multiple) anchors of identity. As the author of this piece of work, I consider that this also applies to me. Before proceeding any further, this preface acknowledges my background.

The ways of explaining who we are play an important part in tikanga Māori, especially on marae and through ‘rituals of encounter’, known as pōwhiri. The processes of pōwhiri are dependent on the kawa and tikanga of a specific marae, but there are general patterns. For example, in a pōwhiri, unknown persons or guests transition from being tapu to being noa. The tangata whenua guide their manuhiri in following their tikanga, with the resulting process enabling groups to meet in time-honoured ways that respect connections between the people to the land, to tīpuna and ngā atua. The concepts determining this process have wider implications than in pōwhiri

1 For example, see Anne Salmond, Hui: A Study of Maori Ceremonial Gatherings (Wellington, 1975).
because they are based in customs that are historically referenced and continuously relevant.

At the beginning of a pōwhiri, the manuhiri will wait to be called onto the marae by a kaikaranga of the hau kāinga. The kaikaranga is a woman (or are women) chosen to perform the role based on their knowledge and experience. On entering the marae, the manuhiri will respond through the calls of their own kaikaranga, and the group will be guided onto the marae ātea to pay their respects to ancestors that accompany them (in spirit). When this is done, the manuhiri will take their seats on or behind a paepae, which is a special seating area devoted to speechmaking. Throughout the time the manuhiri enter onto the marae and marae complex, the tangata whenua will stand at their paepae, waiting for both groups to be seated and facing one another for the whaikōrero.

On most marae, sitting on the paepae is a carefully gendered arrangement that, like the karanga, takes account of knowledge and experience. The most authoritative individuals (usually male elders with good understandings of tikanga and the Māori language) will sit at the front, where in turn, they can rise to speak. In speaking, the hau kāinga will set the context for discussions, and each following kaikōrero will draw from his kete of knowledge to articulate his purpose for speaking. In doing this, he will ‘speak back’ to his whakapapa and construct a narrative that communicates the mana of his iwi, and the connections between the manuhiri and the tangata whenua.² As one interviewee for this thesis explained, speaking on a paepae is a time when all the things known before that moment culminate and become shared.³

In a similar way to this procedure for meetings between groups, this thesis is a culmination of knowledge from a range of sources, coming together at one time to present a particular history. Similar to the korero between hau kāinga and manuhiri, this preface allows me, as the author of this history, to articulate the physical,

---

³ Matthew M. Bennett, personal communication, Kohupātiki, Napier, April 2012.
emotional and intellectual connections between myself and this work. As a descendant of Ngāti Te Whīti from Ngāmotu, I maintain connections with that whenua. I am also a long-time resident of Wellington city, which is a focus of this thesis. Due to this focus on the city as home to many Māori with many different associations to the landscape, the research for this thesis does not draw singularly on the experiences of Ngāti Te Whīti from Ngāmotu, and neither does it claim to represent the perspectives of Taranaki Whānui of the Wellington area. Instead, this thesis has brought together people from a range of backgrounds because, as described in the acknowledgments, I consider that one of the most important values of research is the insights it provides into the lives of our kaumātu. Where information is included that is from Taranaki Whānui, this has largely been accessed through publicly-available sources.

There are also a few points deserving explanation concerning the technical creation of this work. First of all, as a descendant of Te Ātiawa from the Taranaki region working on a topic that involves histories of Taranaki Whānui from the Wellington region, I have decided to use the preferred spellings of each of Te Ātiawa and Te Āti Awa to distinguish between them when appropriate. Taranaki Whānui include members of the iwi of Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Tama, Taranaki, Ngāti Ruanui and others, who descend from tīpuna that migrated to Te Whanganui ā Tara (the Wellington area) in the early nineteenth century. In recent decades, it has become common practice for ‘Te Ātiawa’ with the conjoined second word to refer to the Taranaki-based iwi, and ‘Te Āti Awa’ with three separate words to refer to the iwi from Te Whanganui ā Tara. Although both iwi are related and connected in the present and in the past, it is from my position as Te Ātiawa that I have decided to distinguish between the two in this thesis.

The remainder of Māori words in this thesis are incorporated into the text with as little distinction as possible. This includes a few instances in which information was sourced through te reo Māori, and which I have chosen not to translate. A glossary (papakupu) is provided on page 17 that provides translations for Māori words used in this thesis.

---

When quoting other sources, I have kept iwi names and other Māori words as they originally appeared in that source, including macron usage.

Lastly, it is important to acknowledge that this thesis is a presentation of histories that are inherently dynamic, ever changing and continuous. But, as the Waikato whakataukī explains, ‘Kotahi ano te kohao o te ngira, e kuhuna ai te miro ma te miro whero me te miro pango’ (there is but one eye of the needle, through which the white, red and black threads must pass).5 In this thesis, I have endeavoured for the white, red and black and threads to coexist, and I acknowledge that the ultimate presentation of this work is my responsibility as author. There are many stories of Māori urban migrations, and this is one place where some of those stories coincide.

Chapter One: The Difficulty in Discussing Urbanisation

During the twentieth century, the majority of the Māori population in New Zealand shifted from being a rurally residing population to one located in the urban spaces of towns and cities. As an urban-residing population, Māori lived more than ever before in close proximity with other cultures. This most commonly meant interacting with non-Māori, but it also included interactions with other hapū and iwi. In the spaces of towns and cities, these interactions gave rise to a wide range of urbanisation experiences.

As the title of this thesis (Ko Ngā Iwi Nuku Whenua) indicates, these urban migrations shifted and extended the presence of Māori throughout the country. In towns and cities, Māori gathered to maintain and nurture identities as individuals, whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori. The histories of these identities demonstrate unequivocally that throughout the urban migrations of the twentieth century, Māori identities were persistent and layered. These layered identities consisted of not only shared identities as Māori, but also the many distinct and coexisting identities of being tangata whenua. As a result, historical and present-day Māori experiences and understandings of urbanisation have accommodated iwi and hapū identities in urban environments where cultures and experiences intermixed and interacted: Māori with non-Māori, and iwi with other iwi. By 1966, when Māori were first recorded by a New Zealand census as a majority urban-residing population, each city was home to countless Māori experiences and types of attachments to the city.
In towns and cities, new types of Māori communities also emerged. In an environment consisting mostly of Pākehā, Māori sought fellowship with other ‘Māori faces’ so they could enact shared identities as Māori.\(^1\) Such groups of urban residing Māori could consist of individuals and families from diverse iwi and hapū backgrounds who related to one another as Māori and using familiar kinship terms. Through shared experiences in urban migrations, Māori who were not related became friends and later, ‘urban whānau’\(^2\).

This thesis discusses the ‘urbanisations’ undertaken by Māori to the Wellington area during the twentieth century, and the lives those Māori established as urban residents. But, as indicated by the title of this chapter, Māori urbanisation experiences and urban migrations are difficult to address in a written history because of the tendency amongst some Māori to refuse ‘urbanisation’ as a research topic. Despite the fact that large-scale rural to urban migrations of large numbers of Māori happened during the twentieth century, and persists into the present, ‘urbanisation’ is not a term commonly used in many Māori communities. In short, Māori acceptances of ideas about ‘urban Māori’ are in no way as broad reaching as the phenomenon of urbanisations was (and is). Although most Māori became ‘urbanised’, understandings of urbanisation are diverse.

Due to the diversity in experiences and understanding about urbanisation, ‘urbanisations’ is used alongside ‘urbanisation’ throughout this thesis. This was a deliberate decision because by using the plural form, I acknowledge that despite urbanisation being a broad population process, it was also something that encompassed a range of personal, hapū and iwi meanings – meanings that have impacted upon varied Māori acceptances of ideas of urbanisation. As a result, urbanisations are considered as being personal and group experiences that were

\(^1\) Term ‘Māori faces’ was used by Witarina Harris, in Patricia Grace, Irihapeti Ramsden and Jonathon Dennis, *The Silent Migration: Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, 1937-48: Stories of Urban Migration* (Wellington, 2001), p. 32.

physical, geographical and material, as well as social and cultural. This definition, explored by a geography student in 1988, uses a combination of perspectives by W. Zelinsky and G.J. Lewis: that migrations are movements, both temporary and permanent, that are social as well as spatial.\(^3\) Thus although urbanisation can be understood as a term relating to a single, shared demographic process, it is also a term that has been connected with multiple social and cultural meanings. This thesis shows that there were many historical factors that caused urbanisation to be understood as a social and cultural process. These understandings were impacted upon by a range of factors including attitudes about Māori in towns and cities that were expressed through the media, from governmental policy and academia through the twentieth century.

An advantage of distinguishing urbanisation from urbanisations is that they become inclusive of many sources of evidence for rural to urban change. These include quantitative facts of change that can be accessed through resources such as surveys and censuses, but most importantly, qualitative perspectives on such data.

This quantitative and qualitative approach allows for contrasting perspectives about urban migrations to be overlaid within every chapter. In doing so, this thesis recognises that there are challenges in the ways that different experiences can be compared. This is especially true on the small scale when comparing, for example, the urban migration of a descendant of Ngāti Porou who was recruited to work in Invercargill during the 1960s, with a descendant of Ngāpuhi who moved to Wellington during the 1930s to reconnect with whānau. It is also true on a larger scale when comparing an iwi or hapū that almost completely relocated to a nearby urban area whilst maintaining tribal connections, to an iwi or hapū that became urban-residing because of the growth of towns and cities.\(^4\) For this reason, this thesis acknowledges that although the urbanisation of Māori as a total population during the twentieth


century can be considered from a macro perspective as a singular phenomenon that occurred over time, the urban migrations making up this phenomenon were diverse, undertaken by individuals, whānau, hapū and iwi. Accordingly, experiences of urbanisation are referred to as a plural process, as urbanisations.

The impacts and attitudes resulting from the mosaic of understandings and attitudes about urbanisation, urbanisations and ‘urban Māori’ were particularly evident in this research when several participants were reluctant to recall their personal experiences with reference to ‘urban’. This point was communicated by Te Pae ki Omeka Joy (Pae) Ruha, who was interviewed in 2009 about living in Wellington. In our conversation, she explained that while ‘urban’ may exist on some levels as an identity category for Māori, it was not important to the experiences of, or relationships between, Māori who moved into cities. Instead, for many, the importance of hapū and iwi persisted. In response to my question ‘what is this concept, urban Māori?’, she replied:

Well I hate being labelled as an urban Māori. I do. I mean, it’s not you, it’s a term I’ve heard my other crew using from Auckland. Urban is just what they say to each other, where urban Māoris are. And I said, who said? I suppose that it’s the use of the terms. You know we have rural and urban, we’re actually putting them in their respective pigeonholes: rural, urban. And I guess the terms are there to stay. So, yes, in a sense we are.

But I think more than ever today, that those who are living in an urban situation are seeking their own iwi, bringing their own iwi together. And I think that I will be right in saying that. And the culture clubs will still remain mixed iwi, unless they want to be their own iwi. But in the name like Ngāti Pōneke and the competing clubs, they’re mostly mixed up, mixed backgrounds, iwi and that. And so there’ll be those two, two groups; the culture clubs and kapa haka will remain a mix of people, but at the same time there’s this keenness to get together as a group, either hapū or iwi, mainly iwi.

Pae Ruha’s message was similar to those presented by the other 14 Māori men and women who participated in the research for this thesis. While there was some

---

5 The name ‘Ngāti Pōneke’ refers to a pan-iwi, non-sectarian and non-political Māori voluntary club of the Wellington area. They were established in 1937 and continue their mahi today. More information on Ngāti Pōneke is included throughout this thesis, especially chapters 4-7.

variation in the acceptance of the concept of ‘urban’ as defining the location of lifestyles, as was articulated by Pae Ruha above, the general consensus was that urban and urbanised were not factors of Māori or iwi histories that warranted close examination. Instead, participants refocused the topic of urbanisations to suit the different categories of identities that contained meaning for them.

In all cases, the recorded and unrecorded discussions about living in Wellington or about experiences of urbanisations involved whakapapa based systems of knowledge that located the speaker within relationships to the landscape, home places and whānau who could also include non-kin ‘whānau’ from both the past and the present.\(^7\)

The interviewed men and women were selected because of their connections to the Wellington area, their self-identification as Māori, and their knowledge of Wellington Māori communities. All are acknowledged leaders or members of the community, and although retired, most still undertake public leadership roles. Their motivations in volunteering varied, but for many the manaakitanga of a young Māori student was a motive (for which I remain very appreciative). There was a higher proportion of female participants, but considering demographic factors, as well as the fact that as a female researcher I may have had increased access to female participants, this was not considered unusual.\(^8\)

Although not all of interviewed kaumātua continue to live in the Wellington area, all lived in the Wellington and Hutt Valley urban areas in the years after (and sometimes before) World War Two. In interviews, they communicated their experiences of the Wellington area in ways that showed their memories of moving seamlessly between the different spaces of the city and its surrounds: from the city to the Hutt Valley, to Porirua and up to Ōtaki. While census data for Wellington city has often been calculated separate to the urban populations of the Hutt Valley, in practice the
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7 This occurrence was also recorded by Melissa Williams when undertaking her doctoral research on twentieth-century Māori urban experiences. See Melissa Matutina Williams, ‘Back-home’ and Home in the City: Māori Migrations from Panguru to Auckland, 1930-1970’, PhD. thesis, The University of Auckland, 2010. p. 31. Chapter Two discusses such aspects of Māori oral histories further.

8 The methodology and tikanga considerations for the oral history component of this thesis are discussed in Chapter Two. For more information on the specific interviewees, see Appendix 1.
borders between these cities are not significant, and people continuously move between them. For this reason, the Wellington region referred to in this thesis spans from the southern most points of the city in Owhiro Bay and up to Ōtaki in the north.\footnote{This area largely excludes the Wairarapa, over the Rimutaka Hills (see Chapter Two, figure 2).}

But although all the kuia and kaumātua interviewed for this thesis resided in the cities of Wellington and the Hutt Valley for multiple decades, not all considered that they had ‘urbanised’ to the Wellington area. Instead, and as discussed throughout this thesis, all showed that they had multiple, co-existing and interacting concepts of ‘home’.

This identification with multiple home places was an important background to people’s resistance to the idea of ‘urban Māori’. The complexities in Māori identities is a phenomenon for Māori populations that has been discussed by a number of historians in recent years, and it deserves reiteration here: home places for Māori were and are not just the location where you presently live, which is one kind of ‘home’; they are also the descent-places of your parents, grandparents and ancestors. This point was demonstrated by Iris and Wereta (Rackie) W. Pahau, who discussed their layered concepts of home places when talking about travelling into the wider Wellington area. ‘Home’ was the Hutt Valley, but it was simultaneously their tribal area.

\textbf{Iris:} Now we come down past Paekakariki or over the Haywards Hill and we think ’home at last’. When we see the lights of the Hutt Valley, we say ’oh choice, we are home’.

\textbf{Rackie:} That’s home eh?

\textbf{Iris:} That’s home. It’s a neat feeling to feel like you are home.

\textbf{Rackie:} And when we go back to Ngāti Porou, for quite a long way we can see Hikurangi maunga. ’Oh I’m home’ – that’s when you feel that.\footnote{Iris Pahau and Wereta (Rackie) W. Pahau, interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 24 November 2010.}

For many Māori, descent-places are typically a tribal area defined by a particular whakapapa, with the presence of landmarks that are seen as tīpuna, including marae
or more than one marae that is an embodiment of an iwi or hapū’s histories of connections to the landscape. Thus descent-places are geographical but also defined by social connections, being the location of family members known as the ‘ahi kā’. It is the place where your relations will have their pito laid, or after dying, return to be buried.11

For many Māori, stories of urbanisation were understood as being stories of movements of people away from these descent-home places. This, combined with other factors discussed in this thesis, meant that the suggestion they became ‘urban Māori’ was also one that suggested disconnection with their homes, whānau, hapū and iwi. This interpretation of urbanisation was demonstrated in a group interview in the Hutt Valley in 2010. For the interview, I presented each kuia and kaumātua with four guiding questions that asked: what it was like to move to Wellington and the Hutt Valley; who they had met; how did it affect their knowledge of urban Māori and tangata whenua relationships; and what were their impressions of the character of the city of Wellington. From my previous oral history interviews I expected that for most, the questions would raise other topics for discussions and include subjects of experiences that some people would choose not to discuss (as indeed was their right). At this meeting, it was the concept of ‘urban’ that received significant attention.

One woman present pointed out that the issue with the word ‘urban’ lay in concepts of identity. Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark explained that she identified as Māori first and foremost, and urban was a descriptive word that she would never use. When undertaking research for this thesis, I was careful never to suggest that a person was ‘urban Māori’. I introduced my research objectives, and explained that while urbanisation had occurred in the sense that the Māori population relocated over the

twentieth century, it was obvious that there were other stories that needed telling. So when kuia and kaumatua, like Huhana, rejected discussions of ‘urban Māori’, they presented an idea that although they moved into towns and cities, they did not urbanise and are not urban. By not urbanising, they rejected all the social and cultural meanings associated with urbanisations.

In pointed detail, Huhana explained that she objected to the term because it was an outsider-term that denied Māori knowledge systems, especially those passed down from our shared Taranaki tīpuna. Like other interviewees who also pointed to the use of ‘urban Māori’ by politicians for certain agendas, Huhana Clark spoke to me clearly, saying that to her, the term ‘urban’ was a Pākehā word that belittles Māori because it is not an idea like manaakitanga, which was a more important concept that has been passed down through generations. In agreement with the other kaumatua present, she explained that ‘urban’ was a word of the colonisers.

Well you know, urban Māori to me is a Pākehā colonisation word that I will never ever use at all, but that’s me, we are not all the same. Ko tēnā kupu, he whakaitia taua te Māori – that word, it belittles us in a way – and because we were colonised we should hang on to it? No, and that’s what I am talking about because a lot of people lose their traditions and their language and they grab on to these kupu, kupu Pākehā, which doesn’t mean a bit to you and I as Māori.

And it doesn’t sit with elders. Well it never did when it first came out in the 1990s. Who are they to say, to put a mark on us that we be urban Māori, who are they? My first reaction was who are they to brand us with that kupu, that word. There is no place here in Aotearoa for that word, no there isn’t, because Māori are very friendly people. And then a lot of us married Europeans, but it does not say that we should be urban. I don’t agree with that. To be straight up and honest, I do have a problem with that kupu because it has never been around when my old people were around. When my mother and father were around we never heard them talking about being urban. All you heard them talking about was ō whānaunga ēnei, kia tū ki te haere mai: those are your relations, welcome them home. That’s how we were, we were hospitable people. This is why I don’t want us to go away with a focus that has been
analysed to us. And so I say no, I won’t have a bar of it. We are Māori, first and foremost. So that’s my whakaaro there, dear.\textsuperscript{12}

In this strong way, Huhana Clark stated that ‘the increasing usage of the term ‘urban Māori’ in the 1990s was yet another tool for ongoing processes of colonisation in New Zealand. This point provides a relevant background to this thesis on urbanisations, especially her reference to conversations on ‘urban Māori’ that emerged from Treaty of Waitangi settlement processes in the 1990s. It was during that time that being ‘urban Māori’ was discussed as being equal to ‘non-iwi’. While the majority of settlements to date have been made between the Crown and tribal ‘large natural groups’, when the Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Claim Settlement Act came into force in 1992, its beneficiaries were intended to be all people of Māori descent.\textsuperscript{13} As a result, competing ideas emerged on how the settlement assets could be distributed when, according to the 1991 census, 22.1 percent of Māori claimed that they did not know their iwi affiliation and four percent stated that they did not belong to an iwi at all.\textsuperscript{14}

So, contemporary commentators discussed how assets could be distributed to all Māori when so many were not affiliated to tribal structures, the social category that the Crown preferred to engage with over individuals, whānau and hapū. They asked what policies there should be about Māori identities and their representative organisations that were based on being Māori but simultaneously not defined by descent.\textsuperscript{15} Part of the tension between urban Māori identities and tribal identities, some scholars soon argued, was that Treaty settlement processes had unnecessarily ‘frozen’ and prioritized iwi identities by requiring iwi to affiliate to tribal structures as they were when the Treaty was signed in 1840. As Roger Maaka has written’[t]ribes are not static organizations... the freezing of tribes at the signing of a treaty with a

\begin{thebibliography}{1}
\bibitem{Clark} Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark, group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010.
\bibitem{In Treaty} In Treaty settlement processes, the definitions for membership as beneficiaries of representative tribal entities are based on descent from named ancestors and associations with an area of interest. I also note, however, that iwi can also include non-related individuals through legal adoption and, sometimes, customary whāngai practices too.
\end{thebibliography}
European power is concomitant with the colonization process.\textsuperscript{16} From this view, prioritising Māori relationships as defined through tribal structures risked devaluing the cultural validity of many Māori communities who in the latter half of the twentieth century have been pan-iwi and permanently urban residing. With 84.4 percent of Māori urban-residing in 2006, and with almost 16 percent of people of Māori descent not knowing their iwi, pan-iwi organisations and shared Māori identities represented the experiences of tens of thousands of Māori.\textsuperscript{17}

Māori in urban areas, therefore, may or may not choose to affiliate to an iwi, or know their iwi affiliation. Even if they are affiliated to an iwi, it is likely that they do not affiliate to the tangata whenua iwi of where they reside. By studying urban-located marae, Paul Tapsell has argued that urban-residing Māori fall under two main types of Māori in cities: tangata whenua and taurahere (immigrant), with the latter category being divided into non-tribal or immigrant-tribal.\textsuperscript{18} By looking at the city of Auckland, Tapsell used the longstanding home iwi of central Auckland, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, to illustrate the experiences of an ‘urban-encircled’ tangata whenua iwi; he used the non-tribal, immigrant-Māori Auckland community of Hoani Waititi Marae to describe a marae as ‘a vehicle of pan-Māori urban unity’; and he used the immigrant-tribal marae of Mataatua in Rotorua, to demonstrate the establishment of a home for an iwi located outside of their traditional rohe.\textsuperscript{19} For Tapsell, there were clear tensions between these Māori identities and their associations in urban areas. As Tapsell argued, the development of pan-iwi Māori groups and identities in Auckland has, at times, diverted much deserved recognition away from tangata whenua groups.\textsuperscript{20} This was demonstrated by Daniel Rosenblatt. By studying the pan-iwi urban community of


\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., pp. 143, 145, 153, 155, 159.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 144.
Hoani Waititi Marae, known as Te Whānau o Waipareira, Rosenblatt showed that tensions emerged from the use by urban-Māori of traditional Māori social and cultural references to the landscape. Using waiata as an example, he showed that assertions by urban Māori of their connections to a landscape in which they have no whakapapa connection were viewed very negatively by mana whenua iwi. As a result, such assertions have led mana whenua iwi to believe that the large numbers of pan-Māori and shared Māori identity groups in Auckland ‘obviated the importance of tangata whenua status and genealogical identity.

Considering the large numbers of Māori who moved into Auckland during the twentieth century, a number unparalleled in the rest of New Zealand, Tapsell and Rosenblatt’s points are fair. For example, in the 1991 census, the Māori population of Ngāti Whātua descent was recorded at just over 9,300. Compared with a total urban Māori population of Auckland of over 27,500 (almost a quarter of the total Māori population), it is easy to see that their mana whenua spaces were inundated with populations of Māori from outside iwi identities, requiring a greater emphasis on the importance of tangata whenua to the Auckland urban landscape. However, as this thesis will show with reference to the Wellington area, the existence of pan-iwi identities have not always necessitated tribal connections or the authority of mana whenua to be ‘obviated’ because in cities, non-kin and tribal identities have overlapped. Although Rosenblatt referred to Te Whānau o Waipareira to demonstrate the maintenance of Māori social and cultural forms in the city through an urban “community” rooted in the institutions and ways of thinking that characterized their previous rural existence’, in doing so he also emphasised the ongoing importance of whakapapa to Māori, whether rural or urban.
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21 Daniel Rosenblatt, “‘Titirangi is the Mountain’”, p.124.
24 Daniel Rosenblatt, “‘Titirangi is the Mountain’”, p. 122.
Through urbanisations, whakapapa has remained a significant guiding concept with impacts upon practical experiences for Māori. This has included literal whakapapa as genealogy, as well as more figurative whakapapa referring to connections between people, ancestors and ngā atua, and between the animate and inanimate. Through living in cities, Māori have maintained their Māoritanga because it is what keeps them connected to their past and their futures. This has been reflected in the recent work of Melissa Matutina Williams who has written about taurahere connections in the city of Auckland that were based in both whakapapa and shared, non-kin experiences. For example, Williams’ focus on Māori communities from Panguru who resided in Auckland allowed her to explore relationships based first on genealogy, before extending to other Māori as well. Using a specific workplace as one example, she demonstrated that while whakapapa assisted in the recruitment of whānau members to become employed at the same factory in West Auckland, broader concepts of whakapapa informed the shared values of what was described as being a ‘workplace-whānau’. These broader concepts of whakapapa were broad indeed and based in the values and needs of those workers, who were largely Māori, and who were required to spend a large proportion of their time at work. In this way, time spent among both whānau and non-kin individuals led to shared experiences and ‘workplace-whānau’ relationships with women from a range of backgrounds.

But what can be said about the relationships of such urban Māori, both kin and non-kin, with mana whenua iwi or Pākehā? Williams’ work is pertinent to the subject of this thesis because, in contrast to the other authors mentioned already, she has studied Māori experiences during a period in which urban migrations were at their peaks, that is, during the post-war decades. However, considering the large populations of Māori who urbanised to Auckland during the twentieth century, the sheer physical size of the city, and the distinct experiences of Ngāti Whātua with the

25 Melissa Matutina Williams, ‘“Back-home” and Home in the City’, p. 26
27 Ibid., pp. 11, 14.
Crown, we cannot assume that any Māori moving into Auckland would interact with the mana whenua iwi. According to Tapsell, the mana whenua iwi in Auckland were considered by non-Māori to be ‘a stumbling block in Auckland’s progressive development’, and thus at the same time as Māori were moving into the city in huge numbers, the mana whenua was also being subjugated. This meant that during the post-war decades, there were many Māori in the city but not necessarily with longstanding historical connections there.

In towns and cities throughout New Zealand in the twentieth century, these Māori from broad backgrounds interacted with other Māori from different iwi or hapū backgrounds, and they also interacted with Pākehā, who dominated urban populations. For example, when Māori were recorded as a majority urban-residing population for the first time in 1966, Māori were only 7.5 percent of the total population. Urban populations were mostly non-Māori and this usually meant Pākehā. A result of these large Pākehā populations was that throughout the twentieth century, urban areas have been characterised as a Pākehā domain. In undertaking research for this thesis, it was that in addition to ‘urban Māori’ being equated to ideas of losing connections with mana whenua identities, it also was related to becoming more ‘like Pākehā’. This was demonstrated by Huhana Clark when she stated that ‘a lot of people lose their traditions and their language and they grab on to these kupu, kupu Pākehā, which doesn't mean a bit to you and I as Māori’. Part of the concern for kaumātua in talking about ‘urban Māori’ was, therefore, related to perceptions of total cultural loss and assimilation.

But this is not surprising when considering the amount of public attention that ‘urban Māori’ has received as meaning that Māori had become disconnected and ‘lost’ in the city. For example, Witi Ihimaera’s *Pounamu, Pounamu* and *The New Net Goes Fishing* published in 1972 and 1977 respectively, told tales of Māori in the city that raised some challenging questions about the success of the maintenance of Māori social and
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29 Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark, group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010.
cultural forms in urban areas. A poignant chapter in *The New Net Goes Fishing*, called ‘Catching Up’, told a story of a young man dealing with his own educational success at the expense of his knowledge of te reo Māori. When the young man met an elderly relative on the day of his graduation from university he was embarrassed that he could not speak Māori. For this young man, succeeding in the Pākehā world also meant losing in a Māori one. ‘This was his world, but it was not his world’, Ihimaera wrote. ‘He had been racing all these years. He had caught up, yes. He had won, but he had also lost.’

Decades after Ihimaera published his work, anthropologist Lily George worked with the pan-Māori community at Atawha Marae in Auckland and found that urban Māori tribal disconnectedness remained a very real phenomenon. Undertaking her research in 2002, she wrote that ‘[i]n New Zealand society, there are several generations of Māori who have lost connection to culture and language’. However, this perception of cultural loss was also evidence of successful efforts to maintain Māori social and cultural forms in towns and cities, away from their whakapapa-based tribal marae and communities. As this thesis shows, urban areas have long been associated with being challenging to Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau identities, as far back as the early decades of the twentieth century. The establishment of pan-iwi communities and communities based on shared Māori identities, especially in the Wellington region and epitomised by the Ngāti Pōneke community, have demonstrated the Māori will to refuse assimilation and cultural decimation. And, as Richard Hill has written, considering the numbers of Māori who moved into urban areas, it is likely that only a relatively small proportion became completely detribalised through urbanisations. Plus, even if Māori became detribalised, there were (and are) opportunities for the children or grandchildren of such individuals to reconnect with iwi identities and landscapes. In this way, as George argued, Māori have used urban Māori communities as an entry
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into more specific identities based on iwi and hapū. Through urban marae, Māori have actively brought together innovative cultural forms with ngā taonga tuku iho (cultural treasures gifted from ancestors) thereby ensuring cultural continuities.  

Amongst all these layers of Māori identities in urban areas, it is thus valuable to recognise that the clubs, marae, groups and organisations resulting from the associations of different Māori identities in urban areas were evidence of the dynamism of Māori cultural forms. ‘Retribalisation’ and ‘the bureaucratization of genealogy’ through Treaty settlements did not curb the loss of cultural forms threatened by urbanisations because Māoritanga had continued regardless. Despite significant material change, Māori did not assimilate and disappear. Through urbanisations Māori ‘still continued to identify as Māori’.  

This was possible because of ongoing connections with home places, the maintenance of multiple home places, and the growth of urban Māori communities that showed that despite narratives of disconnection and loss through urbanisations, experiences of urban migration were layered and Māori identities were dynamic. This thesis approaches such Māori urbanisation histories, which emphasise the continuity of Māori social and cultural forms, from a ‘bottom up’ perspective that is guided by the experiences of oral history participants. Melissa Williams’ study of Māori with a shared ancestry showed that many Māori values and practices such as whakapapa and whānau social organisation were robust, remaining important in urban and tribal areas through the twentieth century. In a similar way, this thesis draws on individual and whānau experiences, but as mentioned previously, the networks of urban Māori whānau were not necessarily related by descent. While Williams wrote ‘against’ urbanisation histories as being stories of assimilation and detribalisation based on her particular case study of Panguru ‘migrants’, non-tribal groups also have allowed Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau identities to be maintained. Tribal affiliations were not

34 ‘Bureaucratization of genealogy’ used by Natacha Gagné, Being Māori in the City, p. 68. 
necessarily weakened by living in urban areas, but in many cases were reinforced through interactions with other urban-located, Māori, as well as those ‘back-home’.\(^\text{36}\)

This was also possible because although a source of continuity in identities was whānau based, as Williams demonstrated, it also connected to longer, shared processes.\(^\text{37}\) For instance, Hill has argued that the maintenance of Māori cultural and social forms through urbanisation was part of an ongoing Māori drive for autonomy or rangatiratanga, especially in ongoing Māori relationships with the state. From the outset, the state had aimed for Māori to be assimilated within the majority culture, but in doing so, the state had consistently collided with the ‘creative energies’ and innovations used by Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau to actively resist such intentions.\(^\text{38}\)

Guided by oral history evidence from interviewees from a range of backgrounds, this thesis explores such innovations from a non-tribal perspective. It focuses on Māori efforts to resist assimilation and work instead towards social and cultural maintenance as iwi and as Māori. In so doing, it acknowledges that Māori communities of towns and cities have enacted relationships that ‘appeared apolitical’, but were still active in a process of the maintenance of Māori cultural and social forms which, when considering the Crown’s previous policies of assimilation, were political.\(^\text{39}\) Through interviews with Māori men and women, the line between apolitical and political was blurred, and many interviewees made an easy connection between concepts of urbanisations and assimilation. What was implicit in such conversations, however, was that although Māori social and cultural forms were subject to challenges through urbanisations, their ongoing presence demonstrates the durability of such Māori social and cultural forms.\(^\text{40}\) The majority of the participants in this thesis were first generation urban migrants to the Wellington region and despite their identification of
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\(^{36}\) Melissa Matutina Williams, ‘‘Back-home’ and Home in the City’, pp. 198-199, 233-234.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., pp. 52-53, 233-234


\(^{39}\) Natacha Gagné, Being Māori in the City, p. 253.

\(^{40}\) See, for example, Richard S. Hill, Maori and the State, pp. 44-45, 290; Melissa Matutina Williams, ‘‘Back-home’ and Home in the City’, p. 237.
the challenges and losses for Māori living in towns and cities, their oral histories are evidence of the resilience of Māori cultural forms.

Thus, even though there are tensions in using ‘urban Māori’ or referring to urbanisations, the value in examining Māori urban migrations is the insight it provides into a wealth of experiences in the intermixing between Māori identities that occurred. As George has argued, it was through urban Māori experiences that the layers of Māori identities can be observed, encompassing the diverse ways that Māori ‘express who we are as Māori’.

This thesis will show that in towns and cities like in the Wellington area, Māori experiences of urbanisation were not universally stories of moving away from descent-home places, nor were they necessarily tales in which urban Māori swamped and then dominated tangata whenua. By exploring a history of the ‘urban iwi’ or ‘urban whānau’ of Ngāti Pōneke in Wellington, a tale of mana whenua and immigrant iwi relationships is revealed. It is a history in which ‘old’ social structures provided continuity for Māori moving into the city and also took on new meanings.

**This Thesis and Māori Urban Migrations to Wellington**

Interviews in the research for this thesis frequently referred to whakapapa relationships in which pan-iwi and iwi specific identities co-existed. This particularly included the coexistence of kin-based whakapapa and non-kin relationships that were discussed in terms of whakapapa. This was especially true for members of the Ngāti Pōneke community who, since the Club’s establishment in 1937, have presented themselves as a kind of ‘front line’ for the maintenance of Māori social and cultural forms in the city of Wellington.
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42 See Paul Potiki, in Grace et. al., The Silent Migration, pp. 225-226.
While kinship-connected hapū and iwi reference shared descent–based narratives in their identity, the Ngāti Pōneke community, with diverse iwi backgrounds, point to the ‘descent-stories’ and experiences of their founding members as the basis for their community. In the 1990 programme for performances held by the Ngāti Pōneke community to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the signing the Treaty of Waitangi, the president of Ngāti Pōneke that year, Matthew M. Bennett, presented a brief history of the Club that acknowledged the varied experiences of members who established and maintained the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club. When reflecting on the history he wrote, he explained that the Ngāti Pōneke community had seen many members and generations of participants, all with authority to recall their experiences. As president, he needed to recognise these varied accounts of the history of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club. This included the authority of those kaumātua who were part of the original establishment, as well as the many other members who joined over the decades – some of whom were ‘born and bred’ within the Club and the urban community.

At the time that I wrote that, I was very conscious of the fact that the generation previous to mine exercised a huge amount of ownership of Ngāti Pōneke and ownership in terms of pride of association, which had seen them grow up as children. And so they were the hau kāinga, and they saw their story as being the story of Ngāti Pōneke. But if you part that story and look to see what preceded it there was another different story that came before that, and that was really the story of fundraising for Māori for the war effort; and when you look at that, these people whose story was just part [of that], were only the little children at that time and it was their parents, Lady Pomare and all of those people who were associated with her and the efforts that she was leading. And that was another story; that was an earlier ‘chapter’.

And then before my time there was another group who came, and so they had their chapter to add to the story of Ngāti Pōneke; and during my time with the Club, and my colleagues, my associates at Ngāti Pōneke, we had another chapter to add. So when I say there have been many attempts to write the
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43 Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, Ngāti Pōneke Performance Programme, 1990, [Wellington], copy in author’s possession, p. 3.
story of Ngāti Pōneke, to really write the story of Ngāti Pōneke you have got to have a look at those different time spans, those different decades, or however you want to break it up.44

The acknowledgement by Matthew Bennett of the varied perspectives and experiences of members of the Ngāti Pōneke community who came before him is a feature of Māori histories that is not unique to pan-iwi organisations like Ngāti Pōneke. As Nēpia Mahuika has argued, this feature in Māori history telling is, at least partially, the result of iwi resistance to the homogenisation of iwi identities beneath a general Māori identity category. However, he continued, it is also a factor internal to iwi and hapū. With reference to his iwi of Ngāti Porou, Mahuika described that within ‘the landscape of Ngāti Porutanga ... although richly coloured in its own unique shades’, there are ‘multiple interpretations within its mātauranga.’45

Throughout the chapters of this thesis, the layers of and interactions between different Māori identities in the urban areas of Wellington and the Hutt Valley are used to demonstrate both the distinctiveness of, and convergences in, Māori identities. By discussing urbanisations directly with kaumātua and exploring historical sources of Māori living in, and moving to, the urban spaces of Wellington and the Hutt Valley, this thesis is a ‘meeting place’ for a range of perspectives on the meanings of urbanisations from the past and the present.

It is important to recognise that despite the difficulty in discussing urbanisation experiences due to varied accounts and perspectives, there are important lessons to be learned from what Māori shared in their experiences, as well as what was unique. Experiences of urbanisations existed within a range of Māori or iwi-specific factors and worldviews, and despite the existence of diverse experiences, many Māori found, and have since argued that, in the words of indigenous scholar Bronwyn Fredericks, ‘we

44 Matthew M. Bennett, interview, Kohupātiki, Napier, 24 April 2010.
don’t leave our identities at the city limits’. Instead, diversity in Māori experiences and backgrounds became factors in the coexisting and layered multiple Māori identities that interacted through urban residencies.

Chapter Two addresses this diversity by arguing that before discussing urbanisations, we must recognise that layered identities are fundamental to Māori histories, both written and oral. It explains that through Māori histories, such layered identities need not be competing but instead can be complementary. It uses Māori tribal history writing over the past two decades to show that the uniqueness of Māori and iwi histories has its basis in tikanga-approaches. Such tikanga-approaches have included Māori historical processes that become fundamental to the production of written Māori histories. Using oral and written Māori histories as examples, it demonstrates the similarities between written Māori histories and the tikanga of a marae and the delivery of whaikōrero on the paepae. In this spirit, Chapter Two introduces a specific whakataukī as a philosophical foundation for the ways Māori interviewed for this thesis choose to relate events of the past, present and future. That guiding whakataukī asks ‘he aha te mea nui i te ao (what is the most important thing)?’ The answer being ‘he tangata, he tangata, he tangata (it is people, it is people, it is people)’. For this thesis, historical information was considered as the taonga of participating people, and those people and their relationships are paramount.

This thesis also acknowledges that the oral histories collected for this history are only one entry point into the many histories of the Wellington region. It is largely guided by the accounts and directions provided by participating kuia and kaumātua, meaning that there are several perspectives and backgrounds not represented within these pages. For example, the Wellington area has many histories connected to many iwi,
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46 Bronwyn Fredericks, ‘We Don’t leave our Identities at the City Limits: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People in Living in Urban Localities’, paper presented at Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Conference, Perspectives on Urban Life: Connections and Disconnections, Australian National University, Canberra, 29 September 2009.

47 Whakataukī can have broad interpretations. After discussing this with one interviewed kaumātua, it is important for me to be clear that for this thesis, ‘he tangata, he tangata, he tangata’ refers to the way that every person should have aroha (love and affection) for other people. In this sense, arohanui and caring for others, including God, can be considered the most important thing.
including those who are still recognised as mana whenua in the area. Discussing and researching urban migrations made these other histories and connections clear (however not all are explored), and urbanisations were frequently related to wider Māori migration practices.

Since oral history interviewees for this study tended to contextualise their urbanisation experiences with references to other Māori migration practices, both pre and post European contact, the geographical focus and timeframe for this study was also widened to recognise urban migrations as part of longer histories of Māori mobility. A number of authors have already discussed Māori urban migrations and have emphasised the necessity of such a broadened focus. Examples are Joan Metge in *A New Maori Migration* published in 1964; and Graham Butterworth in his 1991 report, *Ngā Take i Neke Ai te Māori: Māori Mobility.*

Chapter Three recognises the relevance of a widened focus for Māori migrations by casting urban migrations relative to a longer history of Māori settlement at Te Whanganui ā Tara (the Wellington area). In doing so, it identifies Te Whanganui ā Tara as a location of layered Māori identities well before urbanisations occurred, especially considering the range of tangata whenua groups based there.

It also discusses the experiences of Taranaki Whānui as one of these tangata whenua groups. Through the migrations of the nineteenth century, many Taranaki iwi and hapū came to reside at Te Whanganui ā Tara. When discussing these groups in the nineteenth century, Chapter Three refers to them as Taranaki Whānui hapū, reflecting their connections as part of the broader Taranaki identity. During the nineteenth century, however, these iwi and hapū established connections in the Wellington area that have are today, longstanding. When discussing these groups into the twentieth century, this thesis refers to them as Taranaki Whānui, a group that today, is recognised an iwi in its own right. While other tangata whenua groups have connections to the Wellington area, this thesis mostly refers to the experiences of

---

Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga, Ngāti Toa and Taranaki Whānui. But while this thesis does not represent a universal experience or a definitive survey of tangata whenua experiences or urban migrations, it nonetheless has begun a journey into understandings of urban migration and Māori histories from a broad range of sources.

This study also explores the relationship between urbanisations and processes of colonisation. Chapter Three uses the longer history of iwi in the Wellington region to argue that Māori urban migrations were a consequence of colonisation, including that European settlement initiated processes that made iwi ‘rural’ and marginalised from urban areas to begin with – not only physically, but conceptually. Through colonisation, Māori ownership of land that was desired by settlers decreased. As the remaining land in Māori ownership was in rural areas, Māori became characterised by rural residencies. Additionally, through the late nineteenth century, urban areas increasingly attracted Pākehā residences, and then became characterised as Pākehā spaces. By the beginning of the twentieth century, land loss and high Māori birth rates contributed to economic forces that meant that urbanisations of Māori populations were imminent, and they would need to move to towns and cities that were indisputably Pākehā in character.

Māori dispossession of land and the decline of Māori wellbeing through the nineteenth century as a result of colonisation continued into the twentieth century. Chapter Four examines Māori populations in the early twentieth century to explore the forces impacting upon them, and in which urbanisations were becoming desirable and necessary. It argues that Māori urban migrations were apparent from the early decades of the century, although at very low rates. Fuelling these early urbanisations were demographic features distinct to Māori, such as high birth rates, which meant that rural Māori communities were increasing at rates that could not be accommodated in most tribal areas. Even though the urban Māori population was only 17 percent of the total Māori population in 1936 – and only 0.9 percent of the total New Zealand population – there was enough evidence for Horace Belshaw to predict in 1940 that Māori were challenged by a growing crisis of population, land and
employment. He pointed out that if current trends continued, Māori would increasingly be required to migrate to urban areas.\textsuperscript{49} However, due to a number of social and political factors, there was resistance to accommodating Māori urbanisations, let alone providing state assistance for them. Chapter Four argues that these issues, articulated in conversations about the ‘Māori Problem’, were connected to assumptions of the need for Māori to be assimilated, and they were not new. However, it was in these early years that discussions on the ‘Māori Problem’ became connected to conversations on Māori urbanisations.

And urbanisations were increasing, although still at rates that disguised the growing need and desires of Māori to move into towns and cities. For example, Māori urban populations were low prior to World War Two. They were only 0.39 percent of the total urban population of Wellington and the Hutt Valley area according to the 1936 census. Thus it was easy for the state to underestimate the scale of the impending urbanisations.\textsuperscript{50} Measures to address ‘Māori Problems’ were introduced by the state during this time, influenced by the leadership of the Young Māori Party. Many of these measures provided much-needed assistance through which Māori living standards and employment in rural areas were improved, but the necessity for urbanisations was still growing. As Graham Butterworth has argued, the ‘rural Māori renaissance’ that took place in these early decades of the century was key in allowing Māori to retain, and in some cases revive, cultural forms whilst coming ‘to terms with Pakeha culture’. A result of this was that Māori actively sought better living conditions, including better employment and educational opportunities, which could only be addressed through what Butterworth called the ‘sad fact’ of urban migrations.\textsuperscript{51} But in the cities in these early decades of the century, Māoritanga persisted, not only within communities of migrating Māori, but in mana whenua populations that continued to live on or near

their traditional areas of interest. However, unlike those mana whenua iwi who noticed the small but increasing numbers of Māori in cities, the state initially resisted implementing measures to assist Māori in their movements. Assistance was instead sourced through Māori initiatives.

Prior to the war, mana whenua iwi such as Taranaki Whānui made efforts to build a home for Māori in the city, not only for themselves but also their manuhiri. Around the same time, another type of Māori urban community – the ‘Ngāti’ of ‘Pōneke’ – set itself apart from mana whenua iwi by accommodating the increasingly diverse iwi backgrounds of urban Māori who felt outnumbered in the city. The Ngāti Pōneke young Māori Club was established in 1937, and from the outset it was a non-denominational, non-political and non-iwi organisation that provided Māori fellowship in the city. Through their Māori community, Ngāti Pōneke aimed to retain Māori social and cultural values without prioritising any particular iwi background over another, and they used this Māoritanga in their interactions with the wider public. This included contributions to the National Centennial Exhibition in 1940 and fundraising efforts for World War Two. Chapter Five puts Wellington Māori at the centre of a story about Māori contributions to the war effort to show that during wartime, Māori-centred efforts for the war played an important part in encouraging urban migrations. The Ngāti Pōneke community in particular attracted membership during the war because the opportunities it offered, for kapa haka performance and relationships between Māori and soldiers, were exciting to young Māori.

The Club also participated in the tribal committees established as the Māori War Effort Organisation, committees which Claudia Orange has described as ‘a vital bridge... between rural and urban life’.52 For Ngāti Pōneke, this bridge between rural and urban life meant providing manaakitanga in the city centre for all people: urban migrants, Māori and Pākehā, and especially soldiers of all ethnicities. This feature of the Club was identified by state officials as being a model for future Māori relationships in the

city, relationships that could advance state intentions for Māori integration or absorption within the larger non-Māori populations. For Ngāti Pōneke members, however, cultural integration or assimilation was in no way a focus of their activities because their focus was on the maintenance and teaching of Māoritanga in the city. By providing a community that was not aligned to any particular tikanga or kawa of an iwi or hapū but that still enacted Māori social and cultural forms, the Ngāti Pōneke community was in a prime position at the end of the war to guide young Māori in their moves to cities. And right from these early years of the Club, Māori found solace in the Club’s operations and a home in the city.

But as Māori continued to move into cities after the war, the survival or relevance of Māoritanga through urbanisations was a subject of some disagreement. After 1951, Māori urbanisations gained momentum and in the lead up to the 1961 census, the urban Māori population increased from 29 to 46 percent of the total Māori population. Chapter Six explains that in this context of change, the state was guided by an ad-hoc policy of Māori integration based on an assumption that Māori should become more modern (and like Pākehā). For Māori in the city, who were more aware of the extent of the increasing Māori urban migrations movements, they felt they had an obligation to meet the needs of the increasing Māori populations. This included efforts not only by Ngāti Pōneke and other pan-iwi clubs and groups, but by mana whenua iwi as well. For example, Taranaki Whānui in Wellington sought to build a marae that would articulate their longstanding presence in Wellington, as well as provide for the maintenance of Taranaki Whānui and other Māori identities. After more than a decade of fundraising, this marae was opened at Waiwhetū in 1960 and called Aroha ki Te Tangata. It was a name that referred to connections between all people as opposed to an iwi ancestor, as is the case in naming practice for many marae.53

The wide range of Māori clubs and groups being established during the post-war decades was a response to the needs of an increased Māori population in the city.

These many groups and clubs catered to different Māori needs and interests, and many operated outside of the reach of official state systems. On a national scale, for instance, the Māori Women’s Welfare League was established in Wellington in 1951; and on a local scale, there were many clubs such as the Victoria University of Wellington Māori Club, established in 1955. Prior to the public release of the Report on Department of Maori Affairs (known as The Hunn Report) these Māori organisations were working to assist Māori in a range of areas such as employment, education and housing. Urban-located, voluntary organisations like these played a significant role in allowing Māori to ‘put down roots and [plant] their culture in the new ground’. And, as Richard Hill has argued, this ‘transplanting’ meant that ‘rangatiratanga was assisted not only to re-establish but also flourish in the large towns and cities.’

Chapter Six shows that in the urban spaces of Wellington and the Hutt Valley, such organisations assisted Māori to adjust to city living, and they did so from a position of retaining Māori identities. With more Māori in the city, pan-īwi organisations played an important role in the retention of īwi identities.

In Wellington during the 1950s, the Ngāti Pōneke community continued to meet the needs and desires of migrating Māori. In all decades since its establishment, the Club attracted membership from Māori who desired fellowship with ‘other Māori faces’ as a result of residency in areas dominated by Pākehā. During the war they had set themselves apart from other groups as a club for activity consistent with the tikanga of manaakitanga. Through the 1950s, this extended to include engaging with travelling groups and international guests.

And as urbanisations continued, the Ngāti Pōneke community continued to grow. Urban births, chain migrations and the persisting economic conditions in which Māori still sought employment and education in urban areas meant that in the five year period following the public release of The Hunn Report, the scale of Māori population change was higher than Hunn predicted. Specifically, Māori became a majority urban

population sometime before the census in 1966 instead of between 1980 and the year 2000, as Hunn had projected.\textsuperscript{55} In the view of the state, Ngāti Pōneke also continued to demonstrate the importance of integration for Māori in the city. But, as Chapter Seven shows, the Club in practice was a site of the maintenance of Māoritanga in the city beyond just the retention of the ‘fittest elements’ or ‘relics’ such as te reo and performance arts identified by Hunn as being for the benefit of the nation.\textsuperscript{56} While Ngāti Pōneke continued to be strong in Māori performing arts, they were much more than a kapa haka group. As Jackie Sturm wrote in 1955, ‘[t]o most people then, especially Europeans, the club is know[n] soley[sic] as a ‘concert party’, and I think many have the mistaken idea that all the training and practising is a preparation for concerts only.’\textsuperscript{57}

Instead, through the post-war decades, the Club continued to provide relationships in urban areas for Māori modelled on traditional Māori social structures, such as kinship. In some instances, this included the Club representing itself as being ‘like’ an iwi. From the late 1960s, Māori identities were increasingly interactive as a result of Māori, pan-iwi and mana whenua groups overlapping in urban areas, and Ngāti Pōneke set itself apart by emphasising their unique attachment to the Wellington landscape. While they considered themselves to be an iwi of the city, they still recognised the authority of the mana whenua iwi, with whom they maintained relationships.

But despite their coexistence over the previous decades, as the 1960s neared their end it also became clearer the ways that Māori identities were in some cases contrastive and competing. Chapter Seven explores growing tensions between groups to reflect on what it meant to be ‘urban Māori’ as the total Māori population shifted to being a majority urban-residing population from 1966. Some Māori turned the focus of the ‘Māori Problem’ back onto the role the state had played in colonisation and that had led to urbanisations. Others used the media to communicate Māori hopes and


\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 15.

fears regarding urbanisations. Despite feelings of cultural loss, Māori in cities wanted the ‘Māori Problem’ to be firmly under Māori control, and to be directed towards Māori purposes. In this context, Ngāti Pōneke leaders worked to open their own permanent marae, and what eventuated became a symbol of the ongoing relationships between the Club and mana whenua iwi. Some Māori sought to prioritise their iwi affiliations over pan-iwi groups, some Māori mourned a loss of connections with their home places, and some Māori saw little value in ‘pseudo iwi’ organisations. Nonetheless, Ngāti Pōneke still sought to provide a home for all these Māori. By building a marae on the traditional area of Pipitea, a space with important historical connections to Taranaki Whānui, Ngāti Pōneke did two things that provided a commentary of Māori relationships in the Wellington urban area: the marae reignited a traditional iwi papa kāinga, but it also provided a permanent anchor for the Ngāti Pōneke community in the Wellington landscape. By the end of the period studied in this thesis, the Ngāti Pōneke community continued to present itself as an iwi of the city, and their relationship with Taranaki Whānui was unusual and unprecedented.

Chapter Eight concludes the path of Māori urban migrations as discussed in this thesis. Māori identities were overlaid in towns and cities through urbanisations, and Māori discomfort about discussing urbanisations came from a range of sources. These sources included public and policy discussions of the ‘Māori Problem’, Māori experiences of towns and cities as predominantly Pākehā places, and ongoing Māori connections between the sites of their urban residency and their descent home places. Urban Māori communities also had an impact on Māori identities, and a number of prominent Māori groups were established as a result of urban communities. Ngāti Pōneke was amongst these groups and in the context of increasing public awareness of mana whenua iwi groups, the Ngāti Pōneke community continued to operate and attract members. Amongst growing discomfort about what urbanisations had entailed, Māori in the city showed that living in an urban area did not preclude being Māori or being tribal.
It is showed throughout this thesis that the formations of urban Māori communities were an articulation of layered and interacting Māori identities in urbanisations of the twentieth century. The cooperation and contrasts between Māori identities in towns and cities particularly contributed to the opinions and perspectives of the kaumātua involved in the research for this thesis. They ultimately disclosed that in discussing Māori urbanisations, ‘being Māori’ was the most important consideration. In this sense, Māori experiences of urbanisation were not simply tales of upheaval and moving great distances, and neither were they only tales of cultural disconnections and becoming like ‘manuhiri in your own country’. Instead, this thesis presents a history in which Māori histories of urbanisations and urban community are stories of relationships and connections. This thesis does not represent the experiences of all urban-migrating Māori during the twentieth century, nor does it represent the experiences of all urban migrating Māori in the Wellington-Hutt urban areas. What it does represent is a collection of experiences that demonstrate that despite the challenges in discussing urban migrations, the reasons why some Māori choose to deny urbanisation as an aspect of their own personal, whānau, hapū or iwi pasts can be understood through a history of those Māori urban migrations.

All the chapters in this Māori history of Māori urban migration weave together histories of urbanisation experiences in the Wellington region to bring together a range of demographic, social and cultural phenomena that had impacts upon the lives of individuals and whānau. During a time of significant material, physical and geographical change, it was continuities and identities that deserve our attention.

---
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Chapter Two: **Studying Māori Urban Migrations**

Hutia te rito o te harakeke,
Kei whea te kōmako e kō?
Kī mai ki ahau,
He aha te mea nui o te ao?
Māku e kī atu,
He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

*If the heart of the harakeke (flax) was removed,*
*Where will the bellbird sing?*
*If I was asked,*
*What is the most important thing in the world?*
*I will reply,*
*It is people, it is people, it is people.*

The whakataukī above was adopted as a theoretical foundation for undertaking research for this thesis on Māori urban migrations. It was chosen because it emphasises that personal experiences and personal connections lie at the base of an historical research project like this – a sentiment that is reflected in many Māori histories and research practices today.2

Guided by this foundation concept, important sources of information for this thesis were conversations and interviews with kaumātua from the Wellington region. These

kaumātua were a select group who held a wealth of knowledge about local iwi and changes that occurred in the region through the decades of the twentieth century.

Significantly, this whakataukī was also a consistent theme in the information and histories shared by those kaumātua. As one interviewee explained, it is the connections to people – both from our own lines of descent and of others – that spurs us to revisit the events of the past. ‘[I]t is about acknowledging your own whakapapa and it is about looking at other people to see if they are the same and what the differences are’, she explained. ‘It is also that what makes people become historians…. That is what makes you the person that you are, that is what makes you become a researcher of whakapapa, of history.’³

Kaumātua, such as this interviewee, emphasised that the value in studying or discussing Māori urbanisations was related to what those discussions could mean and do for people, including their connections and their whakapapa. In a literal sense, the word whakapapa means the layering of matter, layer upon layer, connected and interrelated. In a metaphorical sense, it denotes relationships and connections. Thus whakapapa can be used to denote not only genealogical descent, which is its most common use, but also the relationships between beings and objects as continuously connected and interrelated, including the tangible and the spiritual.⁴

In recognition of the literal and metaphorical uses of whakapapa by kaikōrero, some Māori historians have campaigned for whakapapa to be increasingly recognised as a significant foundation to Māori approaches to knowledge of the past.⁵ In the words of Danny Keenan when he undertook research with whānau, ‘[m]ost kaumatua... do not seem impressed with such descriptions as “Maori intellectual processes”’. Perhaps, to
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³ RTN, interview, Wellington, 14 April 2010.
some, such descriptions suggest an inappropriate detour into abstractions.‘ Thus, because this thesis is a history about ‘urbanisations’, which some kaumātua considered to be such an ‘abstraction’, consistent reference to the whakataukī cited at the beginning of this chapter enabled an approach to the research that would prioritise the perspectives and agendas of participants. This chapter explains how that whakataukī was used in oral history research. It explains how, in studying a history or Māori urbanisations, the most important thing is people.

Māori Histories

By its very nature, the sentiment communicated in the whakataukī is layered. ‘He tangata’ includes the shared experiences of Māori as the tangata whenua of Aotearoa, as well as the unique experiences of whānau, hapū and iwi. However, such layered and multiple Māori identities are an important distinguishing feature of written Māori histories. ‘It is a fallacy to research Māori as though they are a homogenous entity’, prominent Māori scholar Wally Penetito has argued. ‘The question we need to ask is what are the ways to be Māori?’

The answer to that question can be found in the tendency of Māori histories to allow general Māori identities to exist alongside iwi and hapū accounts of the past, as well for different hapū or iwi accounts to exist in parallel. Such layering of histories stems directly from Māori historical practices. The use of whakapapa and its associated connections, for example, is something that requires authors to acknowledge the authorities and ownership of whānau, hapū and iwi over their own, personal
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narratives of the past. In 2011, Nēpia Mahuika demonstrated this when he argued that discussions of Māori history must begin from basic Māori social categories such as whānau and hapū, before advancing to analyses from the wider theoretical framework of iwi or ‘Māori’. He spoke from his own background as Ngāti Porou, while simultaneously acknowledging the rights of other iwi to present their own perspectives and historical arguments.8

However, although Māori histories should take account of the perspectives and agendas of smaller social categories, multiple descent identities need not preclude the creation of layered or collective Māori histories. Multiple perspectives for Māori history is a well-discussed and foundational concept of many Māori historical practices. Although, as Miranda Johnson has argued, indigenous oral histories may be incongruous to the practice of democratic historical processes, Māori approaches to creating histories prioritising accounts based on their relationship to a particular social group (such as one defined by descent) are not necessarily an academically limited undertaking.9 Instead, Māori histories that prioritise certain descent-related or shared historical sources or narratives are actually a strength of Māori historical practice.10

The difference is an acceptance and acknowledgment of the contrasts between groups. ‘[T]he tool of rigour may be a chisel made of steel or it may be a chisel made of pounamu,’ Tipene O’Regan has argued. ‘[T]hey are handled differently, but they have, properly handled, comparable results.’11

Thus, crucial to the creation of Māori histories incorporating multiple and layered identities and perspectives, is research that is mindful of tikanga, which in itself may include diverse considerations through whānau, hapū and iwi. In 1999, Te Maire Tau argued that this feature of Māori histories was important for Māori history writing

8 Nēpia Mahuika, ‘Closing the Gaps’, p. 21.
10 See Moana Jackson, ‘Hui Reflections: Research and the Consolidations of Bravery’, in Jessica Hutchings et. al., Kei Tua o Te Pae Hui Proceedings, pp. 71-78.
because the value of Māori oral traditions – not their limitations – lay in their apparent subjectivities. Instead of focusing on limitations, Tau argued that researchers needed to understand the ways in which such subjectivities were employed to maintain a group’s mana in an intellectual space where accounts of an historical event by other whānau might be different. Although tikanga approaches to such narratives might include creating an intellectual space where contrasting perspectives were not challenged, the existence of such alternative narratives is why some authors of Māori histories have tended to shy away from engaging in wider historical debates.\(^{12}\)

The wealth of historical accounts and sources with limited engagement with western historical traditions is one result of the reluctance by some Māori to engage in disciplinary history. As Tau has argued, Māori look to their own ancestors when recalling the past and in doing this, mana was (and remains) a significant defining feature of the resulting histories that vary as a result of the different tikanga of Māori social groups.\(^{13}\)

Accordingly, by recognising that different social categories may have different tikanga approaches to retelling histories, there is no reason why varied accounts of Māori histories cannot exist simultaneously. ‘We reconcile difference and versions and variations with other tribal groups by respecting what they have’, Joe Pere stated when describing this feature of Māori histories. ‘We’re all connected in some way where we have a version of oral history that’s connected with some current event or some historical event – and they accept ours. We don’t argue and say that you’re right and we’re wrong; or we’re right and you’re wrong. We accept that that’s the way theirs has been passed down and we acknowledge it.’\(^{14}\) Instead of a focus on objectivity, Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau histories can acknowledge their creation as a


\(^{13}\) Danny Keenan in Selby and Laurie, *Māori and Oral History*, pp. 55-56, pp. 59-60; and Te Maire Tau, ‘Mātauranga Māori as an Epistemology’, p. 15.

\(^{14}\) Of course, many iwi have chosen to engage in tikanga-based historical fora in which varied accounts of the past can be challenged. The Waitangi Tribunal is one such forum. Joe Pere, ‘Oral Tradition and Tribal History (1990/1991)’, in Selby and Laurie, *Māori and Oral History*, p. 52.
result of prioritising certain sources of information, acknowledging that other Māori may have a different story to tell. Such histories have been written from a position where there is little reason to doubt the value of different tikanga as methodologically appropriate.

Māori-specific historical sources are thus a methodological consideration common to Māori histories. Although in the past there was debate over the historical value of non-textual Māori-specific historical sources, today sources such as waiata, whakairo and whakapapa are widely accepted as being historical resources like any other, subject to biases and providing valuable insights. In short, they should be important considerations where relevant.\footnote{For example, Te Maire Tau, ‘Advancing an Alternative Past’.


In recent years, scholars have accommodated the growing use of such Māori historical sources within formal academic disciplines, and have discussed approaches to using such sources in ways that empower whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori at large. The way to empower groups, many have argued, is by encouraging researchers to share their autonomy in undertaking research with the participants in their research, thereby enabling that research to be undertaken by Māori, be about Māori, and be for Māori purposes.\footnote{As was especially explained by one interviewee. Group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010. See also Jeffery Paparoa Holman, \textit{Best of Both Worlds: The Story of Elsdon Best and Tutakangahau} (North Shore, 2010).} Such Māori-centred research is important because over time, Māori have experienced sometimes subtle and sometimes obvious negative consequences as a result of outsider-led research upon their communities. This includes research undertaken over a century ago, but the memories of which were not positive and are still remembered by whānau today. Although some iwi and individuals have actively sought participation in the creation of scholarship, such as were the intentions of Tutakangahau of Maungapohatu in working with Elsdon Best in Tūhoe country in the 1890s, other communities have had research experiences that left them unacknowledged, unanswered to, and ignored.\footnote{As Linda Tuhiwai Smith has argued,}
“research’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary.’\textsuperscript{18}

By sharing decisions about the research with the research participants, Māori histories today not only include work that is structured around insider-based research positions, but it also includes work that confronts narratives of Māori interactions with histories of colonialism. Ranginui Walker is often acknowledged as the first Māori academic to do this with regards to nationalist history writing, which, he argued, obscured the variations in iwi experiences. Published in 1990, Walker used \textit{Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End} to present a ‘counter-narrative’ of New Zealand history in which Māori and iwi perspectives contributed to a history about the ‘endless struggle of the Maori for social justice and self-determination’.\textsuperscript{19} His writing told a story that was parallel what he interpreted as the well-known narrative of the nation. He instead focussed on the ongoing encounters between Māori and the Crown because Māori history, he argued, stood as a ‘mythological charter against colonialism’.\textsuperscript{20}

To other Māori historians, however, this form of Māori history writing was still a deliberate engagement with the western university tradition of history, with Māori interactions with non-Māori and the Crown remaining at the centre of a general Māori history.\textsuperscript{21} For some, this counter-narrative approach should have been further diminished. Instead, iwi, hapū or whānau histories should be created that deliberately disengage with histories of colonisation experiences.\textsuperscript{22} As the remainder of this thesis will demonstrate, a history of urbanisation based on interviews with kaumātua is positioned between these perspectives because while people cited whānau, hapū and

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} Linda Tuhiwai Smith, \textit{Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People} (Dunedin, 1999), p. 1.
\textsuperscript{19} Ranginui Walker, \textit{Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou}, p. 10.
\end{flushright}
Iwi narratives as important facets of their experiences, they also referred to interactions with the Pākehā, the state or its agents. Although histories of urbanisations were told as stories of relationships, connections and whakapapa, stories of urbanisation were also linked to processes of colonisation.

Either way, a common feature of all these types of Māori histories is that tikanga approaches to history writing necessitated tikanga approaches to the act of research. For example, iwi, hapū or whānau histories are commonly written using information that is highly prioritised or sensitive, frequently restricted in its communication to only people deemed worthy of receiving the information. In 1996, Monty Soutar identified this feature of Māori histories to argue that an author who can sufficiently demonstrate their abilities and ongoing intentions and relationships with the whānau, hapū or iwi (for example through whakapapa), was more likely to benefit from iwi or hapū research sources.23 Although what the privileged research sources may actually be can vary, they frequently include oral histories, especially as written sources of some events do not always exist because, at times, Māori have deliberately chosen not to enter oral-based knowledge into the literate realm.24

For Te Maire Tau, the tendency for whānau to prioritise sharing information with whānau highlighted the ways that when approaching whānau, an academic prescription for research could be insufficient. He wrote that he ‘found that taking an academic approach to interviewing kaumatua did not work. As a nephew of many kaumatua I needed to approach them as a nephew rather than as a ‘historian’.25 Tau’s experience reflected the messages of other academics at that time that Māori-centred research practices were a necessary part of disciplinary approaches, and they should thus have greater recognition in scholarly spheres.26 Despite disagreement amongst

26 See, for example, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Decolonizing Methodologies; Ted Glynn and Russell Bishop, ‘Cultural Issues in Educational Research: A New Zealand Perspective’, He Pukenga Kōrero, Vol. 1, No. 1, Koanga (Spring) 1995, pp. 37-43; and various authors in Jessica Hutchings et. al, Kei Tua o Te Pae Hui Proceedings.
Māori about whether colonialism deserved attention in Māori histories, a conversation that continues today, the work of historians such as Ranginui Walker nonetheless furthered a greater incorporation of Māori systems of knowledge into research, especially active Māori participation in research and writing.\(^{27}\) For instance, in 1995, Arohia Durie argued that for Māori scholars, accountabilities between their obligations to academia and their communities were a ‘constant source of tension’. But by 2009, Aroha Harris had argued that Māori history writing in the twenty-first century had become less concerned about creating spaces for Māori voices to be heard because now these spaces could be assumed. She argued that through the greater incorporation of Māori voices in the creations of written Māori histories, such as the establishment of the Māori history journal, *Te Pouhere Kōrero: Māori History, Māori People*, Māori foundation values employed within historical frameworks no longer needed to be justified when communicating our histories.\(^{28}\)

In recent years, New Zealand historians whose areas of interest lie outside of iwi and Māori histories have also begun to aspire to include in their work widened understandings of Māori identities, especially identities that can both enrich and disassemble national narratives that have defined New Zealand history writing for some time.\(^{29}\) Giselle Byrnes, as editor of *The New Oxford History of New Zealand*, encouraged this for historians in 2009. She argued that historians no longer needed to rely upon notions of nationhood in structuring their histories, thereby obscuring multiple counter narratives – including those from Māori populations. ‘How... does the dominant interpretation deal with iwi, hapu and whanau stories that see colonisation as a wholly destructive, rather than benign, experience?’ she asked. ‘[H]ow can it cope

\(^{27}\) Alice Te Punga Sommerville, Aroha Harris and Nēpia Mahuika, ‘Locating the Past, Where is Māori History?’ panel presentation at He Rau Tumu Korero 2011, Māori Historians’ Symposium, Waipapa Marae, the University of Auckland, 9 June 2011.


with the many individual iwi histories that reveal different stories where Pakeha are not the main subjects? Although it is arguable whether the final presentation of Byrnes’ collection did provide a sufficient account of the varied experiences of iwi, hapū and whānau, this was an important point for some writers of non-Māori histories. Since Māori histories had received greater scholarly recognition as requiring considerations not often accommodated by national history writing, it was time that historians of non-Māori topics incorporated or considered multiple, varied and dynamic Māori viewpoints into their broader histories.

But considering the potential specificity of whānau, hapū and iwi approaches to history writing, questions have existed for some time amongst Māori historians about whether pan-iwi histories are possible. And considering the dynamism of whānau, hapū and iwi, these questions have not yet been, and will likely not be, answered easily (let alone by this thesis). However, for Māori historians, participation in western historical practices has enabled wider ‘use’ of historical tools, resources and evidence of the Māori past that allow Māori to be, as Aroha Harris has termed, ‘modern in a traditional way’. One way this has been achieved is through conceptualising Māori oratory and written histories in the terms of the metaphors of customary processes that elucidate certain understandings of present-day historical processes. A number of Māori historians have referred to tikanga of marae and whaikōrero as models for guiding the presentation of Māori written histories and academic arguments. One excellent example of this was Tiopira McDowell’s comparison of his research methodologies to him being a ringawera at a marae. In this metaphor, he conjured a

---

community-centred image to illustrate his provision of a forum in which Māori discussions of the past would be possible.\textsuperscript{35}

The metaphors of marae and whaikōrero for the construction of historical narratives also provide further insight into the unique relationship between tikanga approaches to, and the written products of, Māori histories. In his doctoral thesis and in a series of later articles, Danny Keenan used metaphors of marae and whaikōrero to illustrate the role of Māori cultural considerations in the organisation of Māori histories. Through an examination of nineteenth century sources and oral history practices, he suggested that a metaphor of a ‘figurative paepae’ for history research could describe the ways that Māori oral histories contributed to, what he called, Mana Māori History.\textsuperscript{36}

Mana Māori History, the Figurative Paepae and Māori Oral History

In his first discussion of a figurative paepae in the year 2000, Danny Keenan argued that the customary role of a paepae was for the creation of tribal histories. He explained that the communication of present contexts, histories and tribal-based knowledge through whaikōrero could be considered an appropriate metaphor for many types of Māori communications of knowledge of the past, including the maintenance of mana and connections via whakapapa.\textsuperscript{37} When he revisited the concept of the paepae as ‘the controlling site for all Māori knowledge’ in 2005, he extended the applications of a ‘figurative paepae’ concept to include a broad range of sources of Māori knowledge of the past, for example, written Land Court records, oral

\textsuperscript{36} Danny Keenan, ‘Haere Whakamua, Hoki Whakamuri’; Danny Keenan in Selby and Laurie, Māori and Oral History, pp. 54-61.
history interviews and evidence from Waitangi Tribunal hearings. For Keenan, this ‘figurative paepae’ for the communication of Māori historical knowledge provided a forum for the co-existence of ‘oral exposition, for argument, [and] for assertions of mana’.

In making this assertion, Keenan made an important connection between the process of undertaking Māori history research based on tikanga, and the creation of written Māori histories that prioritise internal perspectives. He suggested that historical accounts created from an acknowledgement of the authority and ownership of whānau, hapū and iwi over their own histories arose from uniquely Māori historical processes. According to Keenan, this ‘Mana Māori History’ referred to the nature of Māori narratives of the past to use whakapapa and mana as organising principles. With reference to Taranaki histories and sources from the nineteenth century, he proposed that reference to whakapapa and mana were cultural commonalities, shared across whānau, hapū and iwi distinctions, and with applications that permeated beyond histories. ‘[W]hakapapa and mana were more closely linked than merely as device and principle of organising past knowledge’, wrote Keenan, ‘as kaumātua are prone to point out’.

Thus, whakapapa and mana are important bases or considerations in many types of Māori history communications, especially Māori oral histories. An additional aspect is te reo Māori, which, as Joseph Pere has discussed, is a culturally-specific vehicle for understanding. ‘[L]anguage and oratory are the lifeline that keep all things tribal and Māori together’, he argued. ‘[Language is] like the tahūhū of a meeting house – the backbone of the tipuna.’ This thesis thus agrees that the value in Māori oral histories is not just to ‘fill in the blanks’ in the historical record, but to reveal the ways in which information accessed through oral histories is structured by Māori values or concepts like these, and for what purposes. For example, while whakapapa may have influenced

38 Danny Keenan, in Selby and Laurie, Māori and Oral History, pp. 54, 60.
39 Ibid., p. 60.
41 Joe Pere in Selby and Laurie, Māori and Oral History, p. 51.
a tribal narrative as knowledge handed down, shared in wānanga and imposed onto the landscape, mana has had influences upon the many recollections of that historical knowledge, including control over what information is communicated and what is withheld.\textsuperscript{42} Although there might be questions about the ongoing relevance of such tribal values in the histories constructed by urban-raised Māori, these values were implicit during interviews for this thesis.\textsuperscript{43}

With whakapapa, mana and te reo Māori being important structuring factors in Māori histories, often inseparable during the practice of undertaking quality, Māori history research, that Māori histories and Māori oral histories are reinforced as unique genres of New Zealand history. An example of whakapapa, mana and te reo Māori being important to the construction of Māori oral histories, alluded to already, was that Māori consistently stressed during interviews for this thesis that although they may not be living within their tribal boundaries, their minds and hearts belong to home. One kuia I interviewed who made this especially clear was RTN, who grew up on three marae with her kuia, koroua, whānau and hapū, before moving to Wellington in the early 1960s.\textsuperscript{44} As the interview excerpt below shows, even though she grew to love city living, she was confident that she would never identify as ‘urban Māori’ because she was never disconnected from her identity and her original home place, her whakapapa, marae, iwi and whenua. Even though she had lived in and enjoyed Wellington for decades, every day her moemoeā were of home.

\textbf{RTN:} I got used to Wellington, I loved every bit of the night life and scene down here and also because of the fact that it's a big city, I was living and working here and I thought that it was primo, coming to the big bright lights of the city here – big, big time.

\textbf{Author:} But you still wouldn’t say that you were an urban person?

\textsuperscript{43} This was possibly a result of participants for this thesis being first-generation urban residents. For questions about how urban-raised Māori may structure their oral histories, see Melissa Matutina Williams, ‘‘Back-home’ and Home in the City’, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{44} As this kaumātua undertakes a public role in the Wellington area, ‘RTN’ was a pseudonym chosen by this kaumātua to connect her with her kuia and kaumātua, as well as for privacy reasons.
RTN: No I would never ever use that terminology that I was an urban Māori.... This kupu is non-existent in my vocab and I would never class myself as an urban Māori, nor would I class myself as a rural Māori because my thoughts everyday are strongly connected to and always have been, always will be, to my birth place, tūrangawaewae, my whakapapa – whānau, hapū and iwi. I might go back once, every two or so years, but the underlying fact of the matter is I know who I am, where I come from, I know my whakapapa, I know where I was born, I know where I grew up, I know where my pito is, and that’s where I am going to go back to when the time comes for me to go home! I’m going back to my birth place, my marae, my hapū, my iwi, my tūrangawaewae!45

To understand and compare messages like this from Māori from broad backgrounds, this thesis brings together data from people from varied iwi to discuss their experiences of urban migrations. This is a relevant approach to an urbanisation history because, as shown in later chapters, urban experiences can be defined by the necessary mixing of people from varied social and cultural backgrounds.46 I explained this approach to people I interviewed, to which interviewees consistently responded by acknowledging their awareness of the variations in histories of whānau, hapū and iwi. In discussing the use of the term ‘urban Māori’, Huhana Clark stated that ‘well, you know, urban Māori to me is a Pākehā colonisation word that I will never ever use at all, but that’s me, we are not all the same.’47 By saying this, she demonstrated that she was not only aware that other people would have different perspectives depending on their own experiences and backgrounds, she respected those other narratives to coexist alongside her own.

This attitude of refraining from suggesting that a particular idea or methodology for Māori history research can be applicable across all Māori social groups had been discussed by Māori historians. For example, in his guide to undertaking tribal research, Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal stressed that personal relationships were an important factor in undertaking research. But even in stating this, he was clear that he was not

45 RTN, interview, Wellington, 14 April 2010.
47 Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark, group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010.
providing a fool-proof or authoritative system that existed above iwi, hapū and whānau conventions. In his very first suggestion on tribal research, Royal stated that ‘it is not my intention to speak about the relationships family members have with each other. If you are dealing with members of your own family, you will know how to approach them.’

Thus, to navigate the sometimes case-by-case circumstances for Māori history research, methodologies for Māori histories are respectful of tikanga, and self-aware about the aims and objectives of the research, which further impact upon the final research piece. To emphasise appropriate processes for history research in his guide to tribal research, Royal identified four questions that a researcher should be prepared to answer, questions that might be at the forefront of the mind of a kaumātua approached to participate in a research project. The first question was asked about what the researcher was trying to achieve; the second asked the researcher to consider whether he or she was the appropriate person to receive the information requested; the third question asked the researcher to consider if there were any restrictions on the requested information that could potentially limit his or her access to certain resources (for example, restrictions based on ability or gender); and the fourth question asked about the support the researcher had in undertaking his or her task.

While these questions were aimed at researchers while in the processes of planning and undertaking their research, Royal’s four questions were reflected in Monty Soutar’s framework for written tribal histories – in other words, in the final historical product. According to Soutar, the first of the four main matters to be considered in understanding written Māori histories was the objectives of the author in undertaking the project; the second matter was the racial, political, gender or cultural background of the author, which impacted upon their approach to the research; the third considered the literary or methodological traditions that the author had inherited and

---

executed in their research; and the last matter was consideration of how the historical, political, social or moral climate of the writing affected the authorship of the research.\textsuperscript{50}

Conscious of the connections between the processes of undertaking history research and the value of the written historical product, I was up-front with participants about the factors noted by Royal and Soutar that could influence a person’s decision to participate in my interviews. In discussing my work with potential participants, I explained that the research project was based on a partnership model that encouraged a shared autonomy between researchers and participants. In 1999, this partnership approach to Māori oral history research was promoted by Rachael Selby, who argued that research relationships should maintain the mana of both the researcher and the researched person or people. ‘Research partnerships involve power-sharing, responsibilities to one another and mana enhancement’, Selby argued. ‘[E]ach partner should benefit from the partnership and neither partner should do anything which diminishes the mana of the other.’\textsuperscript{51}

Thus, the first thing that I made clear to interviewees was that a major objective of the research was to create a Māori history of urban migrations that was intended for submission as a doctoral thesis. Then when undertaking the interviews, a flexible structure was used so that participants could direct our conversations towards aspects of their experiences that they saw as significant to a Māori urbanisation history. Rather than providing static questions requiring direct answers for the interviews, I provided questions or topics that were a guide for the discussions. As most participants had no trouble extrapolating the topics and questions into many areas of history and experiences that were relevant and important to their own backgrounds, this approach allowed me insight into a wealth of information about their experiences. This approach also accommodated topics that could arise whether I introduced them or not. As indicated earlier, the most significant of these topics was whether it was

\textsuperscript{50} Monty Soutar, ‘A Framework for Analysing Written Iwi Histories’, pp. 50, 53.

possible to discuss ‘urban Māori’, both in the present and in the historical time period being discussed.

When kaumātua consistently responded that ‘urban’ was not an idea that applied to them and was, in the words of one kuia, ‘nothing’, this brought attention to the fact that there was likely to be a large amount of other information absent from the oral history interviews.\(^{52}\) Since at no stage did I require any participant to share information that they were not comfortable discussing, presumably there was a wealth of personal information that interviewees did not share. But, as a partnership model was a crucial factor in my approach to oral history, I was not concerned with exploring such ‘silences’. I neither asked people to reveal private or personal information (be the information tribal or otherwise), nor did I require interviewees to leave information in the final research product that they did not want shared.\(^{53}\) To do otherwise would contradict mutual mana enhancement.

And while this did not mean that interviewees did not reveal personal stories, many personal stories have not been included in the final research product. To paraphrase Melissa Williams, while it is one thing to have participants express their support for historical research, it is another for an historian to decide what they can, on best conscience, include in their research products.\(^{54}\) Many personal stories were shared in the research for this thesis, but the reasons they were communicated were much broader than the objectives of this research. One interviewee, for example, told me that she wished a family member was asking her the same questions that I had presented to her, and another interviewee expressed that she was grateful of the recorded discussion because it contained information she believed her children should be aware of. For Wikitoria Paaka from Ngā Puhi and Ngāti Porou, the opportunity to have conversations about her memories in moving to Wellington was also an opportunity to discuss her personal history with her daughters who also attended our meetings. Although Wikitoria Paaka had moved to Wellington from Tokomaru Bay via

\(^{53}\) Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal, \textit{Te Haurapa}, p. 42.
\(^{54}\) Melissa Matutaina Williams, ‘‘Back-home’ and Home in the City’’, pp. 32-36.
Gisborne in 1953, she emphasised to me and her daughters that urbanisation was not a defining narrative of her experiences, a message she was glad to be able to share with whānau. The presence of her daughters made our conversations richer and revealed multiple layers involved in Māori urban identities.55

In keeping with the partnership model, I also offered all interviewees opportunities to influence the ways that their interviews would be included in the final written piece. While I exercised filtering to ensure the histories I retold were relevant to the objectives of the project, which were explained to interviewees, the final thesis is the result of my invitations to kuia and kaumātua to have active participation in determining its final form. The process of discussing how the oral histories would be presented raised questions about the value of converting oral histories into written form because of the amount of information, especially context, lost through that process. However, the discussions I had with kaumātua about how their spoken histories would be presented were valuable because of the increased mutual understandings about ideas on urbanisations, not to mention each of our backgrounds that had led us to discussing these matters. Although the final presentation of this work is the result of my own decisions as author, the thesis is the result of the valid – and possibly generational – perspectives of the kuia and kaumātua involved in this research about what urbanisations meant to them. Under mutual mana enhancement, I considered that I was required to tell their stories with the sensitivity they deserved.

Thus, guided by the concept of the figurative paepae and an emphasis on the importance of ‘he tangata’ in urban migrations, the research for this thesis has used varied tikanga for interacting with people from a range of backgrounds and iwi. Although Māori urbanisations are the main topic of this thesis, I was conscious that the research processes followed would ultimately impact upon the final written product – not just in the terms of scholarly methodologies, but more importantly in the terms of Māori historical processes. The information and ideas provided by interviewees has guided how oral histories are presented, and, as the next chapter will

demonstrate, how Māori narratives of migration should be prioritised. This thesis therefore joins a growing literature on Māori histories that uses tikanga and Māori foundation concepts such as whakapapa, mana and te reo. Historical methods prioritising concepts and Māori identities make Māori histories a distinct genre of New Zealand history writing, constantly conscious of the value of research upon communities and impacting upon whānau, hapū and iwi as well as Māori in general. As the whakataukī cited at the beginning of this chapter explains, ‘he aha te mea nui i te ao (what is the most important thing)? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata (it is people, it is people, it is people)’.

The following chapter responds directly to the longer timeframes referred to by interviewees by contextualising urban migrations in relation to nineteenth-century Māori migratory and mobility practices around Te Ika a Māui. Throughout the history of Māori occupations at Te Whanganui ā Tara, connections between iwi have been referred to as an historical context that is relevant to Māori living in the Wellington region, one that remains relevant today within urban migrant and tangata whenua communities. Importantly, many urban-migrating Māori who moved into Wellington during the twentieth century did so often on the heels of ancestors, from both the west and east coasts of the North Island. For some, becoming urbanised was not just a matter of moving into the city or having a city grow around their community; it was also a process of colonisation.
Colonisation and the subsequent ‘ruralisation’ of Māori populations were foundations for the twentieth century urbanisations of Māori individuals, whānau and communities. During the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, many iwi were attracted to engage with Europeans in their sites of settlement, enthusiastic about creating and maintaining connections with people from another place. Those connections included material and social benefits. However, through processes of colonisation, sometimes immediate and sometimes gradual, Māori became marginalised from the growing towns and cities of Europeans – marginalisation that was physical and geographical, but also social and cultural.

As a result of this marginalisation, Māori and non-Māori communities in the Wellington area were largely separated as rural and urban by the end of the nineteenth century, a state that contributed to unfamiliarity between Māori and Pākehā. Māori populations had also significantly declined, and in 1896 reached a population nadir of just over 42,000.¹ But despite this low population, Māori were still exhibiting high birth rates. Geographically separated from the majority of the New Zealand (Pākehā) population that was increasing in its proportion of urban residencies,

Iwi populations were recovering.\(^2\) Māori were thus an overwhelmingly rurally located but growing population.

However, Māori as ‘rural’ as a result of nineteenth century Pākehā settlement in New Zealand is not a complete picture of Māori experiences. For example, while many iwi in Aotearoa became urban-located through twentieth century urban migrations, others became urban-residing because of the growth of towns and cities around their home places.\(^3\) The latter phenomenon has become particularly apparent to non-Māori in recent decades as tangata whenua of spaces such as Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch have engaged in Treaty settlement processes involving land in some of the most expensive real estate areas of the country. But during the nineteenth century, these iwi maintained their interests in those growing urban spaces through other methods. Although their physical residence or residence as perceived by non-Māori in those areas diminished over the nineteenth century, ongoing tangata whenua interests were passed down through generations. This chapter will show that deliberate characterising of Māori as rural not only misrepresented the varied experiences of iwi, it was also the result of processes of colonisation that had caused Māori populations to be assigned ‘rural’ as a defining characteristic of ‘Māoriness’.

This chapter uses the Wellington region to explore the colonisation and ‘ruralisation’ of Māori populations. It does this because ruralisation was a process of colonisation that laid the foundations for urbanisations of the twentieth century. This was the case for iwi who became urban by being surrounded by and encapsulated into the rapidly growing settler (Pākehā) populations, as well as iwi who resided in locations more distant from settler populations. For this chapter, ruralisation is explained as developing as a result of iwi residing at distances from settler communities with limited access to resources provided by urban centres. Although many iwi did not ‘ruralise’ by migrating to rural spaces because they had longstanding connections


there, they were nonetheless ruralised through a conceptual shift that characterised Māori as outsiders to Pākehā modern settlements.

Long before Māori were discussed as ‘rural’ or ‘urban’, the spaces of Te Whanganui ā Tara were home to dynamic and sometimes very mobile whānau, hapū and iwi. In these spaces, members of iwi from both the west and east coasts of Aotearoa New Zealand had lived in and moved through the region in the centuries prior to European contact. Those longer migration histories continue to be referenced by Māori living in the Wellington region, and they were recalled by interviewees in this research on urbanisations. By the time settlers arrived in the Wellington region from 1840, Taranaki Whānui hapū were among the tangata whenua of the region and they had meaningful relationships and connections with people still residing in the Taranaki area. As a result, migrations and connections across the spaces of the motu were important to iwi in the Wellington region during the nineteenth century.4 The nineteenth century was also a period in which Māori became increasingly defined by their relationships with settler communities, being classed as both rural and as urban.

Iwi and Hapū at Te Whanganui ā Tara: Migrations and Connections

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Māori populations of what would later be known as the Wellington region descended from a range of waka and iwi with connections to both the east and west Coasts of Te Ika a Māui. Whānau and hapū from Ngāti Toa, Ngāti Raukawa, Taranaki and Te Ātiawa were among a number of iwi who had migrated to Te Whanganui ā Tara from more northern areas (see Figure 1). Home

4 As discussed previously in chapters one and two, the structure of this thesis has been influenced by the histories provided by kuia and kaumātua who participated in the research. More information about these participants is included in Appendix 1. I note that while some of these participants were descended from Taranaki Whānui and Taranaki iwi, there may be Taranaki Whānui perspectives that are not encompassed by the history presented here.
places remained an important part of the genealogical memory of these iwi, and often, ongoing connections between those home places and other spaces of habitation allowed these iwi to maintain their links to their ancestral lands.

Figure 1. Te Whanganui ā Tara is on the southern end of the North Island of New Zealand. Map of Te Ika a Māui, by Erin Keenan.

In the Wellington region (Figure 2), these iwi had multiple and sometimes overlapping relationships to the landscape of Te Úpoko o Te Ika a Māui. With frequent intermarriages between groups, whānau from different descent lines often occupied similar community areas, making specific territories based on hapū or iwi lines difficult to accurately delineate. To illustrate this, Jock McEwen explained that there was no way he could tell a history of Rangitāne without acknowledging the wider influences of other iwi from nearby landscapes. He explained that although a single iwi was unique in its authority over its own mana, history and whakapapa, he had to reference

---

7 Jock McEwen was of Scottish descent and grew up 200 yards from a Feilding marae, speaking Māori and interacting with kaumātua. In his career, he became an influential public servant acting on behalf of Māori, a composer of waiata, tribal historian and a master carver. See Peter Kitchin, ‘Jock McEwen: Maoridom's very special civil servant’, *The Dominion Post*, 24 May 2010; and Jock McEwen in Grace et. al., *The Silent Migration*, p. 69.
histories from Wellington and parts of the South Island to properly tell a history of Rangitāne in the Manawatū area. He stated that ‘[t]he point about these people [the iwi of Te Whanganui ā Tara] is that they are all the same people – the people pretty well from Napier to Wellington – on both coasts; Manawatū to Wellington – they are all the same mixture – the same fruit salad.’

Figure 2. Map of the wider region of Te Ūpoko o Te Ika a Māui, showing iwi areas and townships established during the nineteenth century. The insert provides a more detailed view of settlement areas around Te Whanganui ā Tara. Map by Erin Keenan.

Early histories of the Wellington region reveal how mobility was part of these fluid relationships between and within communities of whānau, hapū and iwi. In particular, the lower spaces of the North Island have long been occupied by hapū and iwi who look outside of the region for their descent connections: for example, to the

---

9 Ibid., Lecture 3, part b, p. 3.
10 Butterworth, Ngā Take I Neke Ai Te Māori, p. 1.
North and to the East as descendants of the Kurahaupo waka with whom McEwen identified, but also to the north and to the west for the Wellington-based Taranaki Whānui hapū.  

The fluidity of communities between spaces is reflected in iwi histories. For example, histories of natural phenomena at Te Whanganui ā Tara have referred to connections between people and spaces around the motu, demonstrating the ways in which iwi were cognisant of the wider motu. Histories of taniwha who were able to cover such significant distances with ease are an excellent example of this. In one of these histories, Te Whanganui ā Tara was once a lake that was forcibly turned into a harbour by a taniwha named Ngake who swiftly and enthusiastically migrated south out of the lake because of his curiosity about Te Moana o Raukawa (the Cook Strait). The companion of Ngake, a taniwha named Whataitai, was left in the draining waters of the lake, where he turned to stone and became the suburb of Hataitai in Wellington today.

Histories like these also demonstrated the ways that Māori communities were not only well-aware of the geography of the wider landscape, they were mindful of other iwi and hapū communities in the surrounding areas. A second history of a taniwha named Awarua o Porirua was a story that connected the spaces of Te Whanganui ā Tara with communities on the East Coast of Aotearoa. According to this history, when Awarua o Porirua departed his home at Te Whanganui ā Tara on a hunting trip, he arrived at Roto ā Tara, the home of the rangatira Tara. Tara was a tapu chief, and he grew annoyed at Awarua o Porirua staying at his lake uninvited. A fight between Tara and his visitor from Porirua broke out, and when Awarua o Porirua was defeated, he was forced to return to his home in the Porirua Harbour. In his battle with Tara, Awarua o Porirua left a ‘scar’ in the lake of Tara that became an island named Awarua o Porirua,

---

11 Closing Submissions of the Wellington Tenths Trust and the Palmerston North Reserves Trust, 1839-1999: 160 Years of Injustice, Delivered at Te Tatau o te Po Marae, 30 March – 1 April and 6-7 April 1999, Volume 1.
a continuous reminder to the descendants of Tara about the taniwha visitor from far away.  

Practices of naming the landscape, such as demonstrated for Awarua o Porirua, provided ongoing reminders to Māori about their interactions with other Māori communities. Names for the Wellington region do this clearly. The name Te Ūpoko o Te Ika a Māui (the head of the fish of Māui), for example, invokes an image of the Wellington region and its relationship to wider motu, with the ‘head’ being just one part of a larger whole.  

A second common name for the region, Te Whanganui ā Tara (the harbour of Tara), was named by the rangatira Whatonga after his son Tara, who, as previously mentioned, battled Awarua o Porirua and lived away from the main harbour. As Elsdon Best explained, the stories behind the names in Wellington revealed a multitude of connections including ‘traditions innumerable; tales of war and trouble, of brave deeds and strange beliefs, of old-time folk-lore and weird religious rites; stories of many migrations and tribal calamities and fights fought long ago.’  

To argue that the high frequency of naming upon the Wellington landscape reflected centuries of Māori occupation of these places, Best drew on information from an informant from Ngāti Kahungunu, an iwi with connections to Te Whanganui ā Tara that preceded the migrations of the Taranaki Whānui hapū. Best’s informant was Te Whatahoro Jury, a man regarded in some Māori communities as holding great knowledge and publicly referred to by Best ‘as a token of authenticity’ for Māori cultural knowledge. Te Whatahoro was not without controversy, however, and some


people doubted the accuracy of his information. Jock McEwen, for example, argued that Te Whatahoro possessed ‘a fertile imagination and a tireless pen’. Privately, Best too wondered about the accuracy of information from Te Whatahoro, especially when comparing information on the upbringing of Te Whatahoro with what Best had gleaned from with informants from Tūhoe. However, the contention from Te Whatahoro that the name ‘Te Whanganui ā Tara’ was a continuous reminder of a chief descended from Kurahaupo and his dedication to his son, Tara, perhaps merely reflected the association of Te Whatahoro with the waka of Kurahaupō.

Iwi and hapū at Te Whanganui ā Tara before Taranaki Whānui hapū settled there included Ngāti Ira, descended from Ira-turoto. Ngāti Ira was an iwi related to Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Tara and Rangitāne through generations of intermarriage. Te Whanganui ā Tara home to Ngāti Ira for many generations, and they were joined for a short period by Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Mamoe as they migrated further south to Te Waipounamu. From the 1820s and onwards, members of Ngāti Ira were challenged in their occupations of the harbour areas by Taranaki Whānui hapū and others. This resulted in them departing northwards into the Wairarapa, for the most part, and they did not return. When European settlers sought information about the histories of interactions between the shifting tangata whenua of the area, they had difficulty because, for one example, Taranaki Whānui referred to the previous inhabitants of the harbour collectively as Ngāti Kahungunu. They did this, Angela Ballara has argued, because iwi were often ignorant of the whakapapa of other (often conquered) iwi, and because Taranaki Whānui hapū tended to use ‘Ngāti Kahungunu’ as a cover-all label assigned to all East Coast and prior iwi of Te Whanganui ā Tara.

17 Ibid.; and Jeffrey Paparoa Holman, Best of Both Worlds, pp. 225.
18 Jock McEwen, Migrations to and Settlement of the Wellington Area, Lecture 1, p. 3; Jeffrey Paparoa Holman, Best of Both Worlds, pp. 225-226.
Te Whatahoro’s perspective that the name Te Whanganui ā Tara proved Kaurahaupō-descent relationships to the area was, therefore, perhaps not so unusual considering the ignorance of other local iwi about the longer histories of occupations. By the late nineteenth century, it was clear that Taranaki Whānui hapū had a distinct presence in the harbour areas, something that was further confirmed by their interactions with settlers in the growing city of Wellington. But the fact that there were multiple iwi and hapū histories of the area, each with connections to the landscape, impacted upon historical processes and continue to do so. A Māori history of the wider region of Te Ópoko o te Ika a Maui requires the negotiation of multiple and relative histories, an aspect of the Māori past that is arguably inseparable from Māori histories. Narratives from Te Whatahoro and Taranaki Whānui hapū demonstrated this with regards to early histories of the area, and the remainder of this chapter focuses on the migratory movements of hapū and iwi from the Taranaki region.

For those Taranaki Whānui hapū who were living at Te Whanganui ā Tara during the nineteenth century, ongoing conscious relationships linked hapū between Te Whanganui ā Tara and the Taranaki rohe. Although there are other tangata whenua stories of the Wellington area in the nineteenth century (such as from Ngāti Toa at Takapūwāhia and Hongoeka in the Porirua area), the reminder of this chapter looks at Taranaki Whānui hapū in the Wellington area, their relationships with Taranaki-located relatives and other Wellington-located Māori. Up until the end of the nineteenth century, their connections and migratory patterns were determined by a number of factors ranging from economy and colonisation to whakapapa relationships.

21 Ibid., p. 15.
Taranaki Whānui at Te Whanganui ā Tara

High rates of iwi mobility around the country in the decades leading up to 1840 were the result of significant social and cultural changes introduced by contact with Europeans. Māori-European contact was initially concentrated in the more northern areas of the motu, and the influences of those northern trade relationships ‘trickled down’ from there. Inter-tribal conflict was exacerbated through Māori-European trade via the introduction of musket warfare. This violent inter-tribal warfare very quickly spurred mass iwi and hapū mobility.

Also in the decades before 1840, Taranaki communities were continually under threat of attack from the north, predominantly from Waikato iwi. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, these conflicts triggered many Taranaki Māori to shift out of the reach of Waikato invaders. For example, Taranaki iwi received an opportunity for reprieve following a defeat suffered by Te Rauparaha from Ngāti Toa at the hands of Waikato in 1822. As a result of his defeat, Te Rauparaha decided to leave North Taranaki and an alliance was made with Taranaki hapū who also sought to leave the area. Te Rauparaha led Ngāti Toa and members of Taranaki Whānui hapū in a large scale migration known as Te Heke Tataramoa. When Te Rauparaha arrived at Te Ūpoko o Te Ika a Māui, he chose Kapiti Island as a home for his people, who comprised a ‘mixed bag’ of iwi that included Ngāti Toa, Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Tama and Te Ātiawa.

Following that hekenga, Taranaki Whānui hapū was one of the more mobile iwi during the nineteenth century. Some Taranaki Whānui hapū who settled at Te Whanganui ā Tara continued their mobile practices, venturing even further south and even off the mainland of Aotearoa; for example, some members of Ngāti Mutunga iwi came to live

24 Ibid., p. 80.
at Te Wharekauri / Rekohu (the Chatham Islands). However, despite residing outside of the Taranaki area for a lengthy historical period, iwi members maintained their interests as tangata whenua in the Taranaki area. The rest of this chapter shows that although this was possible because some Taranaki Whānui hapū and iwi did not leave the Taranaki area, it was also possible because those who left claimed co-residencies between Te Whanganui ā Tara and Taranaki. There were several instances during the nineteenth century of members of Taranaki Whānui hapū at Te Whanganui ā Tara returning to the Taranaki region after decades of occupation in Te Whanganui ā Tara – sometimes as a response to escalating conflict.

When the large numbers of iwi from Taranaki and Waikato arrived in Te Whanganui ā Tara in the early 1800s, conflict over rights to living spaces arose with the iwi and hapū who already resided there. For example, it was not long after Te Rauparaha and his travelling groups of hapū and iwi had arrived in the Kapiti area that the local iwi sought to expel them. Having set up three pā on Kapiti Island, the ‘outsiders’ looked to be settling permanently. So, in the early 1820s, a group of Ngāti Ira and other local iwi attacked a group of Ngāti Toa as they were gardening on the mainland near Waikanae. Since the result of this battle was not clear, Ngāti Ira gathered assistance from other iwi from the wider region between Porirua and Whanganui, and a second battle ensued. Despite having as many as 2,000 people fighting, Ngāti Ira lost in a decisive victory to Te Rauparaha. This victory arguably established the mana of Te Rauparaha in the area and his leadership of Ngāti Toa and Ngāti Raukawa with whom he had whānau connections. This victory also established Taranaki Whānui hapū at Te Whanganui ā Tara because Te Rauparaha provided them land for settlement ‘under his authority’ south of Kapiti, around the harbour.

---

25 For more information, see Michael King, Moriori: A People Rediscovered (Auckland, 1989), pp. 57-76.
In the following decades, Taranaki iwi continued to migrate separately from Te Rauparaha, and they moved into the area that would become Wellington city. The second migration of Taranaki Whānui hapū to Te Ûpoko o te Ika a Māui was called Te Heke Nihoputo and involved iwi from Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Tama and Te Ātiawa. Te Rauparaha welcomed this second hekenga of Taranaki hapū and iwi, and the Taranaki groups settled from Waikanae to Ohariu, and from Kaiwharawhara to Tiakiwai (present-day Thorndon). The third major migration of Taranaki hapū occurred in December 1831 after conflict in Taranaki between Waikato and Taranaki groups. Although small numbers of Taranaki iwi went into hiding on islands off the coast of Ngāmotu (see Figure 3), large numbers of whānau and hapū chose to depart for Te Whanganui a Tara in early 1832. This hekenga was called Te Heke Tama-te-uaua. It consisted of a combination of hapū from Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Tama and Te Ātiawa (including Ngāti Te Whiti, Ngāti Tawhirikura and Te Matahou). It was led by a number of prominent Taranaki rangatira and included some ‘Pākehā-Māori’ settlers such as Dicky Barrett, J. Love and William Martin (Billy) Keenan.

Te Heke Nihoputo and Te Heke Tama-te-uaua allowed Taranaki Māori to escape the threats of invasion by Waikato iwi, but also to take advantage of increased opportunities to trade with Europeans that occurred in the Wellington area. Through the 1830s, Taranaki Whānui hapū interacted with Ngāti Ira and other iwi, slowly but surely edging those iwi outside of the area. Iwi who left included some Taranaki Whānui iwi and hapū, such as Ngāti Mutunga and Ngāti Tama who departed for Te Wharekauri to escape the threat of conflicts with Ngāti Raukawa, settling in the Ōtaki area. Under arrangement with Ngāti Mutunga and Ngāti Tama, Te Āti Awa settled at Ngauranga, Waiwhetū and Pitoone, and in the early 1840s they were party to peace agreements with Ngāti Kahungunu and Ngāti Toa. These measures led to some settling

28 Ibid., pp.18-20.
of conflict in the area, but relationships remained complex.\textsuperscript{32} When the New Zealand Company sailed into the Wellington Harbour in 1839, they found that the local Te Āti Awa rangatira were keen to develop relationships with the Europeans, including trading rights to land with representatives of the New Zealand Company. By inviting Europeans onto their land, Te Āti Awa rangatira intended to ensure their ongoing protection of trade relationships with the settlers, a process which could also exhibit and confirm their recently established mana whenua to the area.\textsuperscript{33}

![Figure 3. Ngāmotu, where Taranaki hapū went into recovery after attacks from Waikato. 'History and Traditions of the Taranaki Coast', JPS, Volume 19, No. 2, 1910, p. 58 ii.](image)

The New Zealand Company’s persistent endeavours of trading for land rights were successful, but flawed and misleading. Representatives of the New Zealand Company, including Edward Gibbon Wakefield and his nephew Edward Jerningham Wakefield, made payment for land at Te Whanganui ā Tara to 16 rangatira who were
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representatives of six Te Āti Awa settlements around the harbour. Then the New Zealand Company continued to seek security over their land purchases by negotiating land sales with other rangatira around the area including Te Rauparaha and others at Kapiti, and Te Ātiawa communities settled at Queen Charlotte Sound at the top of the South Island. Satisfied that land was being secured, the New Zealand Company continued their journey north through Taranaki with hopes to negotiate more land sales. But unbeknownst to the Te Āti Awa rangatira at Te Whanganui ā Tara and around the wider region, processes were already underway that would forever alter the human settlement of the harbour. Even before representatives of the New Zealand Company sailed into the harbour in 1839 to negotiate the land sales, New Zealand Company ships full with new settlers were already on their way to live in the new settlement of Wellington. Over the following three years, evidence cast serious doubts over the legitimacy of land sales conducted by the New Zealand Company. By 1842, the Crown had initiated a Land Claims Commission to specifically investigate the land sales were made prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. In this short time, however, colonisation was already in full force, and iwi rights to land at Te Whanganui ā Tara had already been eroded significantly.

Colonisation and Māori Migrations

The colonisation of the Wellington region was swift and it marginalised Māori from the developing urban centres. In early January 1840, less than three months after the New Zealand Company struck deals with local rangatira, Lieutenant William Mein Smith sailed into Te Whanganui ā Tara aboard the Cuba to begin surveying for the
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34 Appendix 1: Port Nicholson Deed of Purchase, in The Waitangi Tribunal, Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ona Takiwa, pp. 53-54.
35 Ibid, p. 84.
37 Danny Keenan, Wars Without End, pp. 69-70.
settlement of Wellington. Within only three weeks of his arrival, the first ship of settlers also arrived looking for somewhere to live. Although William Mein Smith had surveyed the flat lands around Pitoone in the lower Heretaunga (the Hutt Valley) for the settlement of Wellington, when the Heretaunga River flooded in March and April, Wakefield refused to pay to protect the river from further flooding. Instead, they decided to build their settlement on the other side of the harbour, at Pipitea and Te Aro – sites occupied by other Taranaki Whānui hapū.38

Initially, the European settlements were attractive to Māori who sought close contact with the Europeans and the increased opportunities for trade.

Through the early nineteenth century in particular, Māori in the Wellington region redistributed their residencies to reflect the layout of European settler populations. From the 1820s, some iwi, such as Ngāti Toa, had chosen to live at Kapiti because the location was strategically located between the South Island and Whanganui and Taranaki. It also initially provided good access to European trade, with hapū trading local resources such as flax, food and labour, for foreign items like blankets and weapons.39

But as settlers began to concentrate around the Wellington Harbour, Māori also turned their focus to prioritising their settlements and connections with those areas. Taranaki iwi, who already resided there, were thus in an excellent position to experience the benefits of contact with settlers, something that lessened the dominance of Ngāti Toa as a trading partner for European vessels.40 This was reflected in the 1850 census of native populations collated by Native Secretary H. Tacy Kemp.41

One of his observations was that settlements, such as one at Ohau Bay, had severely
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38 The Waitangi Tribunal, Te Whangai a Tara Me Ona Takiwa, p. 84; Philippa Mein Smith, A Concise History of New Zealand (Melbourne, 2005), pp. 56-57.
40 The Waitangi Tribunal, Te Whangai a Tara Me Ona Takiwa, p. 31.
dwindled. Despite once being, as Kemp described, ‘the longest lasting populated place on Terawhiti’, this Māori community on the south-west coast of the Port Nicholson Block had been reduced to only one male and four female adults by 1850.42

There were a number of reasons why populations like that at Ohau Bay dwindled, but a significant one was ongoing mobility practices. For instance, in 1848, just prior to Kemp’s survey, Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake had led 586 Māori from Waikanae and Port Nicholson back to Waitara in Taranaki because of concerns about land sales and increasing potential for conflict there.43 Kemp noted these changes in populations in his census in 1850, writing that following the death of a rangatira from Waiwhetū, the Te Āti Awa population there had also decreased.44 These return migrations were possible because of the ongoing connections between iwi at Te Whanganui ā Tara and in Taranaki. Referring to the Taranaki Whānui population as ‘Ngatiawa’, Kemp wrote that ‘the Native population within the district of Wellington fluctuates very much. Many of their friends come in from Taranaki on long visits, and generally return accompanied by some of their relatives…. The whole of the ‘Ngatiawas’ entertain to this day the strongest attachment for their Native soil, and a desire once more to mingle with their relatives and friends’.45

The largest community recorded by Kemp in the Wellington region was a combined group of Te Āti Awa, Taranaki and Ngāti Ruanui living at a large pā in the Te Aro area.46 This Taranaki-descended community had not been party to the deed of purchase with the New Zealand Company in 1839. By 1850 they numbered 186 people and owned a wealth of crops and cattle. Kemp recorded that the Te Aro community owned seven

waka and two carts that could be pulled by some of the 20 horses owned by the iwi. Other Taranaki Whānui hapū nearby included a small, 14 person Ngāti Te Whiti community at Kumutoto pā; and a Te Matehou community at Pipitea consisting of 96 people living in five weatherboard houses and 11 huts. Other significant Māori populations at Te Whanganui ā Tara lived at Pitoone, Waiwhetū, Ngauranga, Kaiwara (Kaiwharawhara) and Ohariu. In total, there were 745 Māori living at Te Whanganui ā Tara in 1850.

These Māori communities interacted with settlers, and the writings of some of these settlers provide an insight into Māori mobility practices. When Charlotte Godley and her husband were visitors to the Thorndon area on a brief hiatus from their work in Canterbury, they observed Taranaki Whānui hapū and Charlotte Godley described them in letters to her mother in England. In one instance, Charlotte Godley described ‘a Maori pah about a mile from the town and two more almost in it, being at each end of what is called ‘the Beach’; that is the long street (about a mile and a half) if street it can be called, that has houses only on one side, and runs along by the sea.’ Given the large numbers of Māori living between Te Aro, Kumutoto and Pipitea, this ‘pah’ was most likely made up of hapū from Taranaki Whānui (Figure 4).

Although Māori and Europeans both benefitted from trade, iwi had mixed reactions as the numbers of European settlers at Te Whanganui ā Tara continued to increase. For example, although Edward Jerningham Wakefield reported that local Māori celebrated the arrivals of settler ships the Aurora and the Oriental in 1840, after the 1,500 settlers alighted, Te Āti Awa rangatira toyed with the idea of a return migration to Taranaki. Other Māori moved because of introduced motivations, such as missionary activities. Minarapa Rangihatuaki was an example of mixed customary and introduced reasons

47 H. Tacy Kemp, Census of Native Population within the District of Port Nicholson, 1 February 1850, pp. 7-10.
48 Ibid., pp. 10, 11-12, 14-17.
50 Charlotte Godley, 27 August 1850, in Godley, Letters from Early New Zealand, p. 94.
for this mobility because after he was taken captive during a raid on Taranaki by the Waikato, he ended up at Te Whanganui ā Tara where he worked as a preacher with the Wesleyan mission. Some Māori also actively courted social relationships with settlers during this time. In 1854, the Māori community at Pito-one poured resources into celebrating an anniversary of the founding of the colony at Port Nicholson. They hosted dinner and dance in a large nikau thatched building constructed especially for the event, and 300 attended including 60 Māori. Special guests included Edward Gibbon and Edward Jerningham Wakefield who first sailed in the harbour in 1839. At the dinner, Edward Jerningham Wakefield toasted the local iwi, to which the rangatira Te Puni replied that he was confident about the ongoing relationships between Māori and Europeans. Apparently mirroring his original welcome to the Wakefields, Te Puni declared ‘come and live here and be our Protectors; it is only a stony place, indeed this Pitone[sic], but there is better land adjoining. Come and live with us.’

This welcoming language, however, masked the ways that colonisation was contributing to growing tensions between Māori and settlers. Colonisation experiences elsewhere in the country were constantly being communicated to iwi in the Wellington region through their connections to other iwi throughout the motu. For example, prior to the outbreak of skirmishes in the upper Hutt Valley in 1843, which became early events in the Lands Wars of the nineteenth century, Rawiri Matangi from Te Āti Awa at Ngauranga wrote a disconsolate letter to his daughter in New Plymouth advising her to hold onto her land in the Taranaki area, unlike he and others had done at Te Whanganui ā Tara. Later, as the Land Wars moved further up the island, iwi in the Wellington area remained interested in the outcomes of those battles. Elsdon Best observed during his childhood on the Tawa Flat in the 1860s that ‘[t]he Ngati-Toa folk naturally sympathized with their countrymen, and expressed their

intention of occupying the farms of Tawa Flat when the Europeans were expelled from the island.\textsuperscript{55}


Iwi experiences were communicated across the motu in a variety of ways, but mostly via individuals and whānau carrying messages. Sometimes this mobility included iwi returning to their home places after years of residence elsewhere. In 1872, for example, members of Raukawa and the Kingitanga travelled to the Wellington area to invite members of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga to return to their homes in the Waikato region. At a hui to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of departing Te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui, one rangatira argued that the decision to return rested with individuals and whānau. ‘This is my reply to the invitation to the tribe of Raukawa’, he said,

> It is an old invitation, and has been repeated for many years up to the present time. Let the Ngatiraukawa do as I have done. Let those who wish to visit the lands of their ancestors go there and return.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} Arthur H Carman, \textit{Tawa Flat and the Old Porirua Road, 1840-1955} (Wellington, 1956), pp. 8 (facing), 47.
But returning home was more than simply a matter of familial ties. Some of the individuals from Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga were worried that they could not trust the motives of the Waikato invitation, especially considering the events of the recent Land Wars. One fear was that in returning to Waikato, whānau would be asked to take up arms and go to war again. The visiting Raukawa rangatira reassured them, however, that they brought a peaceful invitation to return north, and they urged Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga to think of their depleting land resources. ‘You are selling all your lands here’, argued Waikato leader Te Whiti. ‘If you stay you will live in poverty.’

Such arguments, however, were not enough to convince the iwi to give up their residency in connections to the Wellington region. Henere Te Herekau rebutted the implication that Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga could be viewed as refugees, or that they were desperate to take up the King’s offer because of the loss of land. ‘Do not put it in the power of Tawhiao’, he argued, ‘to say to you, you came to Waikato on Tawhiao’s invitation.’ Other Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga rangatira agreed with him. Ihakara Tukumaru declared that ‘so long as I retain a right to the piece of ground on which my house stands, I will not leave this place’, and Hori Te Waharoa added ‘although this land is being sold, do not let this drive us away.’

Indeed, land sales and land loss continued in the Wellington area, which, combined with other effects of colonisation processes such as introduced diseases, affected Māori population sizes in the growing urban areas. Whilst compiling his survey of Māori populations in 1850, Kemp had commented on the decreasing standards of health he observed and wrote that Māori health was ‘retrograding’, being ‘especially visible in and near the European Towns.’ It did not help that Māori ownership of land, an economic base for iwi, hapū and whānau, was decreasing. Only four years
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57 Te Whiti, cited in Ibid., p. 35
58 Te Whiti, Henere Te Herekau, Ihakara Tukumaru and Hori Te Waharoa, cited in Ibid., p. 35.
after Hori Te Waharoa declared that land loss should not drive Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga away from their lands, James Booth, who was also present at that hui, proudly reported that during one year he had acquired over 58,000 acres of land from Māori in the Wellington provincial area.\textsuperscript{60} Between 1874 and 1878 the Māori population of Wellington decreased from 161 to 118, and the perception of their presence in towns and cities was similarly decreasing.\textsuperscript{61} Despite high birth rates, Māori were dying at higher rates than they were being born. And in the Wellington area, populations were also decreasing because of continuing mobility practices – not to other towns and cities, but to rural areas.

In the late nineteenth century, Taranaki Whānui hapū were enticed to return to the Taranaki area (and escape from the effects of colonisation) by the leadership of Te Whiti O Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi, both of Taranaki and Te Ātiawa descent and who stood for Māori autonomy and peace at Parihaka. While Māori had been interacting with Pākehā to benefit themselves and their communities, official systems were set against them. One reason for this, economist Gary Hawke has described was that ‘[o]nce land was taken from Maori ownership into the public domain, the issue was simply how to distribute among the colonists.’\textsuperscript{62} And the Crown and settlers hungered for Māori land. This was in part because, as Tom Brooking has argued, Pākehā wanted to be on that land, and Māori ‘wasteful’ use of the land was perceived as a hindrance to the nation’s progressive development.\textsuperscript{63}

So Māori continued to be mobile and have connections across the motu. In 1868, a group of Ngāti Tama residing in Pakuratahi, north of Upper Hutt, returned to Taranaki to live. And in 1872 or 1873, a group of Māori who had been living in Waikanae also

\textsuperscript{60} James Booth, ‘Report to the Under Secretary of the Native Department’, 30 June 1876, \textit{AJHR}, 1876, G.5., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{63} Tom Brooking, ‘Use It or Lose It: Unravelling The Land Debate In Late Nineteenth-Century New Zealand’, \textit{NZJH}, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 160, 162.
But as well as enticing iwi home to Taranaki, the leadership of Te Whiti and Tohu was also connected into the Wellington region. In 1880, Civil Commissioner Charles Brown from New Plymouth observed the growing Parihaka community and stated that the strength of the followers of Te Whiti was ‘guided to some extent by information and advice from his leading countrymen and their advisers in Wellington.’ This connection between Parihaka and Wellington was in part via whānau. A daughter of Te Whiti, Perani Ngaruaki (also known as Peranu), was married to Taare Waitara (also known as Charlie), a Wellington man descended from Te Whanganui ā Tara-dwelling Te Āti Awa. Although he was born away from the Taranaki region, Taare Waitara was a wealthy man who used his resources to help modernise the amenities at Parihaka. He provided resources so that the Parihaka community could have access to clean water via ‘an ingenious water supply system’ and made other sanitary reforms. He was a symbol of the ongoing bonds between iwi at Te Whanganui ā Tara and in the Taranaki rohe.

However, the autonomous community of Parihaka was unacceptable to the Crown because the Crown aimed to provide Pākehā New Zealanders with uncomplicated access to owning land. By the time that the community at Parihaka appeared to threaten European access to owning Māori land, successive governments had already introduced decades of measures through which lower-class European immigrants to New Zealand could work towards attaining their own property. As Māori decreased in how much land they owned, decreased in their numbers and withdrew into rural areas, they became characterised as ‘rural’. This rural, however, was conceptualised

differently that when it was applied to Pākehā, who saw their connections to country land in idealised, progressive terms.

Underpinning the Crown’s land policies that undermined Māori land ownership were Pākehā attitudes that urbanisations distanced people from their natural environments. In particular, through the nineteenth century Pākehā persisted in looking towards the country as an important source of New Zealand culture, identity and economy, which had an effect upon relationships between Māori and Pākehā. Although, Pākehā rural lifestyles were still susceptible to the pressures of modernity through the first half of the century, governments continued to promote the rural areas of New Zealand as idyllic and capable of providing economic and spiritual ‘sustenance’ for the nation.69 Plus, as David Hamer has argued, although urban living was a necessary part of the colonisation process in New Zealand, New Zealanders still chose to look towards the rural environment for their cultural foundations.70 This was particularly clear in Crown land policies.

This idealisation of rural identities has been called a ‘rural mythology’ by Miles Fairburn.71 From the 1880s onwards, the rural mythology motivated the state to promote closer land settlement, which directly aimed to get families onto rural properties, despite wider economic changes that meant more and more Pākehā were becoming residents of towns and cities.72 Although technology for farming was developing and strengthening the farming industry, these developments also meant that the need for rural labour lessened. As a result, Pākehā increasingly identified education as a source of ‘material security and social prestige’, urban living as a means through which Pākehā could better access modern conveniences and opportunities, and rural identities as providing important spiritual sustenance.73 Despite the

72 Ibid., p. 10.
73 Ibid., pp. 9-10, 12.
economic advantages of urbanisations, and that Pākehā urban living was often in poor and unhealthy living arrangements that, in the eyes of many, were in opposition to a collective pioneering identity that tended to idealise rural living and rural working, Pākehā ‘voted with their feet’ and moved into cities. There, the rural myth persisted.  

So even though Pākehā were moving into towns and cities, the drive to get Pākehā families onto farm land impacted very negatively upon Māori through the late nineteenth century. Although there was disagreement amongst Pākehā about the best model for settlement of the land, there was one point upon which most Pākehā could agree: that if the land was not being used productively, the resident or residents had no ‘moral’ claim to that land. This was particularly applied to Māori whose models of land ownership were based upon the rights of iwi, hapū and whānau to land because of descent and historical and spiritual connections. Plus, Pākehā tended to oppose the way that Māori models of land ownership included communal rights. Tom Brooking has argued that as a result, Māori became the focus of state polices that were not explicitly racist, but required iwi to lose land in the pursuit of encouraging Pākehā settlers onto farm lands, thereby revitalizing rural communities. This ‘land grab’ through the Liberal government from 1890 and repeated during the Reform government from 1912, had the effect of stunting any Māori farming development and contributing to Māori becoming ‘locked... into a vicious syndrome from which it was difficult to escape’. By the beginning of the twentieth century, this ‘vicious syndrome’ meant that Māori had lost ownership of massive amounts of land. In 1896, the Māori population reached its lowest point on record, being just over 44,000.

By that time, the ruralisation of Māori was widespread, so Māori leadership styles changed as hapū and whānau worked to make the best of their circumstances. When

76 Brooking, ‘Use it or Lose it’, p. 161; Brooking, ‘‘Busting Up’ The Greatest Estate of All’, p. 97.

100
Te Whiti O Rongomai died in November 1907, the Parihaka community decided that Taare Waitara would succeed Te Whiti in the management of the Parihaka lands, although he too died only just under two years later.\textsuperscript{78} He was buried next to Te Whiti at Parihaka and was given ‘an eloquent’ eulogy by Maui Pomare, a leader from Ngāti Mutunga.\textsuperscript{79}

Pomare was a well-known public figure, frequently cited by the press as advocating modernisation of Māori. At the tangi of Te Whiti in 1907, Pomare spoke in memory of the departed rangatira, identifying his achievements as being ‘the author of peace’. However, in referring to the changing tides of Māori leadership, Pomare also urged that the old ways must now give way to the new. Using a metaphor of a whakataukī, Pomare explained that when the old fishing net is worn, the new net must go fishing (ka pū te ruha, ka hao te rangatahi):

I do not want to cast reflections or discredit on the old net. It was good in its day, and many fish were caught in it; but the old net is worn with time. We must go fishing with the new net our brother brought us. We must advance by work, for therein lies our only salvation.”\textsuperscript{80}

As leaders such as Te Whiti, Tohu and Taare Waitara passed away, young and Western-educated leaders such as Pomare and his contemporaries took up the mantle of maintaining Taranaki Whānui relationships with Taranaki. Although iwi, hapū and whānau continued to look to Pākehā populations as sources of material benefits, the loss of land, warfare and decreasing populations of the nineteenth century meant that Māori also had to continue to look to consolidate their resources, ‘recuperating in isolation’ as iwi.\textsuperscript{81} This involved large numbers of Māori residing away from the European populations, who, by 1901, outnumbered Māori almost 18 to one.\textsuperscript{82}

\begin{footnotesize}


\textsuperscript{81} Ian Pool, \textit{Te Iwi Māori}, pp. 104-129.

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings 1971}, p. 15.
\end{footnotesize}
Māori as rural, many New Zealanders lost touch with, or never interacted with, Māori individuals and whānau. Since Māori populations had become marginalised from towns and cities, Māori stories were also largely marginalised from mainstream awareness and experiences.

By the end of the nineteenth century, therefore, Māori in the Wellington region were, by a massive majority, rural residing. Over the following decades, as will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, the ‘ruralisation’ of Māori impacted upon commonly held perceptions of Māori communities. For example, in 1939, one author described a history of the city of Wellington since 1870 in ways that completely displaced Māori influence in the area, not only politically but also socially. Although Māori had maintained their interests in the Wellington region, the author wrote that ‘[s]ocially, the history of Wellington in the last seventy years is the history of every British community’.  

Despite being ruralised, Māori mobility practices remained. From the 1890s, Māori censuses reported that around 250 Māori were living in the Hutt Valley, but these figures were based at least in part on impermanent Māori populations who entered the area for seasonal employment. In 1901, for instance, Māori travellers from the Horowhenua area were temporarily living in the Hutt Valley, engaged in flax cutting.

Seasonal employment mobility ‘allowed young Maori families to maintain their traditional links with their iwi and hapu’, a feature seen as early as the 1880s and which continued into the twentieth century. These impermanent movements, however, were not like the urbanisations of the twentieth century for two reasons. First, they were often rural to rural residential movements; and secondly, although they could be for months at a time, they did not involve long-term settlement.

---

At the beginning of the twentieth century, mobility of whānau, hapū and iwi was an ongoing phenomenon; however, colonisation had directly impacted upon Māori communities throughout the country, including in the Wellington area. Although the Wellington region was home to Māori communities who traced their ancestry to a range of Taranaki iwi or iwi from other regions beyond the boundaries of Te Whanganui ā Tara, these communities were small. The following chapter looks deeper into Māori communities in the Wellington area during the early twentieth century and explores the ways in which urbanisations of Māori led to new kinds of urban Māori organisations that were modelled on urban tangata whenua organisations. While Māori mobility practices and impermanent settlements continued into the twentieth century, leading up to the mass urban migrations influenced by the Second World War, they were small in scale and insignificant relative to mainstream affairs. Nonetheless, small, urban migrations were apparent from the outset of the century, and they laid a foundation for the mass urban migrations that followed. The following chapter demonstrates that it was from these early migratory beginnings that later Māori urban migration patterns can be understood.
Chapter Four: **Origins of Multi-Iwi Urban Communities in Wellington**

After an explosion of European settlement through the nineteenth century, Pākehā urbanisations caused the swelling in size of urban areas across New Zealand. Through the nineteenth century, international city sizes had been similarly increasing, and despite their resistance to urban lifestyles, populous urban centres were becoming homes to the varied social and cultural systems of many populations. In New Zealand, the urbanisations of Pākehā New Zealanders were a necessary product of an increasingly urban-based economy. By the First World War, over half of the non-Māori population in New Zealand had become urban dwellers.¹

Māori too were also increasingly urban-residing from the turn of the twentieth century, although at greatly reduced rates compared to Pākehā. In 1926, for example, the urban Māori population in Wellington and the Hutt Valley area was only 216 in a total urban population of 98,893.² By necessity, these very small Māori populations interacted with the rest of the urban population over issues that included welfare initiatives emerging from tangata whenua iwi. These also included the activities of a particular Māori community that was established to promote shared Māoritanga in the city. This latter community was based around the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club.

While pan-iwi urban communities, such as that which surrounded the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, became increasingly common through the twentieth century, this chapter shows that in the Wellington area, they had their origins in urban-located

---

tangata whenua organisations that sought to engage with Māori and non-Māori. Even though Māori had moved into cities at low rates during the early decades of the twentieth century, these Māori encountered experiences that emphasised their small numbers within the larger non-Māori urban population. Urban areas populated by mostly only European-descended people had existed since the outset of colonisation in New Zealand, and when Māori moved into the city before World War Two, these feelings of being ‘outnumbered’ in the city were ones that would come to characterise urban migrations throughout the twentieth century.\(^3\) With small numbers of Māori in the city, and in many cases, even smaller numbers of Māori from similar iwi backgrounds, Māori individuals and whānau sought pan-iwi fellowship with other Māori to, as Witarina Harris described ‘cling to my Māori side’.\(^4\)

Pākehā urbanisations were thus an important predecessor to Māori urban migrations and an important context for the development of urban Māori communities and identities. This chapter will show that Māori urbanisation experiences in the early twentieth century demonstrated that early city-dwelling Māori were intent on the retention of Māori social and cultural forms, and their urbanisations did not mean that Māoritanga in the cities was doomed to extinction. Through pan-iwi gatherings in the city, Māori were able to access support systems with people whose experiences mirrored their own.

---

\(^3\) For more information on urban areas through colonization, see David Hamer, *New Towns in the New World: Images and Perceptions of the Nineteenth-Century Urban Frontier* (New York, 1990), pp. 146-147.

Urbanisation in New Zealand and Around the World

By the 1920s, North America, Australasia and most countries in Western Europe had experienced significant population urbanisations. But despite the economic advantages of an increasingly urban population and workforce, urbanisations were not always well received because they were perceived as presenting certain social and cultural challenges. Some of the challenges experienced elsewhere in the world were communicated to audiences in New Zealand. For example, reports about urbanisations in Britain were published in New Zealand newspapers, lamenting their increasing urban residences, and that similar urbanisations were unacceptable for New Zealand populations. One such report described unease about not only Britain’s majority proportion of urban-living individuals, but also that these urban populations were still increasing and causing detrimental social, cultural and economic effects. In 1881, the paper reported that the ratio of urban to rural populations in Britain was 212 to 100; and twenty years later it was 335 to 100. By 1901, urbanisations were accused of causing hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land to lie unutilised.

Nonetheless, urbanisations continued and city sizes around the world increased. Cities of more than 10,000 people in Europe at the end of the eighteenth century were home to 12 million people, and 100 years later they had increased to more than 67 million people. In North America between 1800 and 1860, the populations of cities of more than 8,000 inhabitants rose from four to 16 percent of the total American population; and between 1860 and 1910, they rose from 6.2 million people to 54.3 million. Closer to home in Australia, urban populations increased even more rapidly, supplemented by the systematic immigrations of European settlers, some of who were

---

from those growing urban areas of Europe.\textsuperscript{8} The city of Adelaide in South Australia established in 1836, for example, grew to 18,000 residents in its first fifteen years, and by 1911 was home to 169,000 people.\textsuperscript{9}

In New Zealand, Pākehā were also moving into towns and cities and in 1911, New Zealanders were first recorded as a majority urban dwelling population. While some of this urbanisation was due to reclassification of areas containing 1,000 or more people as ‘urban’, it did include increasing residencies in larger towns and cities. As a result, from 1911 onwards the populations in urban areas of 10,000 or more continued to increase.\textsuperscript{10} These rates of urbanisation were possible in New Zealand, Campbell Gibson has argued, because of the importance of farming to the national economy. An emphasis on economic productivity meant ‘outdated agricultural techniques’ were swiftly replaced, reducing labour demands and therefore causing the redundant rural communities (excluding Māori) to urbanise.\textsuperscript{11} During these early decades of the twentieth century, the population of Wellington city increased at unprecedented rates. In the two decades leading up to the 1911 Census, Pākehā urban migrations and urban births made the Wellington urban population rise at rates of 44.3 percent between 1891 and 1901; and 43.3 percent between 1901 and 1911.\textsuperscript{12}

The increasing urban migrations of populations around the world caused an emergence of scholarly interest in urbanisation studies that investigated the effects of urban living upon people and communities.\textsuperscript{13} A concern identified by German and American writers early in the twentieth century was that urbanisation in industrialised

\textsuperscript{9} Lionel Frost, \textit{The New Urban Frontier}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{10} Campbell Gibson, ‘Urbanization in New Zealand’, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 78.
states removed people from their rural connections and ‘authentic’ lifestyles. Georg Simmel from Germany argued that by becoming a metropolitan dweller, man would live less by instinct, and instead be more active within the internal and intellectual spheres of the human psyche. ‘The metropolitan type of man – which, of course, exists in a thousand different variants’, wrote Simmel, ‘develops an organ protecting him against the threatening currents and discrepancies of his external environment which would uproot him. [In the city,] He reacts with his head instead of his heart.’

In a similar vein, urban living for Pākehā in New Zealand was connected with social and moral decay. When non-Māori urban dwelling became representative of the majority population in New Zealand in 1911, one contemporary commentator argued that ‘the modern tendency to drift into towns’ was evidence of the increasing need for asylums and prisons. ‘If this country was to rise to greatness’, he argued, ‘it must check agents of degeneration, and promote those that would improve the physical and mental qualities of the people’ – country living included. Ongoing urbanisations and relative normalization of urban residency also did not appear to lessen people’s concerns about the wellbeing of citizens in urban living. Ten years after becoming a majority urban-located population, when Pākehā were recorded as 60 percent urban-dwelling, the Farmers Union in Otago still argued that ‘urban drift has proceeded too far, so that the population distribution [in New Zealand] is unbalanced.’

Despite their awareness of the urban-rural distribution of the New Zealand population, the authors of the 1926 New Zealand census also expressed concerns. They stated that migrations into urban areas were ‘disturbing’ and unnatural for the nation:

The continuance of a somewhat disturbing feature is revealed by the census returns in the presence of further evidence of ‘urban drift.’ The term ‘urban drift’ is used to indicate the gradual abandonment of rural life for that of the

16 The figure of 60 percent excludes Māori. If Māori are included, urban populations in New Zealand did not reach close to 60 percent until 1936. ‘Table 2’, in Campbell Gibson, ‘Urbanization in New Zealand’, p. 73; ‘Urban Drift Gone Too Far’, The Auckland Star, Vol. LX, Issue 130, 4 June 1929, p. 7.
city and the growth of cities at the expense of their rural hinterland. It is a condition not peculiar to the Dominion. but for New Zealand, which is for the greater part a primary producing country, the indications of strong urban drift are viewed by many with alarm.\(^\text{17}\)

These concerns were connected to the pervading Pākehā idealisation of the rural character of New Zealanders, as described in the previous chapter, which existed during the nineteenth century and persisted into the twentieth century. By the end of the 1920s, the ‘excessive’ urbanisations worried contemporary commentators as being a challenge to both nationhood and an economy based upon agriculture. In a symbolic gesture to acknowledge the importance of agriculture, men of the Empire Marketing Board in 1928 banned their wives from buying Parisian dresses that supported their agricultural competitor, France.\(^\text{18}\)

But Pākehā urbanisations continued. To ease the discomforts of urbanites living in towns and cities, suburban development through the 1920s provided individuals and families their own ‘slice’ of country living.\(^\text{19}\) In Wellington, a relatively high population density amongst New Zealand cities meant suburban developments were particularly necessary. Between 1901 and 1926, the city was frequently reported as having the highest regional population density in the country.\(^\text{20}\) The central city was the section of Wellington with the highest number of people, and in 1911 this amounted to 49.7 percent of the Pākehā population of the city. By 1926, this proportion (including Māori) decreased to 38.1 percent as the result of suburban developments. The 1926 census described that in the Wellington area, ‘[w]hat were in 1911 only sparsely inhabited areas, with large stretches of sand-dunes, are now thickly populated

\(^\text{17}\) Dominion of New Zealand Population Census, 1926, p. 4.
\(^\text{20}\) Registrar General, Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 31\textsuperscript{st} March, 1901 (Wellington, 1902); Registrar-General, Results of the Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 29\textsuperscript{th} April, 1906 (Wellington, 1907); Government Statistician, Results of a Census of the Dominion of New Zealand Taken for the Night of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} April, 1911 (Wellington, 1912); Government Statistician, Results of a Census of the Dominion of New Zealand taken for the night of the 15\textsuperscript{th} October, 1916 (Wellington, 1918); Dominion of New Zealand Population Census, 1926, p. 5.
In fact, between 1911 and 1926 there were only population increases in the suburbs of the city, and spaces such as the suburban Lyall Bay and Miramar increased in population by 273 and 543 percent respectively during that fifteen year period.

With more Pākehā living in towns and cities – and still managing to maintain their identities as rural – feelings of ‘alarm’ about Pākehā urban migrations adjusted. Through urban living, families maintained their idealised rural personas by emphasising participation in outdoor pursuits, such as town planning to include gardens, and the development of horticulture societies. In 1923, the Wellington Horticulture Society expanded to accommodate the ‘suburban’ societies that had emerged. From 1926 onwards, a separate Suburban Horticulture Club was established and began running its own events. During the first half of the 1930s, they were holding monthly meetings to discuss growing vegetables and flowers.

Thus by the 1930s, urban living was still undesirable to many, but it had become more than just an issue of abandoning the countryside; it was increasingly viewed as progressive and necessary. For example, in 1936, urban dwellers represented 62.4 percent of the Pākehā population of New Zealand, and the census reported that the once ‘unnatural urban drift’ was now not only inevitable but necessary for New Zealand lifestyles and economy. In fact, it was crucial for the development of urban based industries so that New Zealanders could maintain modern lives full of New Zealand made, factory produced amenities. This changing attitude was influenced by the election of the Labour Party into government in 1935. The Labour Party was founded on socialist values, and their policies were sharpened in the context of the
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21 Dominion of New Zealand Population Census, 1926, p. 4.
22 ‘Table 22. Wellington City - Population of City Divisions and Suburbs at Censuses 1911, 1921 and 1926’, in Ibid., p. 72.
24 See, for example, ‘Suburban Horticulture’, The Evening Post, Volume CXII, Issue 67, 16 September 1926, p. 11.
Great Depression. As soon as they were elected to government, the Labour Party aimed to provide all New Zealanders with access to better lifestyles. For Māori, the Labour government aimed to raise the wellbeing of Māori in rural areas. In the lead up to the Second World War, this would mean dealing directly with ‘Māori Problems’.

Rural Māori: Modernisation and Cultural Continuities

In the first four decades of the twentieth century, Māori were by far dominantly located in rural areas consisting of Māori populations with shared iwi backgrounds. This can be seen in the shared iwi backgrounds listed by Māori when they declared iwi allegiances for the voters rolls in 1908 and 1919. For example, of the Māori voters who cited Wellington, Lower Hutt or Petone as their home address in 1908, Te Ātiawa voters were the majority iwi, making up 52.5 percent of all voters. Added to other Taranaki Whānui iwi including Taranaki, Ngāti Ruanui and Ngārauru, and other tangata whenua iwi like Ngāti Toa and Ngāti Raukawa, 72.5 percent of voters had longstanding connections to the Wellington area. In 1919, this was also clear in other areas on the Western Māori Electoral District Roll, with 96.8 percent of the 190 Ōtaki Māori voters stating that were from Ngāti Raukawa, the tangata whenua iwi of that area. Similarly, out of the 237 Te Ātiawa (and Ngāti Awa) voters across the entire Western Māori Electoral District Roll, 68.1 percent still lived in the Taranaki region.26

For most iwi around the country at the beginning of the twentieth century, living in tribal areas meant living in areas that had low Pākehā populations. In rural areas, Māori were socially and economically distinct from the majority of the New Zealand population, with restricted access to ‘mainstream’ services. In the first four decades of the twentieth century, this meant that Māori exhibited poor health and lower life

26 See Appendices for more information on the Māori Electoral Rolls. Western Maori Electoral District Roll 1908 and 1919, New Zealand Maori Voters Rolls, NZ 324.64, Wellington City Library, Wellington.
expectancies, and Māori dwellings were overcrowded or located in damp or unhealthy places. The maintenance of this system of distinctiveness, which Ranginui Walker called Māori becoming a ‘brown underclass of New Zealand society’, was at least partially based in the limited provision of educational opportunities to Māori in rural areas. The native schools system, established by legislation in 1867, aimed for Māori to become more like Europeans. The English language was the primary language for all learning, and school funding relied on demonstrations that the English language and the ‘ordinary subjects of primary English education’ were being sufficiently taught. By the early twentieth century, the curriculum was also directed at keeping Māori in tribal areas, trained in agricultural and home-making skills. Through the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, poor health, high mortality rates and low visibility influenced a popular belief that Māori were headed toward extinction.

Prominent Māori Member of Parliament, James Carroll, recognised the concern that Māori populations were declining and he argued for the continuity of Māori social and cultural forms. In 1907 he reportedly declared that ‘the New Zealander of the future would combine within himself the best attributes of the Anglo-Saxon breed’, creating a kind of amalgam of the races in New Zealand that was both Māori and Pākehā. Carroll, however, also declared that this New Zealander of the future would retain ‘the best characteristics of the race from which the speaker was proud to have sprung’ – that is, their ongoing, chosen Māoritanga. In reality, though, Māori populations were not only surviving, they were increasing, although not in areas where their increases were necessarily apparent to most Pākehā populations. Thus ideas persisted in both Māori and non-Māori circles that the only way for Māori populations to survive was

through assimilation into the much larger, European-descent population.\textsuperscript{31} To encourage Māori well-being and resist assimilation, a new generation of Māori leadership emerged seeking new ways to uplift whānau, hapū and iwi.

The Te Aute College Students Association and, as it was later known, the Young Māori Party, sought to enact change and modernisation for iwi through direct engagement between government structures and Māori communities. Established in 1897, the group of young, academically-educated Māori men referred to themselves as ‘young’ in that they sought to promote ‘new ideas’ with Māori.\textsuperscript{32} From early on, these new ideas included Māori participation in activities and habits often characterised as ‘European’, such as higher education, the ‘right use’ of European clothing, and the industrial and professional employment of Māori youth.\textsuperscript{33} Young Māori Party members Maui Pomare and Te Rangihīroa Peter Buck were also graduates of Te Aute who became the first Māori doctors. They argued that many diseases plaguing Māori communities were a direct result of forces of colonisation, meaning they could be tackled by providing Māori with the knowledge and resources for increased standards of living.\textsuperscript{34} For example, some of the problems for Māori health came about because Māori tended to live in rural areas away from Pākehā centres and therefore away from where medical professionals were located; and the costs of seeking medical help also turned Māori off from seeking advice from professionals.\textsuperscript{35} The solution, according to Pomare, was the modernisation of Māori communities, which might come at the expense of losing some customary practices.

Pomare’s advocacy of modernisation for Māori communities whilst promoting the retention of some Māori social and cultural forms made him a paradoxical character subject to Māori and non-Māori attention (Figure 5). In rural Māori communities, he was not shy in condemning the lifestyle practices he observed. This was a ‘forceful and

\textsuperscript{31} Raeburn Lange, \textit{May the People Live}, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{33} Ranginui Walker, \textit{He Tipua}, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{34} Raeburn Lange, \textit{May the People Live}, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 35-37.
bold’ trait that famously almost had him ejected from a meeting with iwi on the East Coast in 1901. Pomare was especially condemning of tohunga. After a tohunga on the East Coast was accused of causing the deaths of 17 children in 1904, Pomare wrote that ‘as one who sees the incalculable harm done to the Maori populations by tohunga, I beg the Government to act at once and pass a measure forever abolishing this demoralising practice of witchcraft’. Consequently, Pomare and the Young Māori Party advocated the Tohunga Suppression Bill in 1907. When the Bill was being debated, Āpirana Ngata spoke in favour of the suppression of what he called ‘bastard tohungaism’ because there was a clear lack of adequate health services in tribal areas. Pomare’s position was more extreme. Over the space of three years, he burned 1,900 raupō whare to the ground in support of bettering Māori health and hygiene in rural areas.

As with their varying stances on tohunga suppression, these two leaders also differed in their attitudes to the ongoing relevance of Māori social and cultural forms. Ngata, for example, showed from early in his political career that he wanted to help uplift Māori through promoting their adoption of aspects of European lifestyles, but he also advocated Māoritanga, especially language.

In contrast, Pomare saw that Māori control and adaptations of aspects of Pākehā lifestyles were crucial to ensure Māori survival. In 1906 he told an audience that ‘there is no hope for the Maori but in ultimate absorption by the pakeha’. When war was declared in 1914, both Ngata and Pomare saw it as an opportunity for Māori to...
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37 Ibid., pp. 64-67.
38 Ranginui Walker, He Tipua, pp. 127-128.
40 Ranginui Walker, He Tipua, pp. 110-111.
demonstrate their loyalty to the British Empire, and as a consequence, their rightful and equal citizenship of New Zealand.\textsuperscript{42}

Both Pomare and Ngata advocated the establishment of a battalion for Māori soldiers. In 1914 this was not immediately possible because the Imperial Government initially refused this the participation of non-white members of commonwealth countries in the war of European races. In New Zealand, however, support from the Prime Minister, William Massey, meant the formation of a battalion of Māori soldiers to undertake garrison duties for the war was allowed.\textsuperscript{43} The establishment of the Pioneer Battalion was thus a ‘win’ for the Young Māori Party, but they also advocated that Māori were fit for, and deserved, full participation in the war, shoulder to shoulder with their countrymen.\textsuperscript{43} After stepping away from his Parliamentary seat for the

\textsuperscript{42} Ranginui Walker, \textit{He Tīpuia}, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 185-186.
Northern Māori electorate, Te Rangihiroa Peter Buck volunteered for the Pioneer Battalion. From this role, he advocated for Māori equality with Pākehā.\textsuperscript{44} While stationed as a medical officer for the Pioneer Battalion in Egypt in 1915, he told an audience that although the Battalion had been restricted to labouring duties, ‘the members of this war party would be ashamed to face their people at the conclusion of the war if they were to be confined entirely to garrison duty and not be given an opportunity of proving their mettle at the front.’\textsuperscript{45} At home, Ngata also made it known that he expected the government to provide jobs for returned Māori soldiers in the public service or on public works.\textsuperscript{46} Pomare’s support for the conscription of Waikato and Maniapoto, however, was a decision that made him very unpopular with iwi.\textsuperscript{47}

Pomare was an advocate of Māori urbanisations. He grew up on the isolated Chatham Islands and in the culturally autonomous community at Parihaka, but as an adult, he and his wife Miria were well-known locals of the Wellington urban scene.\textsuperscript{48} During the Great War, Miria Pomare encouraged Māori to not only ‘advance by work’, as suggested by her husband, but to assist other Māori like themselves in living in the city. She led a welfare committee, which was associated with Lady Liverpool’s’ welfare fund, that was dedicated to Māori and the task of ‘elevating of him to his former high estate’.\textsuperscript{49} In 1918, Miria Pomare was awarded an OBE for her wartime welfare work, and from then on became known affectionately as ‘Lady’.\textsuperscript{50} Along with her husband, she continued to participate in Māori welfare work into the peacetime.

In the city following the war, there were indications post-war of urban-dwelling Māori having increasingly diverse iwi backgrounds. For example, the iwi backgrounds of
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Wellington-dwelling Māori were becoming increasingly diverse and inclusive of iwi identities outside of the mana whenua iwi. Of the 47 Wellington-dwelling Māori who voted in 1919, 11 different iwi backgrounds were nominated. Other than the Taranaki Whānui iwi and hapū (Te Āti Awa, Taranaki, Ngāti Ruanui and Ngāti Tama) and other tangata whenua populations of Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa, the other listed iwi were representative of tribes in the wider catchment area for Wellington – including Whanganui, Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, and Ngāti Porou.\(^{51}\)

However, in Wellington city, these populations were tiny compared to the larger non-Māori urban populations. Thus following the war, both state and Māori leaders actively encouraged Māori development in tribal areas. A newspaper article in 1925 described that in contrast to recording the character of the Māori race ‘on paper’ and from an ‘ivory tower’, Ngata was seen as being proactive in Māori issues by assisting Māori in rural areas and ‘putting him on farms’.\(^{52}\) In 1926, just over 84 percent of Māori still lived in rural areas, and this was changing only slowly.\(^{53}\) As Minister of Native Affairs, Ngata continued to develop land schemes for Māori and in late 1929, legislation provided for the establishment of a scheme through which he could delegate suitable lands for development.\(^{54}\) This land development was based on systems of tribal leadership, and where these schemes were successfully initiated, whānau and hapū were shielded somewhat from the worst of the Great Depression and its economic difficulties.\(^{55}\) However, as Cybele Locke has written, wages for Māori were still lower than for non-Māori, and as a result, Māori remained relatively mobile in their searches for incomes for their whānau and hapū. During this time, Māori

\(^{51}\) New Zealand Maori Voters Roll 1908, Western Maori Electoral District Roll.
\(^{52}\) ‘Notable Trio Of Maori Scholars’, *The NZ Truth*, Issue 1042, 14 November 1925, p. 4.
moved between rural areas in response to seasonal employment, and this included some small amounts who migrated towards urban areas too.\textsuperscript{56}

By focussing on Māori in tribal areas, Ngata and his colleagues overestimated the amount of Māori land available to Māori communities and underestimated the breadth of employment being undertaken by young Māori.\textsuperscript{57} In the 1920s and 1930s, Māori had been employed in a range of seasonal and labouring work which, as economic conditions worsened, became harder to find.\textsuperscript{58} Making matters worse, state agencies failed to recognise the ‘legitimacy of Māori unemployment’.\textsuperscript{59} In 1933, an estimated 40 percent of the Māori male work force was unemployed compared with an unemployment rate of 12 percent for the Pākehā male workforce. So when Labour was elected in 1935, the first thing that was changed was the existing system of relief payments under which Māori had been systematically receiving less funding than Pākehā on the basis that Māori ‘had fewer needs and could be paid at a reduced rate’.\textsuperscript{60} Despite remedying the relief scheme, there were fears that Māori would become dependent on state funds.

Thus when Labour came into government in 1935, they pledged to work for the betterment of Māori and deal with the ‘Maori problems’, which meant helping Māori to ‘help himself’.\textsuperscript{61} Through land development schemes, the Labour government sought to increase Māori employment on Māori land. However, this emphasis on keeping Māori in tribal areas was short-sighted and influenced by public (Pākehā) opinion that Māori were ill-equipped to negotiate modern, urban life. In 1935, for example, one author was reported in the media as arguing that ‘their place is not in the cities and towns except for a few who have loosely[sic] assimilated European ways
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and whose children are reared in town life’. ‘For 99 per cent the open land is his only place’ the author continued, arguing that ‘they cannot live their lives in crowded towns.’ But land development schemes with poor conditions and inadequate pay meant Māori were seeking employment outside of their immediate tribal areas. This included moving into towns to make use of the relief payments through the sustenance scheme.

Movements into urban areas remained slow, however, and by the next census in 1936, populations of Māori in rural areas had dropped only slightly to just under 83 percent. Rural communities, including in the Wellington area, struggled with mortality rates that were a direct result of rural living standards, a factor which made urban migrations increasingly attractive. The comparatively low living and health standards for Māori in rural areas included overcrowding, poor diet, poor personal hygiene and inadequate sanitation. Even ‘on the progressive East Coast in 1933’, hygiene expert Harold Bertram Turbott wrote in 1940, ‘thirty-three per cent of houses [were] without privies’. At that time, Māori living in the small township of Ōtaki were an example of how overcrowding was aiding the spread of disease. Two medical students who surveyed the Māori community there in 1939 despaired about the effect that high rates of disease and the close proximities of cinema seating had on the popular attendance of Māori at the Ōtaki cinema. ‘The number of people amongst the audiences with bad coughs is particularly noticeable at the Otaki-Cinema,’ they reported. ‘We met several Maoris who were open cases of pulmonary tuberculosis and yet who were regular customers of the cinema.’

But in moving into towns and cities, Māori moved into environments where poor urban living standards remained common. Although the Labour government aimed to
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re-house individuals and families into adequate state housing after it was elected in 1935, change was slow, and on the ground in Wellington, inadequate urban housing standards persisted well into the late 1940s. In 1937, a medical student concluded that in the central city areas of Wellington, a ‘lack of foresight’ and inadequate room for expansion could mean more slums would form. Similar sentiments remained 10 years later when another medical student found slum conditions continued to be a threat to Wellington public health and living standards. In his survey, this latter student discovered that a shortage of accommodation in the city had resulted in many dwellings being altered to house multiple families through the creation of ‘apartments’. Compared to an Auckland survey of 60,698 family unit dwellings where 3,699 were found unsatisfactory (only 6.1 percent), he concluded that houses in Wellington tended to be significantly more sub-par. In a survey of 29,507 Wellington city family dwellings, 22,130 were deemed satisfactory and a large 7,377 were unsatisfactory (25.0 percent). The student concluded that this overcrowding was connected to high rates of communicable diseases such as tuberculosis, which occurred at unusually high rates in Wellington.

Living standards were, therefore, an ongoing concern for health professionals and the state. They were not limited to Māori in rural areas, and the small urban Māori populations were challenged with poor living standards that were common amongst all urban populations. In Wellington, living costs were also said to be unusually high, and even though housing standards were generally more improved than in rural areas, a housing survey of public health in Wellington undertaken just after World War Two

70 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
71 Ibid., pp. 9-10, 31, 50.
identified that adequate housing for all Wellingtonians remained a major concern.\textsuperscript{72} Compared with Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin, overcrowding in Wellington was also a symptom of city local living costs, such as high rent prices, that were said to be connected to Wellington’s ‘legacy’ as the capital city of New Zealand (Figure 6).\textsuperscript{73}

![Figure 6. Average Weekly Rent, Four Roomed House, 1926-1946. Similar trends in rent prices over the same time period were also observed for five and six roomed houses (data excludes 1934). From M.R. Ashbridge, An Insight into Wellington Housing Today, Preventative Medicine Dissertations, University of Otago, Dunedin, 1947, p. 69.](image)

Nonetheless, urban-ward migrations continued to be the main migratory direction for Māori populations. In the urban areas of Wellington, tangata whenua communities had maintained their presence in the city, although in very small numbers. In 1926, only 2.9 percent of all Māori in the wider Wellington region resided in urban areas, and within the total urban population, they were only 0.22 percent. Over half of these urban-located Māori were resident of the central city (58.8 percent).\textsuperscript{74} Within this

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., pp. 1-2, 31, 63-64.  
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., pp. 31, 69.  
\textsuperscript{74} Grace et. al., \textit{The Silent Migration}, p. 54; Eric Schwimmer, \textit{The World of the Maori} (Wellington, 1966), pp. 98-99; also, information calculated from ‘Table 22. Wellington City - Population of City
small but growing urban Māori population, tangata whenua groups provided fellowship for other ‘visiting’ iwi moving into and through the city of Wellington.

The Urban Tangata Whenua and the ‘Ngāti’ of ‘Pōneke’

Although Māori moving into urban areas prior to World War Two were small in number, the tangata whenua iwi in Wellington noticed the increasing populations.75 Local kuia Ripeka Love, for example, wrote that in the decades leading up to the opening of their marae, Te Tatau o Te Pō, in 1933, they had observed that ‘more and more Maoris were coming into our district.’76 In response, Taranaki Whānui sought to build a marae so that they could receive these manuhiri in line with appropriate protocols.

By 1933, there was no wharenui and marae for Taranaki Whānui in the areas that had become Wellington city. Other than Waiwhetū, which by the 1920s had been overtaken by the growing city, there were two Ngāti Toa marae north-west of the city. So inside the city areas, Taranaki Whānui used private homesteads for manaakitanga, a practice that has been called ‘whare Māori’, associated with a ‘whaamere’.

Whare Māori, as Lily George and Natacha Gagne have written, are alternative forms of marae for city-dwelling Māori who reside at physical and emotional distances from their own, descent-related marae.77 Through urban migrations, whare Māori have
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77 ‘Whare Māori’, as it is used here, is different to the Whare Māori of Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana who, as part of his teachings, ‘helped the people become free of the old superstitious fear of little gods in material objects’ using a ‘Whare Māori’ to house tapu objects ‘placed under Ratana's mana so that they would do no more harm’. That Whare Maori was also known as the 'Devil House' or ‘Whare Taipo’, the ‘jailhouse’, the 'boogie house', Whare Herehere i ngā Taipo me ngā Atua Māori (Jail House of Devils and Māori Gods), and Te Whare Tekoteko (House of Figurines). See A.H. and A.W. Reed in association with the Polynesian Society, Ratana, The Man, the Church, and the Political Movement (Wellington, (1963)
ranged from an urban-located homestead with an ‘open door policy’ so that friends and whānau may comfortably stop by as they desired; to other arrangements for fulfilling social and cultural needs, such as groups of buildings, networks of family houses or anyplace where ceremonial practices (such as a pōwhiri) can take place, such as a community hall. 78 Whaamere, described by Pat Hohepa in 1964, includes the group of people associated with a particular whare Māori arrangement, and according to him, this group was often defined by descent. But, as Richard Hill has noted, these social groups and the homes that became a ‘stop-in’ place for members often included Māori who were not from the same iwi. 79 In the early twentieth century, whare Māori in towns and cities were sites of interaction between iwi.

The home of Hapi and Ripeka Love at Korokoro in Lower Hutt was a type of whare Māori for an iwi who were not residing at any physical or emotional distance from their own tūrangawaewae. Plus, the Loves had an open door policy so that Māori in the city, with no other traditional marae in close proximity, could still enact fellowship with reference to tikanga. Known as ‘Taumata’, the home of the Loves was ‘a modern Maori residence’ that was a common gathering place for iwi that emphasised the mana of the tangata whenua. 80 Since the hospitality previously provided through marae were no longer available, the Loves made their house available whenever necessary. Ripeka Love described that

After the passing of the old generation my husband and I were impelled to continue the traditional hospitality in the same manner and promote the well-being of our people in Wellington and Taranaki districts. For all public affairs that involved the Maori people it was necessary to make our house available, at all times. 81

81 Ripeka Wharawhara Love, In Retrospect, pp. 4-5.
But the Loves and their whānau also sought to build a traditional style marae in the city. While, as Paul Tapsell has argued, iwi like Taranaki Whānui in Wellington (and around the country) were ‘subjected to the humiliation of becoming marae-less on lands their ancestors initially sought to share in good faith with the incoming colonial power,’ for Taranaki Whānui building a marae was a way that they could demonstrate their longstanding connections to Te Whanganui ā Tara.\(^\text{82}\) The Taranaki Whānui marae in Lower Hutt, Te Tatau o Te Pō, was opened in 1933 and is arguably the first urban marae in Wellington, not only because it was a traditional marae located in the city, but it was also, as shown below, it was built by iwi who were conscious of multi-iwi Māori lives in the city.

Taranaki Whānui intended that their marae would be used to advance the welfare of all Wellington iwi. This included the maintenance of tikanga practices of manaakitanga for Māori in the city. Prior to the building of the marae, the mana whenua had used improvised locations for hui and providing welfare assistance.\(^\text{83}\) Ripeka Love remembered that in the early years of the century ‘there were no welfare organizations as we know them today’ and the lack of formal structures for Māori welfare meant that the responsibility rested upon Māori communities.\(^\text{84}\) This included mana whenua based groups that drew on pan-iwi relationships. In 1919, for example, Maui Pomare was the patron of a group in Petone, called Ngapani O te Whanganui-a-Tara (orphans of Te Whanganui-a-Tara). This group was committed to ‘take up the several causes of the Maori people of the district’, including teaching te reo Māori to younger generations and supporting Māori involvement in sport.\(^\text{85}\) Even though the group’s participants included members of the local iwi, the group name – ‘orphans’ of tribes – expressed early urban Māori sentiments about feeling distant from home places.
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Because of the sometimes large distances to home places and their small numbers within the larger urban Pākehā populations, these early urban Māori perceived that they had weakening connections to the things that connected them to their whakapapa, especially cultural knowledge and te reo Māori. In 1929, a group called Te Ropu o Te Whanganui ā Tara was established to administer the building of the urban-located Te Tatau o Te Pō marae, and in 1930, they explained that they were dedicated to the fostering of Māori culture. But while in name the group provided spaces for all Māori backgrounds living in Wellington and the Hutt Valley, the still small urban Māori community was primarily focussed on members of Taranaki Whānui descent. The objectives of Te Ropu o Te Whanganui ā Tara included supporting Māori cultural activity, writing and sporting achievement as well as strengthening relationships between local Māori and the wider community by ‘bringing together the tribes and subtribes known as Te Atiawa, Taranaki and Ngati Ruanui’.

Te Tatau o Te Pō marae thus filled a valuable purpose in the local Māori community in the 1930s by welcoming immigrant Māori whilst prioritising the status of the mana whenua. While there were some pan-iwi clubs in the early 1930s, they were closely aligned with the mana whenua. In a ‘Grand Concert’ held in 1930 in Wellington, local Māori combined as the ‘Wellington Young Maori Party’. Members in that Young Māori Party included people who later became members of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, and they raised funds for Te Ropu a te Whanganui ā Tara. In 1932, Te Ropu o Te Whanganui ā Tara established an executive which enabled several members to dedicate their land sections towards an amalgamation of a native reserve for the
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This, coupled with substantial amounts of volunteer work from local Māori, allowed Te Tatau o Te Pō to be built quickly and it was officially opened in October 1933.

The opening of the marae was attended by the Governor General and his wife, Lord and Lady Bledisloe, as well as former Prime Minister, Joseph Gordon Coates and his good friend, Āpirana Ngata. Speeches at the opening celebrations communicated Māori intentions that the marae would promote good relationships between Māori and Pākehā, and in the following years the marae was home to a number of Māori delegations to the city seeking an audience with the government. In 1935, more than 500 Māori from Taranaki came to the Hutt Valley for business at parliament, and they were accommodated at Te Tatau o Te Pō. By 1936, members of the marae continued to be optimistic about their role in the larger Wellington and Hutt Valley community. An article for the Evening Post reported that Te Tatau o Te Pō would be increasingly used by visiting Māori and to host a wide variety of events.

Over the coming decades, however, Māori urban migrations into Wellington and Hutt Valley began to reveal a more permanent form of urban settlement that included a massive increase in the numbers of Māori in the city who hailed from an increasing range of iwi backgrounds. In 1937, the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club was established so that urban-residing Māori could maintain Māori cultural identities, which was similar to the broad objectives of the Taranaki Whānui groups, but Ngāti Pōneke went one step further: this urban club was for any person from any
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background. In practice this meant embracing people from any iwi or hapū, and allowing them to embrace their own identities for the benefit of all members.

The Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club was established by members of an urban-located Māori community who had been providing fellowship for Māori in the city through a number of non-iwi clubs and organisations. Accordingly, an important hallmark of the Club from the outset was its function in bringing together Māori from different walks of life. As Ngāti Pōneke founding member Paul Potiki remembered, the local tangata whenua were less attracted to this aspect of Ngāti Pōneke, meaning that the Club ‘wasn’t for them and very few came in’.⁹⁵ Although some members of local iwi did become members and had good relationships with the Club over the years, from its establishment the objectives of Ngāti Pōneke were clear: it was to be a club for any young Māori from any iwi background to participate in local and cultural affairs.

The earliest instances of Wellington Māori identifying with the name ‘Pōneke’ were through the Wellington Anglican Church. The name ‘Pōneke’ is attributed to two possible origins, one based on the concept of manuhiri settling in Wellington, and the other sourced from an older local iwi history at Te Whanganui ā Tara. The latter explanation is from Ngāti Toa, and the name ‘Pō-neke’ tells of a raid by a warring party made at night time.⁹⁶ Considering the nature of the Ngāti Pōneke community in Wellington, however, it is more likely the former explanation was more appropriate. In this origin for ‘Pōneke’, the word is a Māori transliteration of another settler name for the area: Port Nicholson, which was a former European name for Wellington.⁹⁷ Pōneke, or ‘Port-Nicky’, is thus similar other Māori place names based on transliterations, such Poihākena, or Port Jackson, for Sydney. In the mid-1930s, Pōneke was applied to the Māori section of the Wellington Anglican Church. For example, between September 1935 and September 1940, Lady Pomare, invited the Governor

⁹⁵ Paul Potiki, in Grace et. al., The Silent Migration, p. 80.
General and his wife to at least six fundraising occasions for Māori welfare in Wellington on behalf of the Women’s Committee of the ‘Ngati Poneke Māori Mission’. Her invitations were accepted by the couple on at least three of those occasions, and through these years, the ‘Ngati Poneke Māori Mission’ was used interchangeably with the ‘Wellington Māori Mission’.

Māori in Wellington thus used the name ‘Pōneke’ and ‘ Ngāti Pōneke’ on an ad hoc basis prior to the establishment of the Club to refer to the shared urban experiences of Māori in Wellington. The addition of the word ‘Ngāti’, a common prefix for an iwi grouping, emphasised a new type of relationship amongst the non-descent-related Māori urban residents that was nonetheless modelled on kinship. This allowed them, as argued by Daniel Rosenblatt, to create a sense of community through structures and language particular to Māori, using social structures that consisted of the kinship terms used by iwi, hapū and whānau in tribal environments. Even though the Ngāti Pōneke community was unlike an iwi or hapū because a genealogical definition of whakapapa was not a principal factor for relationships and membership, their relationships were nonetheless articulated within similar terms. Along with a desire to express their Māoritanga, the key organising principles for initial inclusion in the Ngāti Pōneke community were shared urban experiences, something that was a part of what Aroha Harris has called ‘whakapapa of experience’.

A number of events through the early 1930s contributed to the development of the whakapapa of experience within the Māori urban community that became Ngāti Pōneke. The primary function of churches to accommodate and encourage community relationships made the Anglican Church in the Wellington area an important and regular source for Māori community interactions. ‘Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club was born out of the church, not to make people Anglicans, though it happened to be the
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Anglican thing’, Vera Morgan remembered; and ‘it didn’t matter what religion.’\(^{101}\) Lifetime Club member Laura Taepa also remembered that for those people who were Anglican, the weekend services were an important event in which desires for relationships based on shared Māoritanga could be accommodated – the important basis from which the Ngāti Pōneke community gathered regardless of their backgrounds.\(^{102}\)

It all started from our church, from our Māori church.... Now, there were not a lot of Māoris in Wellington and whether they were Anglican or not they still came to Church, and from that, the beginnings of Poneke Māori Club started.... life at that time revolved around the Church, and so everything branched out from the Church.\(^{103}\)

Another important influence in bringing the Wellington Māori together was the Young Māori Party leader, Āpirana Ngata. Having suffered from ill health for several years, Maui Pomare died in 1930 whilst on a trip to the United States, and despite his controversial political life, Māori sought a formal memorialisation of the leader.\(^{104}\) The process to arrange a suitable memorial became a popular activity for Wellington Māori, including local iwi and Māori from broader iwi backgrounds.

Ngata used his relationship with Wellington Māori to celebrate Pomare’s life. In recognition of Pomare’s advocacy for Taranaki iwi, particularly with regard to the damages caused to iwi through government land confiscations during the nineteenth century, Taranaki leaders campaigned for Lady Pomare to have his ashes interred at a permanent memorial in Waitara.\(^{105}\) In August 1930, it was agreed that Pomare would be buried at Manukorihi Pa instead of at Te Whanganui ā Tara, and at a hui in 1932
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attended by both Āpirana Ngata and Wi Hapi Love, the Wellington-based leaders were assigned the task of consulting with Lady Pomare to develop the proposed memorial: a carved whare influenced by wharenui on the East Coast.\textsuperscript{106} To undertake this task, Ngata brought together Māori in Wellington to voluntarily contribute to a celebration of Pomare’s life.\textsuperscript{107} According to some, it was Ngata who introduced the idea of ‘Ngāti Pōneke’ to this gathered group.\textsuperscript{108}

Under Ngata’s leadership, Māori in Wellington city worked together to create the whakairo and tukutuku for the memorial whare in Waitara. A spin-off of this work was that the young Māori greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet and learn from one another, especially relating to performance. Thus while the Pomare memorial was recognition of a man who had a high profile through his life time, on the ground in Wellington it became an excuse for Māori community to unite towards a common purpose that reflected inter-iwi connections. The young men making the whakairo worked in a tin shed on Sydney Street near parliament. They carved panels that expressed an East Coast contribution to the memorial that represented the relationship between Pomare and his wife, who was descended from Ngāti Kahungunu and Rongowhakaata.\textsuperscript{109} At this location, Ngata also hosted young Māori women from Whanganui, Ōtaki, Taranaki and Wellington, who weaved tukutuku panels. Together, the young people not only worked, they participated in informal sharing and learning of waiata led by Ngata. From this informal community, several of the young Māori decided to perform together as ‘Ngāti Pōneke’.
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\end{flushright}
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The Ngāti Pōneke group that emerged from Ngata’s leadership made their first public appearance in 1936 at a concert to fundraise for their travel to the opening of the Pomare memorial in Waitara. At the concert in 1936, the Ngāti Pōneke group performed alongside iwi groups from Taranaki, Whanganui, Ōtaki, Rotorua and Wellington. Entertainment included the award winning Ngāti Raukawa group that performed the double poi, and the ‘Waitara Tukutuku Party’ that performed two waiata a ringa. The Ngāti Pōneke group sang a song called ‘Kia ora Poneke!’

Figure 7. The women pictured are (back row from left) Ruby Mason, Benie Watson, Lucy Gunson and Nin Jones; and (front row from the left) Bubs Wallace, Riria Utiku, Francis Mitchell and Dovey Wallace. The photo was donated to the Alexander Turnbull Library by Riria Utiku. ‘Poneke hockey team, Waitara’, in Utiku, Riria: Photographs relating to Ngati Poneke, Walker family, and women’s hockey, 1/2-180908-F, ATL, Wellington.

Although this performing group of Ngāti Pōneke was assembled for the sole purpose of contributing to the Pomare memorial, it also contained members who had connections into the other urban Māori community groups, including the Anglican


Māori Church and the Pōneke women’s hockey team. During the early 1930s, Māori leaders from the Anglican Church encouraged Māori participation in hockey teams, which provided a popular way for young Māori to gather socially outside of the Church. Patihana Kokiri, who regularly travelled to Wellington from the Wairarapa to hold Anglican Church services for Māori, was a keen advocate of Māori participation in sport and he promoted it to the people who gathered for his services. Members of his congregation included Rangi Utiku, Mere Pene and Henare Tahiwi who especially enjoyed hockey, becoming grade ‘A’ hockey referees. In 1936, the annual hockey tournaments were organised to coincide with the opening of the Pomare memorial, and over 50 teams competed, including at least one team from Pōneke (Figure 7). The young women who played in this team continued to meet after the Pomare memorial was opened and the work of the ‘Ngāti Pōneke’ performance group died down. These relationships contributed to the reinvigoration of the group in 1937, when the Club was established formally.

Thus, even though they were small in number, the urban Māori community in Wellington before World War Two was one active in Māori events, standing alongside iwi organisations in sport and performance, and emphasising the importance of retaining Māoritanga while living in cities. The 1936 census recorded that with only 589 Māori individuals living in the urban areas of Wellington and the Hutt Valley, consisting of both tangata whenua iwi and Māori from wider backgrounds, Māori were only 0.39 percent of the total urban population. Being such a small population compared to the vast numbers of Pākehā in the city, Ngāti Pōneke founding members considered it was important that they formally establish their group, especially in terms of tikanga. Out of respect for the authority of the mana whenua, Ngāti Pōneke founding members approached members of a tangata whenua iwi to receive approval.

112 Document compiled by Meri Mataira, Frances Warren, Riria Utiku and Laura Taepa, copy in the possession of Laura Taepa, Waiwhetū, Wellington, p. 3.
113 Ibid.
114 Laura Taepa, personal communication, Waiwhetū, Wellington, 5 April 2011.
116 Dominion of New Zealand, Population Census, 1936, p. 5.
for their operations. When the Club was established by members of the Ngāti Pōneke community one evening in the house of Hinga Walker at 12 Cardell Street in Newtown, they also decided that Kingi Tahiwi should be their leader and he should make a trip out to the Hutt Valley to consult with Wi Hapi Love about the establishment of the pan-iwi Club. Together, Kingi Tahiwi and Wi Hapi Love saw the benefit of a pan-iwi voluntary organisation, and over the following decades, Wi Hapi and Ripeka Love became regular supporters of the Ngāti Pōneke community. For the tangata whenua, this recognised their longstanding authority and customary connections at Te Whanganui ā Tara. For Ngāti Pōneke, the Club was a home for the ever increasing urban-residing populations.

Figure 8. This photo shows Māori who contributed to the Ngāti Pōneke concert in 1936, including carvers, weavers and members of performance parties from Ōtaki, the Whanganui-Patea area, and Porirua. ‘Ngati Poneke group’ in Utiku, Riria: Photographs relating to Ngati Poneke, Walker family, and women’s hockey, 1/2-180921, ATL, Wellington.

Through its establishment, therefore, the Young Māori Club and the Māori community surrounding the Club allowed young Māori to participate in a community that encouraged them to stand on their own feet and use their Māoritanga in the city. ‘When those young people coming in to work came in’, lifetime member Laura Taepa explained, ‘there weren’t so many of their own here, so their life was different. But they still knew who they belonged to, where they came from [and] everything else - but in Wellington they were a part of a big group, a family group, where it didn’t matter where you come from.’ Importantly, this included the maintenance of kinship-type relationships through a community that allowed for whānau connections between people who were not related. By gathering together, Māori were able to retain and maintain Māori social and cultural forms, especially because they were always conscious of their small numbers within the larger non-Māori urban population of the city.

From the outset, the Club was also a voluntary organisation with, at least initially, no official support. One consequence of this was that there was no regular space that could accommodate the Club in its activities during its early years, and so they operated out of a few different ad hoc locations in the city. During its first seven years of operations, Club members sought a permanent and centralised location for the Club, but this was not achieved until during World War Two (described further in the following chapter). Instead, the Club sometimes met in rooms at the Anglican Women’s Tea Rooms at the Paramount Theatre on Courtenay Place, at St Thomas Church in Newtown, and at a church on Hill Street by parliament. But when the state became aware of the function of the Club to encourage ‘successful’ Māori urban living whilst maintaining certain forms of Māori culture, it soon also saw advantage in creating a close relationship with the Club. For the Club members, however, the Ngāti

---
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Pōneke community allowed not only opportunities for friendship with other Māori, it also met their own purposes of creating a friendly space for iwi, hapū and whānau identities to exist simultaneously with Māori and pan-iwi identities.

This was epitomised by a particular memory from Ngāti Pōneke Young Club founder, Witarina Harris. In remembering the involvement of Ngata in the Club, she told a story about how he would instruct each of the pan-iwi members to undertake performance in ways that reflected his own background, as Ngāti Porou. Witarina, however, was not compliant with that because she was loyal to her own background and upbringing:

(Api would say, ‘You girls, your foot action is not right.’ He wanted the Ngāti Porou style. And I’d say to him, ‘Api, I can’t lift my leg.’ ‘Why can’t you Wi?’ I’d say, ‘Because I’m from Te Arawa.’ That to us is a man’s stance. So I’d say, ‘I’m sorry Api, it’s just that my Arawa refuses. I try, but I just can’t. So if you don’t like the way I stand, I’m sorry, because this is my Arawa style.’ I’m Ngāti Pōneke, but this was the Arawa in me.)

Through the Club, young Māori were able to deal with the challenges of urban living from a space where their Māoritanga was encouraged. ‘It was just like a marae’, Paul Potiki remembered. ‘In fact it was our marae, even if it was only a little odd room in a city building.’ Well before the state had begun to notice the migrations of Māori into towns and cities, the mana whenua iwi in Wellington and the Hutt Valley and the Ngāti Pōneke community had drawn on tikanga to create systems to assist these Māori in the city. They were still small in numbers, and as a community that stood apart from the far larger mainstream urban community, Ngāti Pōneke Māori viewed their urbanisations as ‘a silent migration’.

However, Māori were still moving, and the Second World increased these movements. Through the war effort, the Club was in an excellent position to encourage both Māori membership and extract support from state officials. For the young Māori heading into the cities from 1939, urban living was more than access to modern conveniences; it was a doorway to exciting lifestyles.
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Chapter Five: Māori, Urban Migrations and the War

Increases in urban Māori populations over the short period of World War Two (the war) showed the scale of urbanisations of which Māori were capable. This growth came about because of Māori networks and Māori desires to make the most of opportunities available in urban areas. Although urban Māori communities that existed prior to the war occurred at modest rates, the number of urban-ward migrations that took place during the war have been described as a ‘catalyst’ for the mass urban migrations that took place in the 1950s and 1960s.¹ Indeed, Māori did move into cities during the war, developing networks and systems that laid the foundations for the larger urban-ward mobility of Māori populations that took place after the war. While the total Māori population (including both urban and rural dwelling Māori) increased by approximately 120 percent during the war as a result of escalating birth rates, the rate of increase in the number of urban residing Māori exceeded this rate, being just under 180 percent. From 1936 to 1945, the urban Māori population increased from 14,212 to 25,414.²

Wartime also brought forward aspects of Māori urban relationships that became important defining features of the Ngāti Pōneke community. In Wellington, the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club had been established to provide a home for Māori in the city so that they could learn and express their Māoritanga. At the outbreak of the war, Ngāti Pōneke used these objectives to carve a niche in wartime fundraising and entertaining soldiers through their performances. And their fundraising contributions

were extensive. For example, in 1943, it was reported that the young Club members undertook 211 performances in one year.³

During the war, this activity allowed the Club to develop relationships with state officials that were mutually beneficial. For instance, the Club was identified by officials as a model for future Māori relationships in the city, relationships that could advance state intentions of Māori integration into the larger non-Māori populations. For Ngāti Pōneke members, however, cultural integration was not the focus for Māoritanga in the city. Rather, their focus was on teaching and sharing Māori cultural and social values for the benefit of young Māori in the city and for the maintenance of iwi, hapū and Māori identities. The manaakitanga and cultural expression provided by the Club through performances throughout the war were exciting and enjoyable for young Māori in the city. Although urban Māori populations remained small in relation to non-Māori populations at this time, the Club was a home for any Māori nonetheless.

Ngāti Pōneke and the War

The war was a short period in which Māori migrated into cities at rates higher than previously recorded. In 1936, the urban Māori population was a mere 17 percent of the total Māori population, but by 1945, this had increased to represent over a quarter of all Māori.⁴ The urban areas of Wellington and the Hutt Valley observed a noticeable increase in urban-residing Māori, more than doubling between 1936 and 1945, from 589 individuals to 1,200. While a significant proportion of those urban Māori were living in suburban areas at the 1936 census corresponding to where mana whenua

³ This number has also been quoted as 265 performances in one year. ‘The First Thirty Years: The War Years’ in Programme for the Grand Concert, Ngati Poneke Young Maori Club Celebrates its 30th Anniversary, Sunday, 30th October, 1966, copy in possession of Lorraine Nikera, Wellington. The New Zealand Listener, 21 July 1944; also reprinted in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, p. 171.
were based, by 1945 these Māori were spread through the city in a similar dispersion
to the non-Māori population (Figures 9 and 10). And although this population
remained small within the larger Pākehā population, increasing from a tiny 0.39
percent of the total urban population in 1936 to a still small 0.69 percent in 1945, it
was enough to be noticed by the mana whenua and Ngāti Pōneke, described later in
this chapter.⁵

These urban migrations between 1936 and 1945 continued to be driven by economic
factors. There continued to be limited resources for Māori in rural areas, such as
limited access to employment and education. In 1940, economist Horace Belshaw
stated that this was a Māori ‘situation’, which was a longstanding one that would have
long-term effects upon Māori communities. He argued that should the Māori
population continue to increase at the rates he observed, urban migration for Māori
would become a necessity. Even if all land that remained in Māori ownership was
developed, only a maximum of one-quarter of the Māori population could be
supported at a ‘reasonable’ living standard.⁶ With economic factors already pressing
upon Māori populations in tribal areas, opportunities presented by residing in urban
areas became attractive to Māori during the war and, as this chapter describes, urban
migrations became increasingly accessible.

It also helped that Māori throughout the motu were keen to mobilise for the war
effort. Prior to the war, some iwi had already demonstrated their eagerness. In the
months leading up to the commitment by New Zealand to war in Europe, iwi, such as
in the territories of Te Arawa and Ngāti Porou, had been campaigning for the
establishment of a Māori battalion. The Te Arawa Māori Returned Soldiers’ League,
which was part of the Rotorua Returned Servicemen’s Association, had even begun
training men as soldiers.⁷ So when the government announced late on a Sunday
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evening on 3 September 1939 that it had decided to join in the war against Germany, Āpirana Ngata was confident that as in the Great War, iwi would be willing to serve in a Māori Battalion that would be an asset for armed forces and for Māori. The establishment of the 28th (Māori) Battalion was announced a month after war had been declared, and under Ngata’s influence, it was modelled on the Pioneer Battalion from the Great War with units organised along tribal lines. As Ranginui Walker has argued, Māori who participated proudly in this battalion saw it as an opportunity to raise Māori morale and mana in the eyes of Pākehā.

However, not all Māori were so enthusiastic to enlist and a general Māori discontent with the Crown – including amongst iwi who were eager to serve in the armed forces – became especially clear during another significant event of the time, the centenary celebrations for the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. For some Māori, the centennial was a chance to raise the profile of Māori and their values in the eyes of Pākehā, but also increase awareness of their grievances. The centenary appeared appropriate because there was a tendency of both the state and Pākehā to use their celebrations to promote a history of good race relations that in practice denied many hapū and iwi claims against governing administrations. For example, when the New Zealand Government committed to support the war, this affected plans for centennial celebrations country-wide, including the National Centennial Exhibition that was due to open in Wellington only two months later. While there were, initially, some discussions as to whether the celebrations for the exhibition should proceed, it was decided that the national celebrations would be a positive event for New Zealanders, boosting the ‘national spirit’. As one New Zealand official explained, the centenary plans should continue because of the pioneering spirit of the nation and their triumph
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of colonisation over the natural landscape. ‘The determination which has prompted the progress during the past century will continue’, he explained.  

For Māori, the centennial of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi was a specific chance to remind the Crown about its actions in breach of that Treaty. Ngata, for example, was engaged in plans for centennial celebrations across the country including events at Waitangi where the Treaty was signed. He was particularly vocal about the need for the Crown to recognise Māori stories of loss at the hands of governments. He was cited in the media on a number of occasions criticising the Crown for this. In July 1939, he was quoted as saying that ‘in land questions, when the Maori got in the way of the European, he had to get out’. Ngata appealed to the government to address these wrongdoings for the benefit of relationships between Māori and Pākehā. ‘We wish to retain our own individuality and wish the pakeha to understand that point of view’. He continued that ‘[b]efore we proceed to the next hundred years, it is the clear duty of the Government to wipe out the wrongs of the past.

Māori were thus using the centenary to reveal what they wanted from the next one hundred years. Before the war and the centenary, urban Māori in Wellington had already identified a connection between urban living and changing fora for Māori identities. The centenary presented another opportunity to highlight the importance of Māori retention of Māoritanga, and to reiterate the importance and durability of Māori social and cultural forms. Echoing the advice of the Young Māori Party, for example, there was agreement amongst Māori leaders gathered at the Waitangi centennial celebrations in February 1940 that Māori should, as James Carroll’s whakataukī stated, ‘kia mau ki tō Māoritanga’ (retain things Māori). The activity of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club during this time epitomised this sentiment. When the war broke out, it prevented some iwi from participating in performing at the
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Table 1. The areas of residency for the urban Māori population and the total urban population of the Wellington and Hutt Valley areas in 1936. Census and Statistics Department, *Dominion of New Zealand, Population Census, 1936, Vol. 1. – Increase and Location of Population*, Wellington, 1937, p. 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Māori Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>117,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petone</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Urban Area</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>589</strong></td>
<td><strong>149,971</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Māori Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>126,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>30,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petone</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Urban Area</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>173,520</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Centennial Exhibition. Ngāti Pōneke was in an excellent position to step up and take the places of those iwi and demonstrate their commitment to their taha Māori. Their participation in the centennial exhibition and their later refocus towards the war effort became defining features of the Club.

At the National Centennial Exhibition, the Ngāti Pōneke community contributed to the ‘Māori Court’, which was both tikanga conscious and a pan-iwi depiction of Māori as a united social category. The pan-iwi character was seen through the decoration of the wharenui. The buildings of the Māori Court featured carvings and other Māori objects accessed from the Dominion Museum or constructed in Wellington under the guidance of the Māori Arts and Craft Institute in Rotorua. According to Bernard Kernot, the decoration from different iwi was combined with a structure that was more ‘community hall’ than traditional; which reflected the intention of the organisers to show that the ‘present-day’ Māori was a product of a ‘blended cultural life’ between Māori and Pākehā. And even amongst Māori participating in the Māori Court, a message of hope was conveyed that called for the preservation of Māori cultural forms and the growth of the Māori population.

Nonetheless, at the Māori Court, Māori leaders outlined their hopes for better race relations between Māori and Pākehā in ways that were tikanga conscious. For example, Wi Hapi Love stood first as a member of the tangata whenua at the opening ceremony for the Māori Court, and he welcomed guests to the exhibition. In doing so, he spoke on the relationships between Māori and Pākehā. The Ngāti Pōneke members, also present at the opening, stood as representatives of the entire Māori race, especially as they felt that being such a small community amongst urban Pākehā, they were already viewed this way. As one ‘old girl’ of the Club remembered, the early leaders of the Club encouraged them to recognise that the urban Pākehā were
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unfamiliar with Māori, and that they saw Māori in the city as being representatives for the ethnicity as a whole. President of the Club Kingi Tahiwi taught them that ‘we were the shop window for all our Maori people in Wellington and that the Pakeha people [should] see that our standards were as good as if not better than their own’. In this spirit, the Ngāti Pōneke group became a regular performing group at the National Centennial Exhibition, both in the Māori Court and in the sound shell, a main stage of entertainment. During the exhibition they performed three times a week and sometimes also on the centennial exhibition radio station, 5ZB. Over the three months, they were said to have taken to the stage 99 times.

When the exhibition closed in mid-1940, the Club quickly refocused their performances to assist in the war effort and they continued to provide services in performance, especially in support of government-led events. This included the rare opportunity of accompanying departing soldiers onto the docks in Wellington before their departure for war, beginning with the departure of the Māori Battalion in May 1940. During this experience, Ngāti Pōneke encountered a tension between positioning themselves as representatives for the Māori race when next to iwi and hapū. Māori troops who departed from Wellington travelled from camps in Palmerston North, and did so without giving most whānau a chance to offer their personal goodbyes. Decades after the war ended, the participation of Ngāti Pōneke women in these farewells, when whānau were locked outside of the docks of Wellington, remains a powerful memory for those women. In Wellington, Laura Taepa was one of the Ngāti Pōneke women given the chance to provide those young Māori
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men with an appropriate farewell, but it was an experience that made her feel both proud and sad.

When the first lot of troops left Wellington, Ngāti Pōneke were taken onto the wharf to say goodbye to them. And that, in one way, was pretty terrible because parents, wives, and girlfriends were not allowed on the wharf. So to see Ngāti Pōneke going through on the bus was not very nice, although Pōneke were really thrilled to be able to do that. But there was sadness because those wives, mothers and parents couldn’t get on the wharf. So I guess that was one aspect that we weren’t really happy about, but as I said, we were there. Later on it wasn’t so bad, but that was the very first troop ship that left New Zealand and it wasn’t nice. And yet it was nice, but it wasn’t nice; it was sad to see all those others who just couldn’t get on to the wharf.⁹

That the ‘big-city’, urban Club was granted an opportunity denied to the whānau of the soldiers illustrated a difference between urban and rural-residing Māori. The urban Māori and pan-iwi group were granted a chance that the travelling rural Māori were refused. ‘It was a never-to-be-forgotten sight’, Laura’s sister Meri Mataira remembered, ‘seeing all those people who were waiting at the gates. We all felt sorry for them. When the gates were opened to let [the Ngāti Pōneke] bus through we were booed.’¹⁰ In their unfortunate role, however, the women of Ngāti Pōneke recognised that their service was important for the young departing men. Along with the first echelon of soldiers, Ngāti Pōneke members were involved in the departures of the 2nd and 3rd echelons of Māori troops, and the 4th reinforcements.¹¹ ‘I certainly didn’t blame those people for booing us’, Meri stated. ‘We felt terrible, but if we hadn’t gone through there wouldn’t have been anybody farewelling them.’¹²

Accordingly, after their contributions to the centennial exhibition, the Club decided in 1941 to only perform concerts for patriotic reasons, but this in no way limited their
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opportunities to perform.\textsuperscript{13} Plus, when a new system of committees for the war effort was established throughout the country in 1942, Ngāti Pōneke was able to participate in this wider effort in ways that drew on their established strengths in performance.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Ngāti Pōneke and the War: Manaakitanga in the City}

The new system of tribal committees for the Māori War Effort Organisation was championed by the Member of Parliament for the Northern Māori seat, Paraire Karaka Paikea. To complement the voluntary work of Māori soldiers in the armed forces, he sought organised Māori contributions to the war effort on the home front.\textsuperscript{15} The first major job for the committees was to focus on recruitment of Māori men for war services, especially as the initial enthusiasm for enlistments had subsided. In some areas like in Taranaki, Māori recruitment into services including the 28\textsuperscript{th} (Māori) Battalion had always been low because of Māori disaffection with the state and its histories of confiscations of Māori land.\textsuperscript{16} And considering the tensions that had arisen during World War One with conscriptions of Waikato and Maniapoto Māori, the Labour government was not interested in alienating Māori in this manner again. So, Māori Members of Parliament were given the task of exploring new ways to recruit Māori for war, a task assigned to the new voluntary committees of the Māori War Effort Organisation.\textsuperscript{17} For Māori participating in those committees, the organisation presented an attractive system for this work because decisions about their operations

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Annual Report 1940-41’, p. 1, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Lindsay Cox, Kotahitanga: The Search for Māori Political Unity (Auckland, 1993), p. 98.
\item \textsuperscript{16} For a discussion of reasons for low recruitment rates into the Māori Battalion from the Taranaki area, see Lauren Keenan, ‘For God, for King and for Country?: Factors influencing Recruitment into the 28th (Maori) Battalion’, BA (Hons) thesis, University of Otago, Dunedin, 2002.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Claudia Orange, ‘An Exercise in Maori Autonomy’, pp. 157-158.
\end{itemize}
were often in their own hands. Māori became active in the Māori War Effort Organisation and made the most of having some degree of autonomy.\textsuperscript{18}

Given this freedom to determine the scope of their operations, it was not long before these committees expanded their work beyond recruitment for war. Within the context of the war, the expanded work focussed on the wellbeing of Māori. Overlap occurred in regards to Māori soldiers overseas. Many tribal committees, both rural and urban, worked to assemble packages for troops. For example, in Tokomaru Bay, Wikitoria Paaka remembered helping prepare food for Māori overseas, food that would be comforting and remind them of home. As a young child, she helped dry kūmara (as kao) on the tin roofs of her community houses.\textsuperscript{19} Ngata also stressed the importance of gifts from home; he organised food from the East Coast to be sent to troops in ‘Nāti’ cream cans, from the dairy industry of Ngāti Porou, rather than the usual kerosene tins.\textsuperscript{20} Between 1942 and 1945 in Wellington and the Hutt Valley, tangata whenua-based group, Te Ropu o Te Whanganui ā Tara, hosted regular meetings at Te Tatau o Te Pō for packaging parcels to send to soldiers overseas. These were social events reported in the local paper, and included afternoon tea and opportunities for local artists, poets, travellers, scholars and composers to showcase their latest work.\textsuperscript{21}

Amongst the more important work of the tribal committees was assisting in finding employment for Māori in wartime industries. One role they undertook was helping with any issues between employers and employees, and assisting young Māori moving into an urban area adjust to the nature and expectations of urban life.\textsuperscript{22} Wartime employment was attractive for young Māori, such as Mihipeka Edwards who moved into Wellington for wartime employment and worked in munitions manufacture at

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., pp. 158-160.
\textsuperscript{19} Wikitoria Paaka, interview, Epuni, Wellington, 15 July 2009.
\textsuperscript{20} Ranginui Walker, He Tipua, p. 355.
\textsuperscript{22} Claudia Orange, ‘An Exercise in Maori Autonomy’, p. 161.
Ford Motors.\textsuperscript{23} She was also one of many drawn to the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club during these years. The Club hosted a tribal committee that aimed to specifically assist Māori in the city. The connections between committees, particularly given their focus on the issues of urban-located Māori, proved vitally useful for young Māori. This was one active example of, what Claudia Orange described as, ‘a vital bridge... between rural and urban life’.\textsuperscript{24}

The Ngāti Pōneke community was just one of the many iwi and hapū groups that took part in the Māori War Effort Organisation, and it fulfilled a specific urban-related purpose. As with iwi and hapū groups around the country, the committee system was used by Ngāti Pōneke to make the most of what they were able to offer. For Ngāti Pōneke, this meant welfare services and artistic performances. Being urban-located, the Ngāti Pōneke community was also attractive to young Māori because of the opportunities for exciting leisure-time pursuits. Consequently, the membership of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club increased through the war, with young Māori attracted to the whānau-styled community of Māori. At the base of their activity was the value of manaakitanga.

Although the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club was not alone amongst tribal committees of the Māori War Effort Organisation of Wellington area, it had a considerable public profile. While, as previously mentioned, Te Ropu o Te Whanganui ā Tara was regularly reported upon in the newspaper for their hui packaging parcels for troops overseas, the fundraising contributions of the Ngāti Pōneke community also received significant attention in the war years. Although they undertook work similar to other wartime committees (including encouraging recruitment to the armed services, and had done so prior to their signing up to the tribal committee system) Ngāti Pōneke excelled in entertaining Wellington-based soldiers. This remainder of this section explores how the members of the Club directed their focus towards the soldiers because it was these soldiers who were making the ‘ultimate sacrifice’.

\textsuperscript{23} Mihi Edwards, \textit{Mihipeka: Early Years} (Auckland, 1990), pp. 151.
Prior to the establishment of the tribal committee system, the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club had actively recruited young Māori men for war service. In 1941, the Club stated this explicitly when it reported that it ‘ha[d] identified itself prominently with recruiting and the welfare of Maori soldiers overseas’. Māori men were continuing to urbanise for non-war reasons such as employment, but while these urban migrations provided some respite for the depleting Club memberships, enlistments for war service meant that it was often temporary. A consequence was that many of the young men who passed through the Club during the war years ‘didn’t come back’. ‘Enlistments have taken a toll of our Boys’, described the Ngāti Pōneke annual report, and for young Māori men who were old enough and in good health, there was an expectation that they would best serve their country through taking a position in the armed services. Ngāti Pōneke reported in 1941 that ‘[w]e have some 30 boys away with the Maori Battalion overseas.... Some more at present in Camp in N.Z. and others in the Pakeha forces.’ Those men of the Club remaining at home or not eligible for military service had either joined the Wellington Territorial Reserves or ‘seen fit to assume the mantle and responsibilities of matrimony’.

The Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club worked alongside the newly-established Ngāti Pōneke Tribal Committee, led by Kingi Tahiwi and Lady Pomare. Their leadership and the expansion in the club infrastructure resulted in the two groups coming together under the combined banner of the Ngāti Pōneke Association in 1944. Leading up to this unification, the Ngāti Pōneke membership continued to grow as a result of increasing numbers of Māori in the city. The relationship between the two groups in the years leading up to this official joining-together enabled a more effective way through which young Māori men could be recruited for war. As founding Club member Paul Potiki remembered, the Club struggled in retaining male members because the

29 Miriama Heketa in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, p. 206.
regional recruiting officer, Henare Tahiwi, was continuously recruiting young men for war services.\(^\text{30}\)

Despite the young men being recruited for war, the number of people visiting the Club remained high because there were large numbers of troops in the city. As a main port of departure for the war, Wellington was host to many Māori and Pākehā men of the armed forces. Soldiers were prepared for war services at an army base in Trentham, 30 kilometres north-east of Wellington City, and during the war, wounded soldiers cared for in Wellington hospitals and homes.\(^\text{31}\) Ngāti Pōneke focussed its attention on these soldiers. Club member Witarina Harris remembered this work as being tiring, but exciting:

> We had to go out and entertain the troops. That was [our] war-effort commitment. That was Ngāti Pōneke’s war service, their active service. They were in demand. The young people hardly had any time for themselves. They went straight from work to the railway station, got onto buses to go to the camps or wherever. Whichever service wanted them, regardless of whether American, British, or our own. The soldiers loved it. So did I when I was with them, especially visiting the American camps. I especially loved being part of Ngāti Pōneke when the American boys came!\(^\text{32}\)

Since the young Māori men were being recruited for war, the membership in the Club became dominated by female members. While the young men became focussed on military service, the young women of a similar age channelled their war efforts into fundraising efforts that displayed their Māoritanga.\(^\text{33}\) When the Club decided to perform concerts solely in aid of the war effort, their performances took place in the Wellington Town Hall, the Wellington branch of the Happiness Club, and the open-air

---


\(^{31}\) Wira Gardiner, Te Mura o Te Ahi, pp. 26-27; Ripeka Wharawhara Love, In Retrospect, p. 5.

\(^{32}\) Witarina Harris in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, pp. 197-198. For a comment on the tiresome nature of such a busy schedule, see Mihipeka Edwards in Grace et. al., The Silent Migration, p. 176.

concert during the Carnival Week, held for the Hutt Valley centennial. Four concerts were also held for soldiers at the Trentham Mobilisation Camp in Upper Hutt. The Club boasted that they were ‘on all occasions... met with enthusiasm and acclamation’. In 1941, the Club was reported as providing a well-known and high standard of entertainment that worked towards worthy causes. In this particular instance, the proceeds of tickets to their performance were donated to the Returned Services Association (RSA) premises appeal.

Since it was mostly women in the Club during this time, they were encouraged to make sure that soldiers stationed in and around Wellington would have an enjoyable time. ‘[T]he club was about three-quarters women to about a quarter men I’d say’, Paul Potiki remembered, and as a result, performances were particularly dominated by female members. Off the stage, young Ngāti Pōneke women entertained the soldiers, kanohi ki te kanohi at regular dances and dinners held by the Club. At the dances, leaders such as Kingi Tahiwi emphasised that the young Club members should show manaakitanga towards all the troops in Wellington because they would soon be sent off to defend the country. Mihipeka Edwards recalled that Ngāti Pōneke members accommodated Māori soldiers who were often straight out of the rural areas of New Zealand, and as a result, they were clumsy on the dance floor. ‘We’d host the Māori soldiers weekly at Saturday-night dances’, she explained:

We had to dance with these boys, they had no one else here. Most of them came from rural areas and were very young. But us townie girls, we’d get hōhā with them. A lot couldn’t dance. They’d tread on my feet with their big army boots – and laugh if I yelped, the ratbags! My one and only proper evening dress – which took me a whole year to pay for, a few shillings a fortnight – one of them trod on the hem. I never wore that dress to those dances again. I had it mended and put away.

Even when it became too much at times I didn’t really complain. Kingi pointed out clearly that our first priority was to entertain the boys because they were

going overseas to fight and possibly spill their blood for us. We did respect and
honour them for that. If these volunteer Māori boys were maybe sacrificing
their lives, what was a trodden foot?\textsuperscript{37}

For the young Māori women involved in the Club, having soldiers come visit also
meant opportunities to develop social and often romantic relationships. At the Club,
the dances were often accompanied by meals for the soldiers, which were
complimentary (unless they brought along a girlfriend).\textsuperscript{38} ‘You know, our life in Ngāti
Pōneke was all a go during those war years’, Laura Taepa remembered, ‘there were
days when we’d do everything that we could to make sure that [the soldiers] were
well cared for before they went away overseas.’ Laura Taepa was only a teenager
attending the Wellington Technical College during the war, but because of her work
with Ngāti Pōneke and the arrival of American troops, she too experienced social
interactions with soldiers.\textsuperscript{39}

Ngāti Pōneke began performing for and meeting with American troops from the
middle of 1942. Around 100,000 troops were stationed across the New Zealand over
the two years of the American ‘invasion’, mostly in Auckland or Wellington. In the
Wellington region, beds were provided for a maximum of 21,700 soldiers, and they
were accommodated in camps near Paekakariki on the Kapiti Coast, Pauatahanui
north of Porirua, the Hutt Valley Racecourse, Kaiwharawhara Park and several other
small settlements around the region.\textsuperscript{40}

For the young soldiers, interactions with young Māori women were a distraction from
the ‘monotony’ of military life. For both American and New Zealand troops, military
life was dreary and the opportunity to get out of camp and mix with the locals was a
welcome chance to get away from the dull routines. While posted in Auckland, Pirimi
Tahiwi wrote to his brother in Ōtaki that ‘[a]s you will notice I am spending the
weekend in the city’….‘Since the new men came into camp the staff has had a most

\textsuperscript{37} Mihipeka Edwards in Grace et.al., \textit{The Silent Migration}, p. 209.
\textsuperscript{38} Meri Mataira in Grace et.al., \textit{The Silent Migration}, p. 208.
\textsuperscript{39} Laura Taepa, interview, Waiwhetū, Wellington, 9 December 2009.
\textsuperscript{40} Nancy M. Taylor, \textit{The New Zealand People at War: The Home Front}, Vol. One (Wellington, 1986),
pp. 623, 633.
hectic time. So [I] was glad to get out even for a few hours, a welcome change from the monotonous military routine. The chance to visit the city and be away from the difficult job of preparing soldiers for war was an appreciated event, even if it was for a limited time. This attitude extended to the Americans stationed in New Zealand. It was even observed by a young Pākehā woman living in Wellington during the war. Even though the American presence caused her to reflect that ‘the town seemed not to belong to us anymore’, she detected that some American soldiers seemed depressed while in New Zealand. One consolation was that American troops felt very welcomed by New Zealanders because, as American naval officer Frank Henderson interpreted while in Wellington, they ‘warmed the seats’ of New Zealand sons, brothers and fathers on service overseas.

In the city, New Zealand men, both Māori and Pākehā, soon found themselves unfavourably compared to the affluent and glamorous foreigners. This was because young New Zealand women found that relationships with American soldiers offered access to modern, feminine conveniences (like stockings) and experiences (like dancing) that were restricted or limited by wartime conditions. Mihipeka Edwards was one such young woman who became enamoured by what the American troops had to offer, and she remembered the arrival of American troops as an ‘invasion’ of glamorous distractions. The New Zealand soldiers were on comparatively limited incomes and the U.S. troops were not shy in displaying their good incomes and the favourable exchange rates. They offered gifts, dancing and experiences to adventurous

---

41 Pirimi Tahiwi, Letter to ‘My Dear Tati’, Auckland, 5 October 1941, original in possession of Jean Albert, Ōtaki, p. 2.
young New Zealand women.\textsuperscript{46} ‘Oh, I had never had such fun in all my life’, Mihipeka remembered,

Sometimes we just sat and watched them dance – they were spectacular to watch and they knew they were good. They were real show-offs, especially the younger ones, but they were so courteous and kind to us girls. They’d give us candy, cigarettes and heaps of chewing gum.

So we girls were moving in a fast lane with the Yanks here. Our own boys were jealous as the Yanks took their place in our social life. Yes, they had an excellence all their own: they were charming, good-mannered, kind, generous and courteous, free with money. And they had blatant and honest sexual appetites. Oh boy, you had to hang on tight to your britches!\textsuperscript{47}

Encounters with American troops were sought out by the young women. Laura Taepa remembered that ‘[t]hey were polite, they appreciated what we were doing for them and I think there was, might have been two of our girls married Americans.’\textsuperscript{48} Club member Witarina Harris sometimes hosted young Māori women and troops in her home, but the reputation of the American soldiers meant she had to defend her choice to host such gatherings. Club leader Kingi Tahiwi was wary about the gatherings, especially because Club leaders did not allow consumption of alcohol to take place under their supervision. For example, when drunken soldiers came to the Ngāti Pōneke dances, Fred Katene was known for confiscating any alcohol. In promoting the Ngāti Pōneke weekly dances, one advertisement even clearly stated ‘intoxicating liquor strictly prohibited’.\textsuperscript{49} As Mihipeka Edwards remembered, ‘[o]f course, we girls were not allowed to do as we liked – too much chaperoning took place. The old people, the kaumātua, kept everyone under control.’\textsuperscript{50} For Witarina Harris, this was a good thing. ‘[I]f Ngāti Pōneke hadn’t been there, I’m telling you this honestly, I would have really become involved in all the excitement of the time. I would have got involved with the American soldiers and that sort of thing, and I’d have

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
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\item[49] \textit{Ibid.}; and \textit{The Evening Post}, Vol. CXXXVII, Issue 78, 1 April 1944, p. 4.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
got lost, if you know what I mean.’ By inviting Tahiwi to the parties, Witarina Harris was able to abate his concerns and prove that the young women were conducting themselves well.

However, although during this time Māori urban populations remained relatively small, their increasing numbers contributed to, as Bronwyn Labrum has argued, an increasing perception amongst Pākehā that Māori were ‘a problematic population’. One result of this increasing perception was that urban Māori continued to encounter racist attitudes from Pākehā. One instance was that of founding Club member Vera Morgan, whose treatment by her non-Māori extended family in Wellington because of her Māori descent made her determined to demonstrate her capabilities. Supported by a couple of family members and a ‘lovely’ employer, she left that living situation.

[M]y uncle said, ‘Vera’s got a job housekeeping in Kelburn.’ My grandmother turned around and she said, ‘They won’t keep a dark face for long, they don’t have them there’.... I couldn’t get out of there quick enough. The quicker the better. When I got up to Kelburn I was so happy, and relieved, to be out of that place. I worked there a good twelve months.

With more Māori in the city, Pākehā like Vera Morgan’s grandmother continued to discuss the ‘Māori Problem’, which was similar to how it was perceived prior to the war: that is, that Māori would have difficulty adjusting to urban and modern lifestyles. In 1940, when Horace Belshaw had predicted the economic necessity of Māori urban migrations, he also concluded that in moving, Māori urban migrants ‘will be strangers in strange cities forced into adjustment while divorced from the moral and material support of their communities.’ ‘Until the full implications of this are understood’, he reflected, ‘there is no solution to the Maori problem.’ In 1943, Wellington-based public servant and economics student Ronald Lindley Meek also warned that in

51 Witarina Harris in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, p. 177.
52 Witarina Harris in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, pp. 199-201.
54 Vera Morgan, in Grace et. al., The Silent Migration, pp. 49-50.
55 H. Belshaw, ‘Maori Economic Circumstances’ in Sutherland, The Maori Today, p. 198; see also discussion in Melissa Matutina Williams, ‘‘Back-home’ and Home in the City’, p. 73.
urbanising, Māori would become a detribalised ‘proletariat of the cities’. Although land development schemes provided an excellent system through which Māori could develop the land still in Māori ownership, he warned that ‘it must not be thought that the successful execution of these schemes will solve the problem of the Maori people to-day.’

And while for many Māori the war presented a chance to demonstrate their worthiness of being treated as equals, this remained a difficult battle. Tensions were common amongst troops in cities, and it is little wonder that conflict eventually broke out, especially as American troops brought with them their own assumptions about ‘coloured’ races. In addition to feeling the burden of the dreariness of military life, these American troops entered into a social environment in urban areas in New Zealand that was still being negotiated between Māori and Pākehā. Although some American troops met with Māori through the Ngāti Pōneke dances and dinners, tensions between New Zealand and American soldiers resulted in at least two ‘riots’ in Wellington; the first was in Manners Street in 1943, and the second in Cuba Street in 1945.

Reports of the time focussed on racial tensions and social competition between troops. Although outbreaks of fighting between New Zealand and U.S. troops occurred at a number of places in New Zealand, these ‘battles’ were often not reported in newspapers because of censorship regulations and a desire by authorities to maintain a public belief in good relationships between the troops. The reports that did appear euphemistically explained that ‘a little bit of jealousy between [New Zealand] men and overseas servicemen’ was a source of disturbances. The competition between New Zealand and American troops in the second of the two large brawls in Wellington, the ‘battle of Cuba Street’ in 1945, was particularly attributed to racial tensions. A New Zealand

Zealand Army report identified that the riot began when an American soldier was accused of stealing a Māori soldier’s hat, but it was also a result of a ‘deep resentment’ amongst Māori soldiers towards the American soldiers. This resentment was based on the behaviours of some American troops, and that ‘U.S. personnel [did] not appreciate the standing that the Maori has in our community, and [were] inclined to treat him as they treat the American negro.’

In reporting this, the New Zealand Army was confident that New Zealand citizens were above other countries in their treatment of their minority ethnicity. This confidence was based on a widespread belief reaching back to the beginning of the twentieth century and reinforced during the centennial celebrations, that New Zealand had the best race relations in the world, despite the insistence by many Māori to the contrary. As Āpirana Ngata famously asked in 1943, ‘[h]ave the civilians of New Zealand, men and women, fully realised the implications of the joint participation of Pakeha and Maori in this last and greatest demonstration of the highest citizenship?’

But although Pākehā pointed to the growth of Māori populations as evidence of their modernisation and betterment, increasing urbanisations were simultaneously increasing Pākehā concerns about ‘Māori problems’. In 1939 the Governor General had proclaimed that ‘[t]he fact that within the last ten or twelve years the Maori population has increased by over 28 per cent indicates that they have now definitely adapted themselves to present-day conditions of life.’ In stating this, he illustrated that largely, Pākehā felt comfortable there were excellent race relations in New Zealand, something that was assisted by limited interactions between Māori and Pākehā to that point. But through the war, increasing numbers of Māori in urban areas were altering this comfort. In 1943, a member of the public even proposed an extreme way to curb the increasing Māori populations. Although he was reportedly not ‘taken seriously’, he suggested to a County Council of the Bay of Plenty that because Māori
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populations were increasing, they should implement a payment scheme for Māori and Pākehā who were facilitating the absorption of Māori into the Pākehā race.63

As the war continued, more moderate commentators saw increased Māori employment in urban-located, unskilled work as realising Ronald Lindley Meek’s concerns about the growth of a detribalised Māori underclass. Henry Charles McQueen’s 1945 book, *Vocations for Maori Youth*, identified that the many ‘separate though interrelated problems’ of Māori were due to their high proportion of youthful populations, limited educational achievement, poor health and housing standards, infrequent interactions with Pākehā, reduced land resources, inadequate administration by authorities, and unrealised vocational achievement.64 Although he insisted that urban, Pākehā ‘dominated or styled’ lifestyles, should be founded on competence not ‘pakeha ideas alone’, like other authors before and after him, the solution to the Māori Problem required adjustment to modern (Pākehā) lifestyles.65

The Ngāti Pōneke community, however, continued to demonstrate that there was another solution to urban adjustment, namely urban whānau. During the war, Ngāti Pōneke whānaungatanga was forged and reinforced through the manaakitanga they encouraged and exhibited. This community-mindfulness was an important factor in their shared identities, not only as Māori – and they undertook many services in which they were presented as representatives for the entire race – but as Ngāti Pōneke, an urban whānau. Club members knew that their pan-iwi inclusiveness meant they were in a great position to accommodate the needs of the ‘new’ urban-dwelling Māori. While this meant the promotion of Māori social and cultural forms for Club members, the Club became a symbol of integration for the state.

64 H.C. McQueen, *Vocations for Maori Youth* (Wellington, 1945), pp. 1-2, 7.
Ngāti Pōneke and the State

The manaakitanga exhibited by the Ngāti Pōneke community drew on a model of whānau. This was viewed positively by the wider community in Wellington, including state officials, because of the potential of such relationships to assist young Māori in adjusting to living in the city. This section describes how this idea was used by leaders of Ngāti Pōneke to encourage young urban Māori to be the best urban-residing Māori they could be, as well as to emphasise the importance of learning and maintaining their Māoritanga.

Although still newly established during World War Two, the membership of the Club and its community included intergenerational relationships, which helped young Māori adjust to living at distances from their whānau. Founding member Vera Morgan remembered that ‘I wasn’t frightened by the Pākehā world, but I was lost in it’. This feeling lasted until she was invited to join the Ngāti Pōneke community. She recalled that:

I was isolated from my whānau, not knowing anybody, and it was really music for me to go. It was like a home away from home for me, being with my own people. With your own people you feel happy because there’s a whānau. I felt very, very happy to find a whānau. I’m not a good singer, and really action songs and things like that are not altogether my thing. I can do them, but I’m not an expert. I get hōhā. So I just went there for the whānau, for the fellowship and the family. That’s what I got out of it.66

Even though she was not an enthusiastic performer, which had been a major part of the Club’s identity and function up to that point, Vera Morgan found in Ngāti Pōneke a home and an urban whānau. For young people like Vera, this emphasis on whānau and shared Māoritanga was hugely desired; and it was demonstrated through the way that Club leaders were referred to and respected as ‘elders’ of the urban whānau. ‘The older people were there to awhi the younger ones’ Witarina Harris remembered, ‘and

66 Vera Morgan, in Grace et. al., The Silent Migration, p. 85.
it was through their manaakitanga that the young people got stronger.\(^{67}\) This included supervision over behaviours and standards of dress, which some of the young Māori Club members found challenging. Kingi Tahiwi, for example, emphasised to the young members that they should prove their equality among the Pākehā urban majority, and the young Club members were keen to live up to such high standards.\(^{68}\) ‘I know everyone was rather terrified of [Kingi] but they all loved him just the same’, Club member Paul Potiki remembered. ‘He was an authoritarian, but then he could be soft as butter too.’\(^{69}\) In fact, only one person was known to be able to stand up to Tahiwi’s strict discipline and that was an authoritative ‘kuia’ of the club, Pirihi Heketa.\(^{70}\)

This strictness was intimidating to some, but the Māoritanga and performance aspects of the Club were attractive. In the Club, members were able to learn and refine their knowledge of Māori culture, and also the cultures of their various iwi. ‘I think one of the main reasons for keeping going to Ngāti Pōneke was that it suited us all’, remembered Paul Potiki. ‘We were all, very nearly all, indifferent at the language. But we were all Māori at heart, and had to learn the conventions and protocol of the marae and of our various iwi. It was a chance to sort-of try ourselves out. It enabled us to be Māori once a week. And then we all became very, very good and close friends.’\(^{71}\)

And being ‘Māori once a week’ was an opportunity to strengthen their skills in performance. After participating in the National Centennial Exhibition, the Club was sponsored to attend the centennial celebrations in Akaroa. Rira Utiku remembered that the pan-iwi Club stood out from other Māori groups because of their urban influences, but their ability in kapa haka shone through. She stated that ‘I suppose they called us ‘city slickers’ or something. There were very few at Ngāti Pōneke that spoke Māori, and we were made to feel a wee bit different. But we were entertainers,
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\(^{70}\) ‘Historical Foundations of Maori Youth Clubs, a) Ngati Poneke’, in Yvonne Poole, ‘Maori Youth Groups’; Witarina Harris in Grace et.al, The Silent Migration, p. 97.
\(^{71}\) Emphasis in source. Paul Potiki in Grace et.al, The Silent Migration, p. 225.
I would say. And we were good, and that is all there was all there was to it.' The pan-iwi organisation of the Club, and the varied abilities of Club members, thus had some drawbacks in relationships with other groups, but these were negligible. In the urban environment dominated by Pākehā, Club members continued attending because of friendships made and the frequent chances to ‘be Māori’ in the city.

The inclusive environment within Ngāti Pōneke and the positive reputation built by members during the war assisted in convincing the government in 1944 to facilitate the procurement of a fixed location for Club operations. It helped that from the time it was established, the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club had emphasised the retention of Māoritanga as a part of ongoing good race relations between Māori and Pākehā. On this positive note, they directly benefitted from changing attitudes about Māori. As Michael King wrote, the organised Māori efforts for the war through the armed services and tribal committees contributed to an increased Māori self-confidence. They also contributed to some increased Pākehā confidence and respect for Māori which was largely expressed as gratitude for the courage of Māori servicemen. The government in particular openly recognised the value that Māori had added to the New Zealand war effort, both overseas and on the home front. At a meeting in 1944 to discuss Māori Welfare, Prime Minister Peter Fraser told the gathered iwi and religious groups that he believed that Māori and non-Māori would benefit from continuing to work together as they had done during the war. Although he was balancing the perspectives of politicians, leaders and Māori War Effort Organisation representatives as they decided the future of the organisation into the peacetime, he emphasised that the future was bright for the state and Māori. ‘Pakeha and Maori are gathered in the canoe to-day, shoulder to shoulder in peace or war,’ he stated.

72 Riria Utiku in Grace et.al, The Silent Migration, p. 168.
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'Our friendship is based on future democratic progress cemented by the blood of our boys in the war fields.'

Ngāti Pōneke capitalized on Pākehā appreciation for the Māori war effort. Following the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister, the Ngāti Pōneke community agreed that the war was a time when their manaakitanga for all people in the city of Wellington – both Māori and Pākehā – confirmed the importance of their ongoing role as a Wellington organisation. They had been seeking a permanent location for their operations since 1941, and when the American troops ‘retreated’ from Wellington in early 1944, it was an opportunity for the Club to step forward and formalise their presence in the city. The Hotel Cecil Hall, also known as the American Red Cross rooms, was a space that American troops had used for recreation during their stay in Wellington. When it became available, Club members decided to campaign officials for their use of the site. Unofficial communication networks were used to lobby this idea: according to Laura Taepa, the Prime Minister’s wife had suggested to her sister that since the hall was becoming available, Ngāti Pōneke should declare their interest in the site. Laura Taepa’s sister, who was working for Eruera Tirikatene at the time, approached the Prime Minister with Tirikatene and made a formal request for the rooms. They were successful in getting agreement from the Prime Minister that processes could be initiated to seek Cabinet consent to Ngāti Pōneke using the hall. Behind the scenes, officials seemed to recognise that the Club’s use of the hall, so close to the centre of government, would be beneficial for state-Māori relationships. At that time, government officials were becoming more aware of the increasing numbers of Māori in the city. This meant that when Club members approached officials about their use of the hall, officials decided that the hall, as a stop-in point for urban migrating Māori, would meet an important need. As the Ngāti Pōneke Club had had no permanent location for operations up to that date, the report suggested that placing the Club’s activities at the hall would provide a central location for ‘useful

78 Nancy M. Taylor, The New Zealand People at War, p. 661.
social activities for those of the Race whose homes are in Wellington and... a means of encouraging Maori culture in all its various forms.\textsuperscript{80} The Club’s aim to ‘recapture and retain an atmosphere in which the best of Maori culture, art, custom, and language is preserved, while accepting a thorough understanding of the social and industrial life of the Pākehā’ also appealed to officials.\textsuperscript{81}

However, the state misunderstood the Club’s objectives in creating a ‘home’ for Māori in the city. For the leaders of Ngāti Pōneke, encouragement for Māori in the city to ‘be the best Māori they can be’ was not a message of physical and cultural assimilation. Instead, it was a message that encouraged Māori to adapt to city living whilst withstanding cultural absorption. When Cabinet agreed to lease the hall to Ngāti Pōneke in April 1944, they emphasised that the lease was a temporary arrangement in acknowledgement of the contributions of Ngāti Pōneke members to the war effort. The lease was, therefore, for a fixed term of 20 years only, and responsibility for the hall was put in the hands of the ‘Ngati Poneke Society’, a committee including Eruera Tirikatene, Michael Rotohiko (Mick) Jones, Kingi Tahiwi and Fred Katene.\textsuperscript{82} However, Club members saw the gesture as meaning more than some temporary arrangement. They saw that their use of the hall and their location in the central city area on a pepper-corn rental was recognition of their important and ongoing role for Māori in the city.

After gaining access to the hall, government official and Club member Mick Jones advised officials that the new location of Ngāti Pōneke would be beneficial for Māori living in and moving to Wellington. It would be a site dedicated to Māori in the city unlike any before it, and the Ngāti Pōneke Hall would be more than just recognition of their work during the war; it would be a symbol of the Māori community in the city. Jones wrote:

\textsuperscript{80} Untitled notes, undated, in Papers relating to the Ngati Poneke Maori Club, Wellington, [n.d.], MA 31/21/55, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{81} ‘Ngati-Poneke Association’, \textit{The Evening Post}, Vol. CXXXII, Issue 133, 2 December 1941, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{82} ‘Minister of Works Accommodation Board’, in Papers relating to the Ngati Poneke Maori Club, Wellington, [n.d.], MA 31/21/55, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
This hall is the first of its kind in the Capital city and we are hoping to set an example not only for our Maori people but also to show the pakeha that we can look after a hall as well, if not better than any pakeha organisation. We have already gone to a lot of trouble and expense in beautifying the hall, and last week our old man Sir Apirana was in Wellington and he was so pleased with the hall that he has promised us the necessary carvings and the tukutuku work for the stage.  

After adding a kitchen, bathrooms, a stage and dressing rooms to the hall, it was officially opened in September 1944 in an event attended by Prime Minister Peter Fraser, who was welcomed onto the site by Kingi Tahiwi and Lady Pomare. At the opening, Kingi Tahiwi stated that ‘[t]he object of Ngati-Poneke was not just dancing Maori dances and singing Maori songs’, but that ‘[i]t set out to make the best Maori there was, for the good of New Zealand.’ This included the ability for young Māori to move between the worlds of Māori and Pākehā: Tahiwi believed that while Māori happiness could be achieved through the preservation of their culture, understanding and living like Pākehā in the city was beneficial to their material wellbeing. As a result, Tahiwi stated that by receiving use of the hall, Ngāti Pōneke ‘aimed to retain the best of Maori culture and to bring the Maori and pakeha closer together.’

The opening celebrations included a dinner and dance, and speeches were made by the Prime Minister and Lady Pomare. After Tahiwi thanked Peter Fraser for his role in handing over the hall, the Prime Minister replied and described that ‘[i]n years to come it was hoped that the area round about would become a great Government centre’. He imagined that that the Government centre would include a memorial dedicated to all Māori for their services during the Second World War because ‘what
the Ngati-Poneke members had done in Wellington was typical of the whole Maori war effort throughout the Dominion. When Lady Pomare responded, she made it clear that despite the temporary lease, Ngāti Pōneke were committed to a permanent relationship between the Club and the city of Wellington. For Lady Pomare, who was President of the Ngāti Pōneke Association at that time, the hall was ‘a dream come true’ for Ngāti Pōneke, ‘for at last the association had its own home’. ‘We now have no fear’, she explained ‘about a fitting place in which to welcome our brave boys when they return’.

Figure 11. Kingi Tahiwi was the first president of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club and was a leader of the Club until he passed away in 1948. This photo was taken in about 1940. Kingi Te Ahoaho Tahiwi, 1/2-C-025176-F, ATL, Wellington.

In the years following the war, the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club continued to attract urban-located Māori members, and the Ngāti Pōneke tribal committee was
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transferred into the new system of official committees established under the Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945. For many Māori, the integration of the tribal committee system under the authority of the state through the newly restructured Department of Native Affairs was a loss in the Māori struggle for autonomy. Since Paikea had died in April 1943, this system was developed by Eruera Tirikatene and the resulting structures were, historians agree, at the very least a compromise and at the most, ‘a victory for the old bureaucracy’.  

Although the Māori War Effort Organisation had given Māori a taste of leadership pregnant with political possibility, the 1945 Act ate away at those opportunities by establishing a system in which committees would, among other activities, assist in the integration (or assimilation) of Māori into urban (or Pākehā) lifestyles. By easing the processes of Māori urbanisation and integration, the long term goal was that one day, the official committees and the Department of Native Affairs would no longer be needed.

But in practice, these official committees were more than just another extension of the strength of the state. They combined the voluntary, wartime committees that retained hapū and iwi objectives, into a system of the ‘lowest level of a bureaucratic hierarchy’ of the Department of Native Affairs. For Ngāti Pōneke, the Department of Native Affairs was located just down the street in central Wellington, and they were able to maintain close connections with officials and with members of the wider Māori community. Although one author probably exaggerated in 1954 when he wrote that the system of committees under the 1945 Act ‘has satisfied in part the great need of the Maori people for self-expression and self-determination’, the committees did enable Māori to take advantage of certain benefits. As Richard Hill has argued, groups like Ngāti Pōneke used official systems to express their ongoing desires for rangatiratanga, especially in an urban context: Māori operated both with and without
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the state towards aspirations defined by their own desires.\(^96\) A Ngāti Pōneke objective that remained distinct from the state was their use of Māori cultural forms and whānau-styled interactions to help young Māori learn and retain te reo Māori and tikanga, as well as adjust to living in the city.\(^97\) Through the pepper-corn lease of the Club hall, Māori had access to a ‘home’ for Māori in the city, but more than that, they had access to an urban whānau.

Figure 12. Ripeka Love (centre), a kaumātua of the tangata whenua in Wellington. She is pictured at the welcome for Māori soldiers in 1946. ‘Group attending the welcome for the returning Maori Battalion, after World War II’, in Pascoe, John Dobree, 1908-1972: Photographic albums, prints and negatives, 1/4-001647-F, ATL, Wellington.

When news reached New Zealand that the Māori Battalion was returning to Wellington in January 1946, the mana whenua iwi in Wellington and Ngāti Pōneke came together to organise a suitable welcome for the soldiers. Ripeka Love had hoped that Te Ropu o Te Whanganui ā Tara would take the lead in organising the welcome

\(^{96}\) Ibid., p. 13; Richard S. Hill, *Maori and the State*, p. 69.  
for the returned soldiers, but this did not eventuate. ‘We had asked for the Welcome home of the returned boys at our Hall “Te Tatau-O-te-Po”, but it was more convenient in Wellington’, she recalled, ‘and the welcome was arranged by the Ngati Poneke Maori Association with the help of Ngati Toa, Ngati Raukaiwa[sic], Te Atiawa and other tribes living in Wellington and Lower Hutt who all helped in providing for their welcome home.’ Lady Pomare had also hoped to host the returning soldiers at the Ngāti Pōneke hall, but this was also passed over in favour of a ‘makeshift marae of Tūmatauenga’ of the Wellington waterfront. This makeshift marae, being an open space on the wharves next to where ships berthed, allowed mana whenua iwi and Ngāti Pōneke to welcome, perform and provide food for the returning soldiers. It also allowed the pan-iwi Club to, once again, appear alongside iwi groups as an important part of the Wellington Māori community.

At the end of the war, Ngāti Pōneke was in a place to accommodate the needs of increasing Māori populations in the city, populations who had heard about the things the city could offer, including employment and social opportunities. However, with increasing numbers of Māori in urban areas interacting with Pākehā and other iwi, discussions on how Māori would be assisted in adjusting to living in towns and cities continued. As a Māori religious leader explained, ‘in the towns [Māori] are subject to all kinds of temptation, and the girls in particular are game for any hunter that happens to come along.’ One Pākehā politician even argued that ‘the drift of the Maoris to the towns was something that all deplored, and steps must be taken to rehabilitate them in the country areas, where the Maori rightly belonged, and where he was happiest.’ As the following chapters show, these urban migrations were happening faster than ever, and the scale at which they were occurring would be more
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significant than many ever expected. The discussions on how Māori might be successfully integrated into modern (Pākehā) lifestyles that emerged in reaction to these urbanisations were also a way that concerns about ‘Māori Problems’ were addressed.
Chapter Six: **Mass Māori Urban Migrations and the ‘Māori Problem’**

The scale, breadth and permanency of Māori as a majority urban-located population took some time to become clear to the state through the 1950s, and as a result, official state systems engaged awkwardly with Māori urbanisations. After the war, the state sought to extend their relationships with Māori into the peacetime in ways that confirmed state control. When addressing Māori from his position of Minister of Finance in 1945, Walter Nash stated that Māori ‘have been magnificent, both on the field of battle and on the home front’, and now ‘[c]o-operation was sought between pakeha and Maori now to face the problems of peace’.¹ But, these ‘problems of the peace’ were not always clear. Despite a significant number of urban migrations occurring between 1945 and 1961, it was not until 1961 that the state published a definitive policy for Māori and Māori urbanisation. This policy was described in the widely discussed Report on Department of Māori Affairs, which became more popularly known as *The Hunn Report*.²

This chapter discusses Māori urban migrations that occurred from 1945 and prior to *The Hunn Report*, released in 1961. In this period, urban migrations of Māori individuals and whānau were increasing because of personal relationships, desires to earn more money and live in places known for being busy and fun. These movements were also influenced upon by demographic factors shared by Māori populations around the country. Even though small but growing urbanisation trends had been apparent prior to the war, in the 1950s and 1960s these trends were confirmed. A still
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rapidly growing Māori population and growing economic opportunity in towns and cities meant that Māori were moving into towns and cities in search of what Joan Metge identified as the ‘big three’ reasons – work, money and pleasure.³

To understand these reasons for urbanisations after the war, it is helpful to consider the ways in which migrations into towns and cities were part of wider population trends. However, it is also useful to contrast this knowledge with how urbanisations were experienced by Māori. This chapter, therefore, also focuses on attitudes towards urbanisations, integration and the ‘Māori Problem’ that were backgrounds to The Hunn Report as ‘the single most important mid-twentieth-century document on Maori relations with the New Zealand state’.⁴ In his report, Hunn declared that ‘urbanisation of the Maori is obviously accelerating’ and the urbanisation of Māori was an ‘inevitability’.⁵ As already alluded to in previous chapters, however, Hunn was reaching a conclusion already clear to Māori communities in areas such as Wellington and the Hutt Valley. For those Māori communities, Māori urban migrations were a reality well before they were officially announced as such.

Thus although Māori moved into towns and cities because they desired participation in modern (and Pākehā) urban lifestyles, particularly in employment and enjoyment, this chapter shows that Māori in the city were decidedly ‘non-integrative’ because they intended to maintain their Māori, iwi and hapū identities. During the 1950s, Māori were moving into cities as a result of personal connections, and the rates in which they were moving came to the attention of the public and the state. Considerations of ‘Māori Problems’ continued, especially as Māori increased in their interactions with urban Pākehā. Urban-located Māori in Wellington, including Taranaki Whānui and the Ngāti Pōneke community, sought to address the needs of the growing Māori urban populations.

³ Metge, A New Maori Migration, pp. 128, 145-145.
⁴ Quote is from Aroha Harris, ‘Dancing with the State’, p. 115.
⁵ The Hunn Report, pp. 14, 19.
Urban Migration after the War

After the war, Māori continued to exhibit demographic features that made them a distinct population in New Zealand. Most prominently, consistently high fertility rates and improved standards in health meant strong population growth. Although Pākehā experienced a population ‘baby boom’ after World War Two, population increases for Māori were high during the first half of the twentieth century and remained high compared to Pākehā after 1945. A consequence of these high rates of natural increase was that the Māori population was a youthful one. In 1956, for example, 47 percent of the Māori population was under fifteen years old, and by 1966, this figure was 51 percent. James Belich has called this swell in Māori populations the ‘Revenge of the Cradle’, and it was consistent with Māori whānau in the Wellington area. In the early 1940s, two medical students observed that in Māori families in Ōtaki, eight or a dozen children in a family were not uncommon.

With strong population growth, Māori increasingly sought new residences. In 1945, the proportion of Māori residing in urban areas was just under 26 percent, which rose to just over 46 percent in 1961. Although the rate of these movements subsided somewhat between the censuses of 1945 and 1951, the increase in urban Māori populations that were taking place was gaining in size and momentum by 1956 (Table 3). This ‘snowballing’ of urban settlements was not only due to migrations, but it was the product of there being more Māori in urban areas, and thus more children born there. In fact, urban births and migrations became so dominant leading up to 1961
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7 ‘Table 7.10’ in Pool, Te Iwi Māori, p. 152.
that the census that year recorded rural Māori populations as decreasing in size. Not only were urban residencies so common that rural Maori populations were decreasing, decreasing rural Māori fertility rate meant that Māori in rural areas were not being immediately replaced (Figure 13). Although the overall Māori crude fertility rate remained high through the 1950s and 1960s, and despite the urban Māori general fertility rate increasing from 132 in 1956 to 180 in 1961, the rural Māori generally fertility rate dropped from 245 to 233 in the same period.\(^{10}\)

![Distribution of Māori Residency, Rural and Urban, 1926-1971](#)


Thus Māori urban migrations (and births) were constantly taking place after the war, increasing especially after 1951. As Table 3 shows, the highest rates of change were in the decade between 1956 and 1966, leading to the urban Māori population being recorded as a majority of the Māori population for the first time in 1966 at just under 62 percent.\(^{11}\) These increases in Māori urban populations were visible in the Wellington area. In the five-year period between 1961 and 1966, the Māori
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populations of the urban areas of Wellington and the Hutt Valley increased 1.7 times from 5,921 to 10,500.12

Table 3. Increases in Māori urban populations between censuses, as a percentage of the entire Māori population, 1936 – 1971. The annualised growth rate indicates the percentage change per number of years between censuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census periods</th>
<th>Percentage change</th>
<th>Annualised growth rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936 - 1945</td>
<td>+8.47</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 - 1951</td>
<td>+3.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 - 1956</td>
<td>+5.65</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 - 1961</td>
<td>+11.45</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 - 1966</td>
<td>+15.14</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1971</td>
<td>+9.12</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Māori moved when they urbanised also reveals the factors that influenced Māori in making their decisions to move, including economic and Māori-specific factors. Auckland, for example, became home to the largest urban Māori population in the twentieth century. In 1936, it was home to just over a tenth of the total urban Māori population (12.4 percent), but from 1951 to 1971 it became a home for at least a quarter of all urban Māori across the country.13 Part of the explanation for Auckland being the dominant location for urban Māori was because more than any of the other three main cities in New Zealand, its catchment area encompassed a high number of iwi with relatively high populations. Another reason for its dominance was its size and

the amount of employment and other opportunities it offered. Its economic attractiveness meant that at one level, Māori urban migrations were similar to the distribution of the Pākehā urban population. Wealth and industry became concentrated in the main urban centres according to a north to south trend during the late nineteenth century, and this was further emphasised during the twentieth century. Pākehā, and then Māori, moved into these main urban centres because of increased opportunities in the more highly populated areas. After the war, Auckland had the highest urban population, followed by Wellington and the Hutt Valley, then Christchurch, then Dunedin. Similar to earlier Pākehā urban migrations, Māori urban populations in the main urban centres also increased in that order during the twentieth century.

These concentrations of Māori (and non-Māori) populations in the big cities of New Zealand in the post-War decades also directly correlated with a focus on the developing urban economies. With an increase in consumer culture and a political emphasis upon material wellbeing, the post-war economy underwent a ‘slow boom’ with unemployment at record lows and manufacturing at record highs. This created jobs and employment opportunities, which were plentiful in Wellington and the Hutt Valley. In 1956, the Wellington and Lower Hutt areas, similar to Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin, had larger manufacturing sectors than the national average. In the North Island, 64 percent of the total manufacturing was taking place in Auckland or Wellington and the Hutt Valley; and in the South Island, 70 percent was in
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14 Campbell Gibson, ‘Urbanization in New Zealand’, pp. 75-76.
Christchurch and Dunedin. Wellington and Lower Hutt were also unusual in that they contained a concentration of work places orientated towards certain industrial skills. This included motor car assembly and refrigeration. In the Wellington area, work places included Todd Motors, General Motors, Ford Motor Company, the Railway Workshops, the Mills Tobacco Factory, Gear Meat Works and the Petone Woollen mills. As academic Godfrey Linge argued in 1960, such a concentration of factories was at least partially a ploy by industrialists to poach urban-located labourers for their own businesses. This meant that jobs in manufacturing were plentiful and wages were good in Wellington and the Hutt Valley. There, wages in manufacturing for both male and female employees in the mid-1950s were recorded as being above the national average, whereas all other neighbouring employment districts in the North Island had wages lower than the national average.

Even though between 1936 and 1966 Māori were entering the tertiary employment sphere at increased rates (including jobs in retail, domestic and government services), Māori employment was still unique within the total employment population because of the large proportion employed in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. This can be seen in post-war employment trends for Māori that show a direct relationship between the types of work Māori were doing and where they resided, not to mention the economic, social and educational backgrounds of young, urbanising Māori (Figure 14 A-B and 15 A-B). For example, both Māori and non-Māori decreased their participation in primary-sector employment through the twentieth century (including jobs in industries such as agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing), but Māori particularly increased in numbers of males and females employed in manufacturing.
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Between 1936 and 1945, the proportion of Māori workers involved in manufacturing rose from four to 18 percent as a result of wartime manpowering. By 1976 almost 38 percent of the entire Māori workforce worked in manufacturing industries.23

News of such plentiful and well-paid employment opportunities contributed to a chain-migration effect for urban migrations. Young Māori were drawn towards the city and its lifestyles that included the chance to join friends or whānau who had already made the move. Rackie Pahau, for example, chose to move to Wellington after being visited at Christmas time by whānau. Rackie Pahau had just finished high school, and whānau stories about high wages made urban migration an attractive option.

**Rackie:** With me, 1960 I think I finished school. Just hung around home, nothing doing, never had any skills. Then the whānau who had come down to Wellington returned home and said, oh, you know how great it was to be down here, you know, got work, got a nice home, things like that. So, i tera wā, ka whiwhitia au kei te haere mai hoki ki Pōneke. So 1961, on my own, not knowing what was out there, I decided to come with my whānau to Wellington. I didn’t even know what was here.

**Author:** But it sounded good?

**Rackie:** Yeah, because they’d come over, said all these nice things about Wellington, you know, they had money in their pockets, they had a car, all of the things that had tempted, you know, fellas like us in coming down to Wellington to try it out too I suppose.24

Rackie Pahau’s experience showed that while employment was an important consideration in deciding to move, personal relationships were an important influence as well. For him, the lifestyles and employment in the city were attractive prospects, but it was whānau relationships that made him choose the Wellington area. The tendency of Māori to choose to move to urban areas that allowed them to maintain social relationships can be seen in the way that most Māori migrated to cities that

24 Wereta (Rackie) W. Pahau, interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 24 November 2010.
were within a reasonable distance of their home places. This practice is evident in many case studies on twentieth century Māori urban migrations. Joan Metge’s study of a rural Northland community, for example, found this for Māori individuals and whānau who moved between rural towns nearby to their tūrangawaewae home places, but ultimately there was a net migration outwards towards the nearest metropolitan centre, Auckland.\textsuperscript{25} J.R. McCreary also found this fact when he looked at Tūhoe in 1958; and in 1962, Jane Ritchie also described this for urban-migrating individuals and whānau in the Wellington area.\textsuperscript{26} Out of 146 Māori men and women surveyed by Ritchie, over half were from Taranaki, the East Coast, and areas in between.\textsuperscript{27}

In urban migrating, Māori also often moved through smaller urban areas closer to their home places before moving to regional main urban centre, such as Auckland or Wellington and the Hutt Valley. Gisborne was one such a ‘transition’ city that contained a high proportion of Māori within the larger Pākehā urban population, even before World War Two. Wikitoria Paaka and her whānau were one such group of Māori who lived in Gisborne before moving to Wellington. Born in 1934 in Tokomaru Bay, she was whāngai’ed to live in Gisborne when the Tokomaru Bay freezing works was closed in 1941. But in 1952, employment spurred a decision for the whānau to move to the Wellington area. According to Wikitoria Paaka, by residing in a bigger urban area on her way to living in Wellington, she was better prepared her for living in the big city and this included interacting with Pākehā.\textsuperscript{28} In 1951, just prior to when she moved to Wellington, the urban population of Gisborne was approximately 5.6 percent Māori, but in Wellington and the Hutt, the urban Māori population was only approximately 1.1 percent of the total urban population. This reflected not only prior

\textsuperscript{25}Joan Metge, \textit{A New Maori Migration}, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{26}‘Figure II’ in J.R. McCreary, ‘Population Growth and Urbanisation’, in Eric Schwimmer (ed.), \textit{The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties}, p. 195; also see logarithmic map based on J.R. McCreary in Russell Kirkpatrick, ‘From Country to Town, Māori Migration, 1930s to 1970’, in Malcolm McKinnon (ed.), \textit{Bateman Historical Atlas: Ko Papatuanuku e Takoto Nei} (Auckland, 1997), plate 91.
\textsuperscript{28}Wikitoria Paaka, interview, Epuni, Lower Hutt, 15 July, 2009.
Figures 14 A-B. Māori and non-Māori Female Workforce in New Zealand by Industrial Sector, 1936, 1945, 1956 and 1966. For these graphs and those in figure 15A-B, the Primary, Secondary and Tertiary sectors were based on the definitions provided by the 1966 New Zealand Census. Broadly, the Primary sector is employment that deals directly with natural resources, such as mining or agriculture; the Secondary sector is employment that creates products, such as manufacturing; and the Tertiary sector is services. Based on data from Table 263 in Brendan Thompson, ‘Industrial Structure of the Workforce’, *Population of New Zealand*, pp. 114-138.¹

¹ See also Pool, *Te Iwi Maori*, p. 122.
15A. Māori Male Workforce in New Zealand by Industrial Sector

15B. Non-Māori Male Workforce in New Zealand by Industrial Sector

Pākehā urbanisations to large cities like Wellington, but also the decreasing populations of iwi in the southern areas of the North Island (Figure 16).

An exception to the layout of iwi populations influencing the sizes of urban Māori populations was the increases in urban Māori populations in the South Island through the 1950s and 1960s. These increases were, in part, due to state schemes that operated through the late 1950s and beyond. These schemes were designed to match Māori with employment and training opportunities, especially if those Māori lived in areas where such opportunities were scarce.² The state schemes to send Māori away from areas like Gisborne to areas like Christchurch were initially aimed at capitalising on seasonal Māori employment that was already taking place, but the difference was that the schemes aimed to relocate Māori who otherwise may not have chosen to move to the southern areas. The official relocation schemes that began after 1960 included families and young women, and especially resulted in Māori being placed in employment and apprenticeship positions.³ Despite such schemes, though, urban Māori populations in the South Island were still small. Although Invercargill increased its urban Māori population from 0.9 percent of the total urban population in 1961 to 3.0 percent in 1971, by 1971 Christchurch had only reached an urban Māori population of 1.6 percent (Figure 16). Most Māori in the country continued to migrate towards Auckland, and Wellington and the Hutt Valley.

After the war, the increase in the manufacturing industry meant that Māori who moved to the Wellington area found that jobs were plentiful – especially in the Hutt Valley. A medical student who surveyed Wellington Māori in 1954 observed that although the increases in Māori population in the central Wellington areas had been ‘moderate’ between 1945 and 1951, the increases of Māori in the Hutt Valley and other surrounding suburbs was particularly the result of the many new industries created there.⁴ Although in 1945 Māori lived throughout the urban areas of

² Richard Beresford Nightingale, ‘Māori at Work’, pp. 149-150.
³ Megan C. Woods, ‘Integrating the Nation’, pp. 75-76.
Wellington and the Hutt Valley (similar to the distributions of the urban Pākehā population), between 1945 and 1961 there was an increase of Māori in areas outside of the main city. During that period, the urban Māori population of the Wellington area increased from 1,200 to 5,921. In 1951, a large proportion resided in the 'other urban areas' that included still-growing suburbs such as Porirua, and by 1961, most of the urban Māori population was resident outside of the main city. The total urban population had also begun to redistribute to suburban areas, although not to the same extent as Māori populations (Figures 17 and 18). This distribution of residence broadly reflected the locations of employment opportunities in the manufacturing industry, as well as the areas of expanding suburbs with affordable state housing.


---

Long-time friends Heemi Kara, Eruwera (Eddie) Tepurangataua Clark and Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark remembered this when they recalled moving to the Hutt Valley after the war. At that time, employment in manufacturing was so plentiful that a person did not have to wait long when searching for paid work. For Heemi Kara, a background in shearing and scrub cutting in Wairoa, Gisborne and the Hawke’s Bay provided him with skills to maintain his livelihood. But when Heemi Kara met and followed the woman he would marry to live in the city, he did not have concerns about his employment opportunities. Plus, the ease with which he was able to maintain a livelihood in the city meant that he stayed.

**Heemi:** I met a nice young woman. Her mother used to work down in the hospital in Lower Hutt. I don’t know what it was, but the next day she said to me she had gone to join her mother, she had travelled from Hastings. So I thought, one of two things. I could let her go, but instead I went to see my boss on the Monday, take my time up, I’m off. So I followed her down here in 1960 and I’ve been here since. But the moral of the kōrero is the difference in the transition of going to work. Work down here was in abundance; you could go to any factory along here, go in, get the sack, and go to the next one, get a job.

**Huhana:** That’s right, yep.

**Heemi:** There was a lot of work. I worked for General Motors. I worked for the motor industry all my life down here, nearly 30 years. And it was a good life you know.\(^8\)

This story from Heemi Kara, and the fact that many Māori tended to live in urban areas within a close distance of their home places, illustrates how personal relationships ‘offset economic considerations’ for young Māori who chose to move into urban areas.\(^9\) The factors causing Māori to opt to undertake urban migrations were a complex interaction between elements that were broad and specific, wide-

---

\(^8\) Heemi Kara, Eruwera (Eddie) Tepurangataua Clark and Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark, group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010.

reaching and personal. The tendency for Māori to move into the suburban areas of Wellington and the Hutt Valley also meant that the mana whenua iwi and hapū there became cognisant of the growing Māori populations. These urban-located mana whenua Māori felt it was their responsibility to assist the new, mostly young Māori in the city. Marae-building was one way in which those tangata whenua iwi sought to provide services for such young Māori: including both iwi members and urban migrants.

Māori of the City: Tangata Whenua, Ngāti Pōneke and Other Groups

Marae-building was an aspiration for many urban-dwelling Māori during the twentieth century. After the opening of Te Tatau o Te Pō Marae in Lower Hutt in 1933, marae building slowed in the Wellington area as attentions were focused on more pressing matters such as the war. But the desire for more formal marae in the urban area did not subside. Instead, Māori urbanisations provided an impetus for the opening of more culturally appropriate spaces in towns and cities to cater for resident Māori populations. ‘[T]he preservation of the Maori marae is imperative for the defence of that essentially community life which is the genius of Maoridom’ wrote the Rev. J. G. Laughton (also known as Hoani Rotene) in 1954. It ‘must be preserved as a corrective against all the suppressions and impacts of Pakeha life upon the otherwise minded Maori. If Maoritanga is to persist it must have the venue of the marae.’¹⁰

Lacking formal marae, many Māori coming into the city continued to visit, and become regular visitors of, whānau homes in the area. Jean Albert, a descendant of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club founder Kingi Tahiwi, was living in Naenae in the Hutt Valley during the 1950s. She remembered that when young Māori from her home place of

Omaio in the Bay of Plenty came to the city, they would visit her house before getting their own accommodation in the city:

When they arrived in Wellington on the train, their first job was to come out and visit us. It was their duty. The old people would say to them before you go anywhere, go see your aunty and uncle who live at so-and-so, and there’d always be this embarrassing looking at each other at the door, wondering who we’re looking at, next thing you know we’re peeking around to see who was who, and we’d all sulk away there, because guess what? They always managed to arrive at tea time [laughs]. And our limited meals were given out to them and we’d be back on bread and dripping. And we used to think, couldn’t they come at another time of the day? Never quite worked out how they got to Wellington and out to Naenae, but it was their burden and duty. They weren’t to go anywhere unless they turned up there first... Sometimes, two or three of them we never saw again. But it was their job to come down there.¹¹

In homes like Jean Albert’s, the ‘whare Māori’ concept was active. Through manaakitanga, her whānau provided a sense Māori community to young urban-migrating individuals. ‘Whare Māori’ like this continued to enable growing Māori communities to use a variety of methods to provide culturally appropriate spaces for gatherings. In the 1940s, for example, the Taranaki Whānui community of Waiwhetū implemented a system of whare Māori connected to their ancestral lands when they negotiated an unusual deal with the government that went against the common state polices of integration. This deal resulted in the Taranaki Whānui iwi, which included the well-known Puketapu whānau, occupying a group of state houses around the appropriately named Puketapu Drive in Lower Hutt. Although there was not a wharenui there, these whānau were grouped together at Waiwhetū and this allowed for their ahi kā to be maintained. By 1954, this community consisted of 120 people sharing 24 state houses.¹²

But because of the limited number of marae in the area during the early 1950s, iwi still had limited choices of formal marae for community events, housing guests and hosting

¹¹ Jean Albert, interview, Silverstream, Lower Hutt, 22 April, 2009.  
tangi. In 1953, it was reported that ‘[i]t may be a hundred years now since a carved meeting-house was built in the Wellington district, and although the Maori residents are served by the Ngati-Poneke hall and Te Tatau o te Po meeting-house at Petone, it has long been felt that the time has arrived when a fully carved house should be built.’\textsuperscript{13} The iwi at Waiwhetū aimed to fulfil this need by building a formal, ceremonially sufficient and community orientated marae complex amongst the iwi-occupied statehouses of Waiwhetū.\textsuperscript{14}

Building a marae at Waiwhetū required substantial contributions from the state and the local community. In the early 1950s, the Minister of Māori Affairs, Ernest Corbett, and the Member of Parliament for the southern Māori seat, Eruera Tirikatene, negotiated support from Ngāi Tahu to reallocate the carved whare built for the Māori Court at the National Centennial Exhibition to the Waiwhetū community.\textsuperscript{15} In April 1952, these negotiations were completed and president of the Te Aroha Association, Ihiaia Puketapu, appealed to the public for their support in building the marae projected to be the biggest built in the Wellington region up to that date. ‘All I want is the help of my people’, Ihiaia Puketapu said referring to his community at the Te Aroha Association annual meeting, and ‘I know that I will get it, especially from my boys and girls.’\textsuperscript{16} Over the next decade, this support came from a much wider number of Māori and non-Māori sources, including the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club.\textsuperscript{17}

In appealing to the public, the Waiwhetū community made it clear that the wharenui would not only embody the longstanding occupation and interests of the iwi at Waiwhetū, but it would also provide space for the increasing numbers of Māori in the

\textsuperscript{13} ‘Carved Meeting House for Waiwhetu’, \textit{Te Ao Hou}, No. 5, Spring 1953, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{14} As mentioned earlier in this thesis, there may be Taranaki Whānui perspectives that are not reflected in this particular historical account. For more information about the kuia and kaumātua who participated in the research for this thesis, see Appendix 1.
\textsuperscript{15} ‘Carved House For Hutt Valley’, \textit{The Evening Post}, 13 December 1950; ‘Carved Meeting House For Valley Maoris’, \textit{The Evening Post}, 28 April 1952.
\textsuperscript{16} ‘Carved Meeting House For Valley Maoris’.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1951 Māori Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>126,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>44,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petone</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Urban Area</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>16,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hutt</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,292</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Māori Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>131,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>53,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petone</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>9,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Urban Area</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>9,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hutt</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>18,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainuiomata</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,921</strong></td>
<td><strong>249,532</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
city. This was partly because the Waiwhetū community in the 1950s had particularly noticed increasing numbers of urban-residing Māori. As a result of them frequently hosting visitors in their homes, for instance, they had experienced two health scares in which typhoid fever had broken out, first in 1951, and then in 1953.¹ And while Te Aroha Association was established for Hutt Valley Māori, especially the descendants of Te Āti Awa based at Waiwhetū who saw themselves as ‘rural dwellers inside a growing urban area’, the Association expanded during the war to include Māori from other iwi backgrounds. This included Māori soldiers and young Māori women who became residents of the nearby Woburn hostels as a result of manpowering.²

But while the Waiwhetū community emphasised the value of marae complex would have within the wider community, it simultaneously distinguished between itself and pan-iwi organisations. For example, to discuss the ways that the marae would be open to all Māori and all non-Māori, Puketapu drew on a longer history of Taranaki Whānui residency at Te Whanganui ā Tara. In 1958, he told a crowd of Māori and Pākehā that the Waiwhetū marae complex would fulfil an important tradition for Taranaki Whānui iwi, that was based on the example set by their tīpuna, Te Puni, who had told the first settlers at Pitoone in 1840 that ‘this rock is big enough for you and I [to] live on’. To acknowledge that invitation from Te Puni to the settlers, and to acknowledge the more than a century of Māori assisting their Pākehā neighbours including Māori participation in World War Two, the name for the whare was chosen as Arohanui ki Te Tangata or ‘good will to all people’.³ The group in charge of fundraising for the marae was the Waiwhetū-based Māori War Memorial Committee, and they expected that the marae complex would be used for entertaining guests, education and other social, moral, religious, recreational and vocational activities. Although the fundraising committee had made it clear they were focussed on the role the marae would play in promoting ‘mutual knowledge and understanding between the two races,’ they were

³ ‘Example of Racial Amity: Impressive Ceremony At Meeting House’. 190
also building the marae complex in response to the fact that ‘[t]he Maori population of the district is increasing rapidly, and will no doubt continue to do so.’

Although separate and distinct organisations, the Te Aroha Association was supported by the Ngāti Pōneke community, who undertook fundraising concerts to aid the building of the Waiwhetū marae. This support was because of their familiarity. For instance, before the Waiwhetū marae was opened in 1960, Te Aroha Association meetings were held at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall and networks of friends kept the two groups close. But while both organisations were committed to urban Māori, a major difference between the two was the clear tangata whenua connection held by the Te Aroha Association. Following the war, Ngāti Pōneke continued to provide young urban-dwelling Māori with the opportunity to participate in community events in ways that displayed their Māoritanga as well as enabled them opportunities to experience the exciting features of city life. During the war, this had included many chances for performing for, and meeting with, new people, such as American troops that provided young Māori a glimpse into American lifestyles only seen in movies. As Mihipeka Edwards described, ‘[w]e were fascinated as we gazed at those beautiful specimens of manhood, so handsome and beautifully turned out, smartly uniformed and very military in their stance. I was carried away and forgot I was married.’

Following the war, this interest in American lifestyles and exciting experiences continued. Caught up in emerging trends for ‘teenagers’, young people in urban areas had good access to employment and a consumer culture of new industries including pop music, soft drinks, cosmetics and clothing. As a result, young Māori popularly believed that if you wanted to have fun, you needed to move into a more urban area.

---

3 ‘Maori Meeting House Appeal’, The Evening Post, 5 September 1956; ‘Gala In Aid Of Meeting House’; ‘Concert For Maori Meeting House Building’; ‘Maoris Raise £900 In Five Concerts’; ‘Example of Racial Amity: Impressive Ceremony At Meeting House’.
8 Redmer Yska, All Shook Up, pp. 55-57.
'The pleasures of village life are sometimes a little over-rated', explained an author in *Te Ao Hou* in 1961. ‘One may live in an overcrowded house, do a lot of hard work and suffer much inconvenience, without getting any obvious reward for one's labours. It is natural for youth to look around for something better — often it can only be found in the towns.' In towns and cities, youth culture thrived. But out of concern about the emerging trends in ‘youth problems’, the state and public sought to contain the immorality they perceived.

In this context of concern about young people descending into immoral or criminal activity (discussed further in the next section), Ngāti Pōneke, was in an excellent position to provide young people with fun and exciting experiences under the care of Club leaders. That the Club was located in central Wellington was thus an advantage to their membership, because it gave them optimum access to certain types of activities. For example, the pleasurable experiences offered by Ngāti Pōneke in the post-war period included meeting travelling parties and high-profile guests to Wellington. Some of the travelling parties were entertainment groups and some were tourists, but they were all regularly reported as reacting positively to Club performances. After Ngāti Pōneke undertook a performance on a visiting liner called the *Orion*, the ship’s liaison officer was reported as saying that the performances touched the touring party very deeply, ‘and they knew they were up against a country with a real culture.’

Baroness Maria von Trapp, who visited Wellington with the Trapp Family Singers in 1955, reacted similarly. After observing performances by the Club, Baroness von Trapp told Ngāti Pōneke that she recognised the value in Māori unique musical forms. She encouraged Ngāti Pōneke to continue to adhere to Māori cultural forms, especially the poi, which she hoped to emulate overseas.

---

Ngāti Pōneke members were also aware that observers of their performances may not have been critically or culturally minded. Being the first point of contact in New Zealand for Māori culture sometimes required them to provide context for their displays of ‘traditional’ culture in the ‘modern day’. On one occasion, Mick Jones felt it necessary to explain to some visitors from America that even though Ngāti Pōneke members performed traditional songs, the young Māori men and women in the concert party held regular jobs during the daytime. But Club members were also adamant that performance was a method through which they could successfully manage their urban experiences. To Club members, Ngāti Pōneke was not a ‘concert party’; the social connections available through the Club were the most important part. If the Club stopped offering performance opportunities, Jackie Strum argued, this ‘would not really affect the everyday living of the young Maori people who come to the hall every Monday night’. But, she continued, ‘if Ngatiponeke[sic] itself disappeared overnight, the gap in their lives would be hard to fill. And what could the city offer them to take its place?’

And as a result, Ngāti Pōneke thrived after World War Two and its ‘urban whānau’ qualities continued to be a basis for its attracting young Māori. The shared identity that the Club provided was epitomised by the Ngāti Pōneke ‘signature song’ composed by Kingi Tahiwi. In his song, Tahiwi described Ngāti Pōneke members as ‘the orphan members of the tribes throughout Ao-tea-roa’, often distant from their home places and whānau. While his lyrics drew attention to the youth of the members of the Club, he also spoke of a positive future for Māoritanga in the city:

Ko Ngati-Poneke, hoki matou;
He iwi taitamariki.
He pani no nga iwi o te motu.
Awhinatia mai matou,

14 ‘Nothing Up His Sleeve For ‘South Pacific’’, The Evening Post, 22 February 1954.
16 Witarina Harris in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, p. 92; Bernie Kernot, People of the Four Winds (Wellington, 1972), p. 64.
No te mea he whakatauki tenei,
‘Pu te ruha hao te rangatahi’
Ko Ngati-Poneke, hoki matou,
He iwi taitamariki.

We are the members of Ngati-Poneke;
Young but ever hopeful.
We are the orphan members of the tribes throughout Ao-tea-roa.
Assist us, as the proverb says:
‘Soon the old nets will be discarded and the new nets used.’
We are members of Ngati-Poneke;
Young, but ever hopeful.17

With ‘young’ and ‘hopeful’ members, the state continued to perceive Ngāti Pōneke as being a vehicle for Māori integration into urban (and therefore Pākehā) lifestyles, something which continued to be beneficial for the Club. In particular, and as discussed in previous chapters, the ways that the ‘orphan members’ of iwi prioritised shared identities over tribal identities was, to outside observers, a progressive move towards the integration of Māori. The proximity of the Club to the centre of government also meant that in the post-war decades, Ngāti Pōneke was able to maintain the positive relationships built with officials during the war. A number of Club members were also employees of the public service, for example, Mick Jones, who held a number of positions in the Department of Native/Māori Affairs both prior to and after the war. He was also chairman of the Ngāti Pōneke Māori Association between 1950 and 1962.18 Several government departments even organised their events with the Ngāti Pōneke Association, and the Association hosted parties, attended by government officials.19

17 Witarina Harris in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, p. 92; P.A.T.A. Conference, Christchurch, 26 February, 1960, Programme by the Ngati Poneke Young Maori Club, in Papers relating to the Ngati Poneke Maori Club, Wellington, [n.d.], MA 31/21/55, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
But in its official operations, Ngāti Pōneke increasingly referred to itself as being more than an urban whānau. With an increasing membership, Ngāti Pōneke saw themselves as more akin to an ‘urban iwi’ that sought its own marae in Wellington city. The Ngāti Pōneke Tribal Committee, established in 1947, and the Pōneke (or Wellington) Tribal Committee, which was an executive committee, had objectives that included assisting young Māori to find suitable accommodation in the city, fundraising, and assisting young Māori in their participation in kapa haka groups. To anchor their presence into the Wellington physical and social landscape as an urban but intrinsically Māori organisation, the Ngāti Pōneke Tribal Committee was also focussed on raising funds to build an autonomous marae complex. The fact that the government had only temporarily leased the Hall to Ngāti Pōneke in 1944 remained on the minds of Ngāti Pōneke members. Then in 1955, when the Ngāti Pōneke Tribal Committee was challenged by Department of Māori Affairs in its application for a subsidy for funds raised on behalf of Māori students at the Wellington Teachers Training College, Pirimi Tahiwi on behalf of the Ngāti Pōneke Tribal Committee explained that there was a definite use for those surplus funds. Specifically, should the ‘rent free Government Hall’ be available no longer, the surplus money would be needed to build a permanent marae, hopefully also in the Thorndon area.

In the following years, the work by Ngāti Pōneke members to secure a more permanent location for their activities increased in momentum, and Club leaders made contact with other community groups to emphasise the positive role that they played for Māori in the city. In a letter to the Town Planner the following year, Pirimi

---
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Tahiwi and his wife Māiratea stated that they envisioned the future Ngāti Pōneke marae would consist of spaces for learning, hospitality and church services. ‘We feel it imperative for provision for such facilities, to assist us in our struggle for the survival and preservation of the things that are so worthwhile in our Maori Culture’, they explained.  

23 Māori welfare officer Fred Katene also supported Ngāti Pōneke saving funds for a new marae, which he argued was ‘undoubtedly good and necessary’. With increasing numbers of Māori in the city and with the impending possible loss of the government-owned, rent-free accommodation of operations at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall, a Ngāti Pōneke marae would positively affect not only local Māori, but Māori and Pākehā alike. Māiratea Tahiwi wrote:

With the steady influx of Maoris to our City, our present Ngati-Poneke Hall is daily becoming more and more over crowded. We are most grateful to the Government for the use of this Hall over the years, and the many opportunities it has given our Maori People, but we are conscious of the fact, that this area is to be rebuilt in the not too distant future, and therefore NOW is the time to prepare, and work for a permanent Marae. A Marae that will not only serve the Maori people but continue to offer opportunities, which the Ngati-Poneke Hall has done, of bringing a better understanding between our two Races, and so developing that good-will which is so essential to peace.

25 To accommodate the increased numbers of Māori in the city and the increased number of members of the Club, there had also been an increase in the range of groups and clubs located at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall. In the post-war period, membership in the Ngāti Pōneke Association swelled to accommodate these groups that were orientated to a range of Māori purposes and activities, such as social clubs, sports groups and religious organisations. In 1955, a Victoria University of Wellington
student estimated that there were 20 clubs in the Ngāti Pōneke Association and based at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall.\(^\text{26}\) Ngāti Pōneke members referred to these groups as being the ‘hapū’ of the ‘urban iwi’. Club member Jackie Sturm described in 1955 that ‘being modelled on a tribe, [Ngāti Pōneke] has no written constitution, but acknowledges the full authority of its tangata whenua, or elders’, which was further emphasised by Fred Katene.\(^\text{27}\) In 1957, Katene wrote to the Secretary of Māori Affairs to explain that under the over-arching authority of the Ngāti Pōneke Association, Ngāti Pōneke clubs were interrelated but orientated towards different purposes – like hapū within an iwi.\(^\text{28}\)

These iwi comparisons also reflected the growing inter-generational feature of Ngāti Pōneke as a result of urban births and second generation Club members. Although whakapapa was not a defining principle of inclusion in Ngāti Pōneke, people were increasingly related to other family members there, and older members of the Club emphasised that their knowledge and experiences made them Ngāti Pōneke ‘kaumātua’. In 1957, for example, two founders of the Club insisted that young Club members should be mindful of their predecessors. When Riria and Rangi Utiku heard about plans to celebrate an anniversary of the Young Māori Club on an incorrect date, they wrote to the Ngāti Pōneke Association to advise them that they should consult more frequently with the original members. ‘We understand that the Ngati Poneke Young Maori Club intend to hold their 21\(^{st}\) Anniversary sometime in April 1957, and in the Town Hall to boot, [but] we are of the firm opinion that the Anniversary would be a mistake’, they wrote.

Most people are firmly convinced, somewhat mistakenly, that the Young Club was formed when the late Sir Apirana Ngata was supervising the Tuku-tuku, and carving in 1936, for the Memorial to the late Sir Maui Pomare.... [If] the present Club are celebrating the Anniversary of the name Ngati Poneke well

and good, but if they are celebrating the 21st Anniversary of the ‘Ngati Poneke Young Maori Club’ as such, well then, it would be advisable to contact more original members.29

But although difficult or tense at times, as the above example shows, such intergenerational relationships were also a feature of the Club that attracted and retained members. The Ngāti Pōneke fellowship and guidance by elders was described by Under-Secretary for Māori Affairs Tipa Tainui Ropiha as revealing an important way in which young Māori men and women could be proud of themselves, avoid loneliness and homesickness, and resist ‘the temptations which often surround them’. ‘Ngati Poneke in Wellington,’ he wrote, ‘is a shining example [that] will have a part to play for many years to come in placing the Maori in a modern community.’30

The many clubs and groups based in the Ngāti Pōneke Hall also contributed to this sense of community. The Māori Women’s Welfare League (the League), established at a national conference held in Wellington in 1951, is an example of another group that drew on existing iwi and hapū structures to promote pan-Māori associations. After 1951, the Ngāti Pōneke Hall became a meeting place for a branch of the League, and Ngāti Pōneke members also participated in branches in the wider area.

From its establishment, the League became broad reaching and influential. Aroha Harris has shown that this was helped by the way that in the first half of the 1950s, the League had the ear of the Minister of Māori Affairs. However, although Māori and the Minister seemingly had similar objectives, their relationship was based on different motivations. The Minister emphasised Crown policy for the betterment of Māori through Māori owning their own homes in urban areas and having good access to reliable employment. The Māori Women’s Welfare League, on the other hand, emphasised that Crown policy was not meeting Māori housing needs.31 The tribal and local area branches of the League were able to address the gaps in Crown policy for

31 Aroha Harris, ‘Dancing with the State’, pp. 108, 102-103.
Māori because they were connected to ‘flax-root’ Māori experiences, and issues could be promoted to the larger district councils and the national, dominion council. Such a structure enabled Māori to exert control over how the local branches were made up, where they were located, and how they could use such structures to determine their influence.\(^{32}\)

In Wellington, Ngāti Pōneke members, who had been part of the tribal committees under Kingi Tahiwi and Pirimi Tahiwi, transitioned into the welfare structures introduced by the League.\(^{33}\) After an inaugural gathering for the League was held at Ngāti Pōneke, Māiratea Tahiwi became the first president of the Pōneke Māori Women’s Welfare League.\(^{34}\) Ngāti Pōneke members also participated in branches outside of the central city area, such as the Naenae-Taita branch, participated in by Jean Albert’s mother, Kahurangi Albert (nee Tahiwi), Māiratea Tahiwi and Louise Carkeek.\(^{35}\) Ngāti Pōneke and tangata whenua iwi members interacted in these wider area branches in places such as Pōneke, Naenae-Taita and Petone. Long-time members of Ngāti Pōneke were also appointed to the district council of the League, including Witarina Harris and Māiratea Tahiwi.\(^{36}\) Through the networks and connections between League branches and other clubs of the Ngāti Pōneke Hall, young Māori in the city had access to urban whānau and systems of support.

The League and Ngāti Pōneke particularly provided assistance for young Māori in the city, especially those struggling with employment or education. In 1959, the Pōneke Tribal Committee worked with a League branch to apply to the Department of Māori Affairs for subsidies towards the education of four young Māori students, and a good relationship between these committees and the Minister of Māori Affairs made the application process relatively smooth.\(^{37}\) In early 1960, Walter Nash as Minister of


\(^{33}\) Dame Mira Szaszy et. al., *Te Tīmatanga Tātau Tātau*, pp. 236 – 237.


\(^{37}\) M. Currie, Letter to Secretary of the Poneke Tribal Committee, 10 December 1959, and Secretary of Maori Affairs, Letter to The Minister of Maori Affairs, 29 January, 1960, in [Maori Councils and
Māori Affairs wrote to the Pōneke branch to say he was ‘very happy to see the interest being taken in the education of young Maoris by such organisations as your League…. I assure you that any effort to enable Maori youth to take their full place in all aspects of the life of the community will always receive my strongest support.’

Another group that frequented the Hall and encouraged educational achievement was the Victoria University of Wellington Māori Club. The Victoria University of Wellington Māori Club aimed to support Māori students because large numbers of Māori university students were ‘dropping out’ during the 1950s. Reverend Manu Bennett surmised that ‘from observations it seems that their great cause of difficulty is the problem of organisation of the personal life and the budgeting of individual time’. Members of the Wellington Student’s Federation, that contained Māori students, were concerned that Māori would ‘give up study and take on a job well below his capabilities’, or if they did remain at university, they might abandon their Māoritanga ‘in the mistaken belief that it is incompatible with [their] professional career’.

Instead, the university club hoped that by providing fellowship in the city for young Māori people in similar situations, Māoritanga and whānaungatanga would encourage the students to stay enrolled. This objective agreed well with the aims of the Ngāti Pōneke community, and it made the Ngāti Pōneke Hall an excellent location for students to meet. Thus they met there not only for practical reasons (its central location), but because, like the university club, Ngāti Pōneke was not aligned to an iwi or hapū and they used shared Māoritanga to encourage Māori wellbeing.

---

Shared Māoritanga was important to young Māori in these years because those people who continued to flock to Ngāti Pōneke still sought Māori community because they felt ‘outnumbered’ in the city. In Ngāti Pōneke they found, like Harris has argued for other urban Māori groups, the things that were missed about home.\textsuperscript{43} During this time, as discussed in the following section, Ngāti Pōneke also provided a message of Māori cultural retention and strength amongst other voices that urged integration or assimilation.

\textbf{Māori Urban Migrations and the ‘Māori Problem’, 1945-1961}

With more Māori in towns and cities after the war, interacting at increased rates with Pākehā, there was also an increase in discussions on the ‘Māori Problem’. Despite the increased positive profile of Māori following their public efforts towards the war effort at home and overseas, many discussions on the ‘Māori Problem’ followed pre-existing themes. A foundation of these discussions was that urbanisation, modernisation, integration and assimilation were not merely linked, they were overlapped to the extent that they could be seen as synonymous.

For some, the connections from urbanisation, to modernisation or becoming like Pākehā, to the loss of identities meant that it was inevitable Māori would feel disconnected when they moved into cities. In 1955, for example, Professor Albert Morris reported in \textit{Te Ao Hou} that in the city, Māori were ‘\textit{in a society but not wholly of it; socially awkward, lonely, frustrated; a marginal person on the fringes of two cultures but without status or hope of position in either.}’\textsuperscript{44} Such a perspective identified the connection between urbanisation and the consequences of self-

\textsuperscript{43} Aroha Harris, ‘Dancing with the State’, p. 59.
\textsuperscript{44} Emphasis in original source. Professor Albert Morris, ‘Crime and Delinquency’, \textit{Te Ao Hou}, No. 10, April 1955, p. 15.
perceived social isolation, such as criminal activity. In 1960, Rina Moore wrote in *Te Ao Hou* that ‘[p]eople do not quite know where they belong, and they feel at home in no society… this is the reason for the type of crime we have among the Maoris; the crimes of assault, rape and homicide which are so high. It is the casting out of all his fears and his insecurity against society.’

Indeed, Māori crime in 1950s was overrepresented by youth, which was most apparent in urban areas. During that decade, the number of male Māori offenders not only increased, the proportion of offenders in the younger age brackets did too. In 1954, the number of Māori male offenders aged less than 20 was 33.26 percent of all Māori male offenders; in 1958, this had increased to 47.06 percent. In addition, such offenders were more likely to be imprisoned. In 1958, Māori male offenders were 15.9 percent of all arrests made, but 23.3 of all imprisonments. Māori women were also seen as being potential prey for urban temptations that included criminal behaviour. ‘Being an overseas port,’ one medical student reported in 1954, ‘Wellington is a breeding ground for the potential delinquent Maori girl.’ And although Māori females offended at a far lower rate than Māori males (for instance, 261 convictions of Māori women in 1958 compared to 2,833 convictions of Māori men), they too were proportionally overrepresented in the number of imprisonments made. In 1958, Māori female offenders were 29.0 percent of all imprisonments.

In this period, many young Māori who were suffering from social and cultural isolation sought fellowship from other young Māori who had experiences similar to their own. This was one reason for the establishment and popularity of gangs in the 1960s and onwards, but during the 1950s, young, urban-located Māori remained participants in what Jarrod Gilbert has called, ‘informal youth associations’. Whare Māori, whānau networks and groups and clubs, such as those housed at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall as
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described in the previous section, were an important part of these and other informal associations because they allowed for the maintenance of Māori social and cultural forms. As Reverend Manu Bennett wrote in 1957, Māoritanga could indeed survive in cities but only if ‘most of what remains to us now finds a new setting in the world of the pakeha of which we must become part’. 51 This message was reflected in the work of state officials. Beyond the influences of Māori informal and formal groups and networks, the state was also developing ways to assist Māori in their moves to the city. This especially included Māori integration into the economic, cultural and social lives of urbanites (or, in other words, Pākehā).

Māori hostels in Wellington aimed to help young Māori to adjust to urban lives. Such hostels were a result of an evolving welfare structure for Māori under the system of Māori and state relationships under the Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945. Welfare provisions introduced by that Act, Bronwyn Labrum has argued, were implemented as a reaction to the rapidity of increasing urban Māori populations, and particularly because as ‘Maori flocked to towns and cities... Maori and Maori problems became more apparent to central government and Pakeha society’. 52 When National was elected into government in 1949, they continued the Labour government’s work to increase the number of hostel placements for Māori and non-Māori youth. 53 Most hostels established in cities, though, focussed on non-Māori residents, partly as a result of a subsidy scheme that allowed the costs for hostels to be met by non-state welfare and religious organisations. Nonetheless, the model that hostels provided was sufficient for the state to consider hostels as a good way to address the needs of the urbanising Māori. 54 Through the late 1940s to the late 1960s, the number of places for

Māori in hostels increased six and a half times, from beds for 173 individuals, to beds for 1,129.\(^{55}\)

Like other areas in New Zealand, Māori hostels in Wellington were particularly aimed at young Māori because they were the demographic most in need of accommodation. A survey that Jane Ritchie compiled of Māori in Wellington in 1958 and 1959 supported this fact when she found that 55 percent of people surveyed had moved to the city at ages 20 years old and younger.\(^{56}\) But to gain a place in a hostel, a person had to have regular employment or be enrolled in study, which included those engaged in apprenticeship schemes.\(^{57}\) In Petone, for example, the Gear Meat Works Hostel was accommodation especially for the Gear Meat Works workers, which happened to include up to 80 young Māori men in its peak season.\(^{58}\) The other hostels in the Wellington area accommodated people from a range of occupations, but only two hostels were orientated exclusively for Māori clientele. These were the Avonhurst Boys’ Hostel on the Terrace in central Wellington and the Pendennis Girls Hostel in Thorndon, Wellington.

These two Wellington hostels were identified by officials as important stepping-stones for the urban acculturation of young Māori. The Avonhurst Boys Hostel was home to many young Māori men in apprenticeship schemes that contributed to building state houses around the Wellington region; and the Pendennis Girls’ Hostel was home to young women engaged in a range of education and employment organisations. Similar to previously established hostels for Māori women in the Auckland area, the Pendennis Girls’ Hostel was opened in 1947 to provide reasonable accommodation exclusively for Māori.\(^{59}\) But prior to its opening, there had been some discomfort in the Wellington area about housing young Māori women in a Pākehā residential area.\(^{60}\)

A newspaper article about the opening of the hostel described the fears of local

---


\(^{56}\) Jane Ritchie, ‘Maori Families’, p. 38.


\(^{58}\) ‘Hostel Luxury at Freezing Works’, *Te Ao Hou*, No. 41, December 1962, p. 27.


residents about Māori living in their suburb, writing that neighbours to the hostel ‘doubtless had visions of ebullient youth performing hakas in the wee sma’ hours’. The article also emphasised, however, that ‘[o]ne point is stressed, there must be no meetings at street corners and no loitering at the gates. Escorts must come to the house and meet their girl-friends properly just as they would in their own homes.’\(^61\) Through suitable accommodation, hot meals and close supervision by the matron, Pākehā residents’ fears about ebullient Māori youth would be alleviated.

To help encourage Māori interaction with urban Pākehā, the majority of hostels in the Wellington area were not exclusively for Māori residents. In 1959, the Department of Māori Affairs reported that there were 128 Māori women spread across 12 hostels in the Wellington area. As only 17 of these women were resident at Pendennis Girls’ Hostel, the majority were living amongst Pākehā women in hostels that the Department reported, ‘accommodated Māori girls if and when required’.\(^62\) As a young Māori woman living in the Hutt Valley, Jean Albert observed that young Māori were billeted into state-sponsored hostel accommodation by welfare officers who undertook this work in order to ensure the best for young Māori in the city. Following the implementation of the Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945, welfare officers of the Department of Māori Affairs were tasked to assist Māori in accessing government departments and the forms of state assistance available to them. As Bronwyn Labrum has argued, this included broad aims of introducing to Māori modern ideas and ‘the ability to be both a member and a successful inhabitant of Pakeha society’.\(^63\) On the ground level in Wellington, this meant that by the end of the 1950s young Māori were arriving in Wellington and being put straight into hostels, discouraged from going into private accommodation. Jean Albert recalled that:

Prior to about 1956, '57, I was aware that a lot of people were coming into Wellington, but they were coming down on the overnight trains, being picked up by Māori Welfare Officers and taken to various homes, hostels. So they never came to Wellington unless they had somewhere to stay, and they were picked up at the Railway station. I think we went through a period of about probably ten years where we didn’t have problems of accommodation because the Welfare departments and various areas would be picking them up along the way.... They weren’t allowed to move into flats straight away, you see, they were all organised in these hostels, and once they got to know the place and everything, got to get friends, they got flats.64

By moving straight into hostels, young Māori were provided a source for urban acculturation into modern lifestyles and prevented from succumbing to urban temptations and ‘falling on the wrong side of the law’.65 Urbanising correctly meant integrating smoothly. This was discussed in relation to the Pendennis hostel, where a connection was made between being a good resident and being engaged in a respectable form of employment. After recovering from tuberculosis, Whetu Tirikatene was a young Māori woman concerned about the living conditions of other Māori.66 In 1959, she inspected the Pendennis hostel, and under a subheading of ‘Good Type of Resident now at ‘Pendennis’’, she wrote to the Māori welfare officer that ‘the whole tenor of the Hostel ha[d] improved conspicuously since the discharge of some troublesome girls’. ‘This is reflected’, she continued, ‘in the type of employment being undertaken by these girls’. As evidence, she listed that 17 of the 22 girls living in the hostel were engaged in skilled employment or training for skilled employment; three were students at Victoria University of Wellington; and two were employed in service jobs.67 When the Welfare Controller received this report from Tirikatene, he was particularly pleased. He agreed that ‘instead of putting up the ‘waifs and strays’’, the good employment and improving character of Pendennis residents was influencing a change that was restoring the hostel’s reputation.

[Footnotes]
64 Jean Albert, interview, Silverstream, Upper Hutt, 22 April, 2009.
66 Keith Newman, Ratana Revisited, p. 417; and Janet McCallum, Women in the House, pp.94-95.
Despite the hostel’s reputation, however, smoothly integrating Māori was not a straight-forward task. Residents of frequently departed Pendennis to pursue private living arrangements, and as a result, living standards at the hostel declined.\(^{68}\) In 1958, for example, only about 80 percent, on average, of the 34 beds at the hostel were filled at any time. Running at a loss of £550 per annum and requiring renovations at a total of £4,600, the Māori Trustee advised the Minister of Māori Affairs, that it might be time to consider integrating the Māori residents at the hostel with non-Māori residents, thus also addressing the hostel’s ongoing financial burdens. In his letter to the Minister, the Māori Trustee acknowledged that ‘an appraisal of some 10 years of operation makes it evident that the hostel has filled a very important part in introducing Maori girls to urban life’, and that ‘the social gains achieved in adjusting them to [the] city environment have adequately offset the financial losses of operation.’ However, despite being the only Māori girls’ hostel in Wellington during the 1950s, the Māori Trustee argued that the continuing role of the hostel in this capacity had come to an end. Instead, an integrated social living arrangement was proposed, including accommodation for up to 25 percent of residents of European-descent.

The appraisal also shows that after a decade of operation, the time is now opportune to consider future operational policy of the hostel. Six other girls’ hostels in Wellington run by religious and charitable organisations regularly take a number of Maori girl boarders together with European girls and as a practical experiment in integration, this arrangement has proved successful. It is felt that to continue the operation of Pendennis exclusively for Maori girls will not facilitate the further successful integration of the girls into the social and economic life of the city.\(^{69}\)

The Welfare Controller in Wellington, however, disagreed with this assessment. He argued that Pendennis Hostel was unique in the Wellington area precisely because of


\(^{69}\) Letter from Maori Trustee to Minister of Maori Affairs, 1 August 1958, in Pendennis Hostel, Wellington – General, 1958-1961, MA – Acc W2490 Box 159 37/24 5, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
its dedication to providing accommodation for young Māori women. Yes, he agreed, acculturation and guidance was necessary in order for many young Māori women to be able to adjust to living in the city. But as he saw it, urban migrations were ongoing, and young Māori women would continue to want to live with other young Māori women. While there was still a need for such accommodation, he argued, it would be short sighted to adjust those provisions just yet:

There are other hostels in Wellington where Maori girls may board with European girls but there is only one to meet the needs of the type of girl we so often get, one who comes from a rural area and who needs a certain amount of time to accustom herself to city life. The need for an establishment like this will increase as more and more girls leave places like Ngata Memorial College, Ruatoria, Tikitiki, Raupunga and others.... We would be adopting a very optimistic attitude indeed if we expect to escape criticism for such an action.70

But adding to the pressure of making a decision about Pendennis was the constantly changing admissions and departures of the young Māori women, including short-term stays. During the late 1950s, it was a common occurrence for visitors to show up at Pendennis requesting accommodation without prior notice, and this was a particular concern for the matron. In February 1959, Whetu Tirikatene suggested that to control these short-term, late notice stays, only the Māori Welfare Officer should be able to approve such residencies. She suggested that this message should be communicated to Māori in rural areas, and that to do this they should publish this change in policy in Te Ao Hou magazine, which had a largely Māori audience.71

But Māori departures from hostels were common across the post-war period. While a minority of Māori stayed in hostels for longer periods of time, Māori women most often chose to move into private accommodation situations, at least in part to make space for the ongoing and increasing populations of other urban-migrating Māori. Many young Māori women also found hostel living conditions restrictive. They valued

hostel living precisely for what it was supposed to be: a stepping stone to living in some form of private residence. For example, when the ‘friendly’ personnel manager for Kilbirnie-based business Amos Softgoods Limited actively recruited twelve young Māori women to live in Wellington and work for his factory, he reported difficulties keeping the young women in residence in Wellington hostels. Despite Mr White’s best intentions, the young women quickly grew tired of the rules of hostel life, and chose to go ‘flatting’ in private, rented accommodation instead.\(^{72}\) A similar situation was observed at Pendennis Hostel. It was still in need of extensive renovations and was running at a loss of over £2,500 per annum by August 1959. An administration officer for the Department of Māori Affairs told the secretary of Pendennis Hostel that if they could maintain a constant rate of residents then the hostel would be able to remain open. Considering the recent turnover of residents, however, the official doubted that their continuing operations could be guaranteed. The official wrote that ‘[s]ince January this year, figures indicate that eleven girls have stayed less than two weeks, fifteen less than a month and thirty-three less than three months. Thirty-one overnight visitors were catered for. It can thus be seen that the hostel serves the girls as a transit centre’. For this reason, he wondered if the costs for renovating the hostel could be justified.\(^ {73}\)

For the young Māori women in the hostel, social relationships were maintained both while resident of the hostel and after, through Ngāti Pōneke. Although the Club did not have an official relationship with the hostel, its unofficial relationship during the 1950s was strong. In 1954, a medical student commented that ‘[f]or the hostel dweller, especially the girls from Pendennis, [Ngāti Pōneke] is a natural meeting place where one can enjoy pleasurable company. It is the venue of many Maoris both young and old, and undoubtedly plays a most important part in their welfare.’\(^ {74}\)

\(^{72}\) E.G.S., ‘Girls Come to the City’, \textit{Te Ao Hou}, No. 36, September 1961, p. 31.

\(^{73}\) The amount 53 percent equated to 18 beds filled. Written by hand in the margin of this letter it was also noted that at the time of the letter, there were only 14 girls resident at Pendennis Girls’ Hostel. Letter from J.F. Robertson to The Secretary, Pendennis Hostel, 6 August 1959, in Pendennis Hostel, Wellington – General, 1958-1961, MA – Acc W2490 Box 159 37/24 5, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.

Pōneke Hall, the Pendennis Girls’ Hostel Social Club met alongside the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, branches of the Māori Women’s Welfare League, the Victoria University of Wellington Māori Club, and the Avonhurst Boys’ Hostel Social Club, amongst many others. Later, in the early 1960s, the Wellington City Mission became an owner of the Pendennis Hostel and included it in its plans to provide ‘relief for the poor, the unhappy, the lonely and the indigent’. By the 1970 financial year, Pendennis provided space for up to 36 young women, who were no longer exclusively Māori.

By attending groups and clubs at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall, it did not matter where in the city young Māori lived because they had a ‘marae’ that was both a place to have fun and a place to enact ‘urban whānau’. Since it had been established as an organisation for any young Māori person in the city, in the 1950s Ngāti Pōneke continued to be at the forefront of the pan-iwi urban Māori community. This received attention from a broader category of Wellingtonians, and when Victoria University College student Maurice Pentecost explored why Māori culture still ‘survived’ during the 1950s, he used the Ngāti Pōneke community as a case study. One of his conclusions was that the ‘overt expressions of Maori-ness’ provided by Ngāti Pōneke were significant because they provided urban Māori with a ‘home substitute’ in Wellington. He also proposed that continued Māori participation in Ngāti Pōneke could be considered ‘ineffectual adjustment’ to city living and a barrier to successful integration.

In proposing this, however, he underestimated the extent to which Club members found fellowship in shared identities. And he was not alone in underestimating the resilience of Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau in the urban Wellington area. A medical student who assessed public health at the Waiwhetū community in 1954 was also pessimistic about the ability of the iwi to remain healthy and avoid overcrowding.
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simultaneously with maintaining manaakitanga practices. One of his conclusions was that the community, when living in ‘a newly established, artificial pa’, was likely to collapse into slum conditions. He argued that ‘to isolate and try to form a synthetic pa, as has been done in Waiwhetu, is doomed to failure from the outset.’

Sure, such writers were influenced by dated texts or misinterpretation of texts – such as this medical student who supported his conclusions about Waiwhetū Māori by explaining that ‘ultimate absorption of the race was predicted as long ago as 1906 by Pomare (Annual Report of Health Department) and again in 1945 by Buck’ – but they also referenced ideas about Māori absorption into Pākehā populations that were common amongst members of the public and civil servants. Welfare officers, for example, were tasked to encourage urban Māori families to be in charge of good, modern homes that were modelled on the idealised Pākehā family, participating successfully in the cash economy. But Māori had different ideas of how an ideal family situation would look, and their refusal to easily adapt to Pākehā familial models, such as one-family dwellings, became a frustration to some welfare officers.

Such opposition to and frustration about Māori fed into concerns about the future for Māori in urban areas. Although the state had become aware of the increasing need for it to address the growing urban Māori populations, and despite the establishment of structures (such as hostels) to accommodate some of these urbanising Māori, the rate of Māori movements into towns and cities was underestimated and integration as absorption continued to be encouraged. In the 1950s, employment and enjoyment were important motivations for moving into urban areas, but many Māori were drawn to urban areas because of whānau and other social relationships. And since more Māori lived in towns and cities, there were increased chances for urban-located Māori to use their connections ‘back home’ to encourage other young Māori to move. In moving to the city, these existing connections helped young Māori adjust and enact

80 Ibid., p. 34.
82 See Richard S. Hill, Māori and the State, pp. 39, 44.
social relationships. Since official structures tended to lag behind the rates of Māori moving into Wellington, and since young Māori preferred not to overstay their residences in state-sponsored accommodation, urban whānau were a priority for the new urban Māori. Groups like Te Āti Awa at Waiwhetū and the Ngāti Pōneke community capitalised on this, providing multiple opportunities for young Māori to meet with other young Māori like themselves in structures that ensured guidance and good examples through kaumātua. Ngāti Pōneke also supplied opportunities for performance, te reo Māori and tikanga, and the Club was well-known for allowing members to meet new people and experience new events, whilst still partaking in familiar cultural and social forms.83

When the Labour government returned to power in 1957, they did so with aims of improving Māori access to welfare. By the end of their short term in office, The Hunn Report was produced (but unreleased) to discuss what Labour had (and had not) delivered. Most notably, and discussed more in the following chapter, The Hunn Report provided recommendations about Māori adaption to Pākehā, urban lifestyles, known officially as integration.84 For Ngāti Pōneke during this time, though, integration was not necessarily threatening to their members. Similar to when the Young Māori Club was established, leaders instead actively promoted what they saw as being the best for ongoing Māori wellbeing in urban areas. Following the release of The Hunn Report, in a year that was described by the Vice President of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, Bill Nathan, as being ‘not much different from other years in terms of engagements, concerts, practices and hard work’, Pat Barber wrote that ‘[t]here has been much theorising on integration,’ but ‘a club such as Ngati Poneke has done much over the years to achieve a more concrete understanding between the races.’85 With all iwi (and Pākehā) invited to the Club, Ngāti Pōneke was a location where Māori adjusted to city living and maintained individual iwi and hapū identities.

83 Aroha Harris, ‘Dancing with the State’, p. 59.
However, despite examples of the ‘transplanting’ of Māori social and cultural forms into urban areas for the benefit of Māori in the city, concerns about ‘Māori Problems’ persisted into the 1960s, especially in the eyes of the officials who were grappling with the needs of the new urban communities. The policies for Māori populations articulated in The Hunn Report were released publicly by the National government 1961. Although presented as recommendations, it became a road map for state policy towards Māori, directly encouraging their structural absorption, and indirectly encouraging the eradication of Māori values that inhibited that structural absorption. In this context, Ngāti Pōneke continued to promote Māori welfare in urban areas, and they maintained good relationships with state officials. They also remained determined to retain and strengthen Māoritanga in the city.
Chapter Seven: When the Māori population became an ‘Urban’ population

In the post-war decades, Māori urbanisations continued and increased until they had involved the majority of the Māori population. By 1966, almost two out of every three Māori were living in urban areas. For most Māori, if they had not already moved to a town or a city, chances were someone close to them had. This meant that on some levels, it was clear by the end of the 1960s that the social and economic future for Māori lay in towns and cities.

Feelings of being an outnumbered minority in the city continued to be closely linked to urbanisations. As had happened earlier in the century, Māori reported that moving into Wellington and the Hutt Valley included confrontations with different social and cultural systems, which could be, as Wikitoria Paaka described, a ‘culture shock’ for young, rural Māori. 1 Despite significant growth in Māori populations, Māori continued to feel that they were outnumbered by the more numerous Pākehā populations. To curb the feelings of culture shock and being outnumbered, Māori sought forms of community and fellowship that were inclusive and based on familiar relationships. These ‘urban whānau’ included those related by descent, as well as kaupapao-orientated social groupings. 2

1 Wikitoria Paaka, interview, Epuni, Wellington, 19 April 2009.
Through the 1960s, Māori moving into towns and cities were also, more than ever before, subject to close attention. In 1960, The Hunn Report had described a ‘Maori situation’ that was a mosaic of issues in high population growth, increasing urbanisations, poor health and educational achievement, high rates of unemployment and crime, inadequate housing standards and land resources, and inconsistent applications of governmental policy. For Hunn, urbanisations were both the source of those problems – as well as their solution.3

However, urbanisations were already well underway. This chapter focusses on Māori urban migrations after 1961 and discusses the experiences of young, urbanising Māori, including those who continued to find moving into the city a difficult, lonely experience. But this chapter will also show that more Māori in the city also meant an increase in the wider public’s awareness of Māori in the city, including these difficult experiences. As Māori became a majority urban-residing people in 1966, their influence was growing.

The last section of this chapter provides an overview of what Māori communities in Wellington and the Hutt Valley were like when after 1966, the total Māori population shifted to being one mostly located in towns and cities. It describes how the increased concentration of Māori in urban areas, coupled with increased interactions between people of different iwi backgrounds, contributed to discussions about the connections of young urban Māori with their tribal home places. For many Māori, this was expressed as a desire for the resurgence of iwi identities and a shift away from pan-iwi associations. For some members of the Ngāti Pōneke community, however, this came out as increased desires to formalise their presence as an iwi of the city through a formal and ceremonially appropriate marae. With increased attention being received by iwi identities, Ngāti Pōneke formalised a relationship with the mana whenua iwi of Taranaki Whānui. With more Māori in the city than ever before, there had to be space for both.

3 The Hunn Report, pp. 3, 5-12, 32-35.
Integration and Māori Communities in the City after 1961

In the 1960s, Māori moved into towns and cities at higher rates than ever before, rapidly shifting towards a majority urban population. Poor housing conditions and high rates of university drop-outs, that had caused Māori to set up groups to assist other Māori, were also things that the state sought to remedy. *The Hunn Report* was the result of a comprehensive study of how Māori were faring, commissioned by the Labour government of 1957 to 1960, but released by the incumbent National government in 1961. Being published allowed *The Hunn Report* to be distributed to and discussed within a broader audience. The immediate responses to the report were reactionary and both supportive and critical. The public policy and scholarly discussions that emerged particularly focussed on the relationships between integration, assimilation and urbanisation.⁴

*The Hunn Report* used a comprehensive study of facts and figures to show more clearly than ever before what the state could do to effect the ‘internal changes of attitude’ for Māori in urban areas.⁵ This included deliberately linking urbanisations with integration intentions – by moving into cities, Māori were intermarrying more with Pākehā, and as a result, Māori social and cultural forms would dissipate.⁶ As Richard Hill has argued, through *The Hunn Report* ‘the government essentially declared that assimilation was now achievable’, but it was mistaken in too closely linking ideas about urbanisation with integrations.⁷
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⁴ Aroha Harris, ‘Dancing with the State’, pp. 130, 121.
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In studying Māori urbanisations in New Zealand, Joan Metge had already sought to answer why people were quick to make this connection. Her suggestion was that overseas scholarship on urbanism, such as from America, was based on a tradition of research on mainstream rather than minority or indigenous communities, with the unintended result being that urbanisation was equated to ‘Westernisation’. In New Zealand, however, Metge argued that Māori in urban areas maintained relationships with kin and land in rural areas, demonstrating ‘the fallacy of confusing urbanisation with assimilation to the dominant culture.’ Assimilation was not going to be the primary outcome of urbanisation, she argued. ‘While urban dwellers may share a common ‘way of life’ with those in other cities, the importance of the national and cultural bonds which unite them with the rural society in the hinterland of the city should not be forgotten.’

But one of the consequences of The Hunn Report was that it did confuse the relationships between urbanisation, integration and assimilation for people outside of government or policy spheres. In his report, Hunn contrasted Māori who were ‘unsuccessful’ members of society and ‘living a backward life in primitive conditions’, with integrating, modern and increasingly urban Māori. Through integration, he argued, these urban and modern Māori would be able to retain ‘only the fittest elements (worthiest of preservation)’ of Māori culture. This included arts, language and crafts that had ‘survived the onset of civilisation’, as well as aspects of Māoritanga that should be fostered for national purposes. For Bruce Biggs, however, the problem with this approach came down to what those ‘fittest elements’ included. Biggs argued that Hunn had defined the appropriate Māori ‘cultural relics’ on a superficial level, excluding important Māori values such as aroha and kinship, which were not ‘on display’. Although proponents of integration, including Hunn, insisted it was different from previous policies of assimilation, others argued that The Hunn
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10 Ibid., p. 15.
Report either did not consider, or it effectively recommended the decimation of, many meaningful forms of Māori culture and society.

Unintentionally, Hunn’s report led to a discussion of what would be the ongoing role for Māori cultural and social structures and values in urban living. Proponents of integration had varying views. American scholar David P. Ausubel, for example, argued that the idea that Māori could adopt ‘the material advantages of European civilisation’ and still maintain Māori socio-cultural systems and values was ‘an idealistic but totally unrealistic’ goal for Māori communities.

But in rationalising the ‘necessary’ loss of Māori connections with their papa kāinga, these strategic thinkers undervalued the connections that Māori had, and maintained, with the people and locations of their descent. As Richard Hill has argued, this was evidence of state officials misunderstanding Māori values, especially desires for rangatiratanga. This is an apt explanation because there was plenty of evidence available to the state that demonstrated Māori intentions in maintaining Māoritanga through their urbanisations. In her thesis research, for example, Metge found that ongoing connections between rurally-located and urban-residing whānau, hapū and iwi, combined with their intentional activity to maintain Māoritanga in the city of Auckland, was important evidence of the durability of Māori cultural values in urban living. Relationships between urban-located and rural dwelling Māori were dynamic and interactive, she wrote. ‘The fact that the Maori minority, once established in the city, had begun to exercise some influence over Maori rural society in purely Maori affairs, should show up the fallacy of confusing urbanisation with assimilation to the dominant culture’, Metge warned.

15 Joan Metge, A New Maori Migration, pp. 249-250.
16 Ibid., p. 257.
There was also some Māori support for integration that was both encouraging of change and optimistic about Māori cultural forms in urban areas. Similar to the work of the leaders of the Young Māori Party before them, some Māori leaders supported Hunn’s proposals because many of his recommendations for the promotion of modernisation of Māori were a positive move, addressing ongoing concerns about Māori health, education and employment. In his report, Hunn described the ways that Māori were lagging behind non-Māori, including a high representation of Māori in crime statistics. With just less than 70 percent of male Māori offenders in 1958 aged 24 years and under, Māori youth and their ‘maladjustment’ to urban living was to blame. ‘The alarming increase in criminality’, Hunn argued, ‘goes hand in hand with the rapid growth in the Maori population and its redistribution through urbanisation’.

This line of thought was repeated by Māori leader Reverend Manu Bennett in 1965, who agreed that urbanisation and criminal activity were related, principally because, he argued, urbanisation led to the dispossession of cultural knowledge. In urbanisation, Bennett argued, Māori were required to adapt to mainstream systems which were, in his opinion, a ‘devastating onslaught’ for Māori identities. ‘[T]he Maori now found himself not only dispossessed, but also displaced, and ill-equipped to adjust quickly to the foreign mode of life’.

This meant that some young Māori moving into towns and cities after the release of The Hunn Report encountered attitudes that Māori culture was a hindrance to their necessary adjustment to urban living. A poem written by some young Māori who took part an employment programme in 1966, for example, reflected the messages they had received that ‘[w]e must adjust, our teachers say’. The poem described that moving to Wellington and getting a suitable job was their path forwards.

   We’re just a bunch of Maori kids,  
   Who have come to find a job,  
   We must adjust, our teachers say,  
   And I’m sure we will obey.

17 The Hunn Report, p. 32.  
We will find the city quite a bore,
The weather we just can’t ignore,
But Wellington must be our home,
Besides we can’t afford to roam!19

Young Māori like these were told that urbanisation and integration were their future. Māori had encountered integration messages prior to the release of The Hunn Report, but afterwards, urbanisations, integration and, however unintentionally, assimilation, became inextricably linked. Not only was the Māori ‘naturally’ rural and urban adjustment perceived to be difficult for any country ‘bumpkin’, but Māori were the recipients of racialised expectations. For example, when seeking further education, some young Māori were the targets of perspectives on their skills and abilities that pigeon-holed them according to their ‘traditional’ aptitudes for certain types of employment. In 1964, for example, a paper presented to Māori students at Victoria University told them that ‘the Māori today’ was traditionally and psychologically adapted for occupations to do with agriculture, forestry and fishing, and Māori were well known for being able to manipulate machinery such as tractors, mixers and bulldozers. 20 Such messages came from both Māori and Pākehā, from official structures like the government, as well as Māori organisations such as the Māori Women’s Welfare League. The Hunn Report also ushered in a renewed approach to the state’s role in urbanisations, an approach that would harness these changes including establishing Māori in cities in ways consistent with Hunn’s policies of integration.

However, the scale of Māori urban migrations and Māori urban births in the five years following the release of The Hunn Report were well beyond what Hunn had anticipated. It is standard that Crown policy can only make the most of statistics that are available at a certain time and those data are by necessity sometimes well behind

20 W.B. Sutch, The Maori Contribution: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, 15 May 1964’, a Paper Presented as Background for the Address by Dr Sutch to the Tenth Annual Conference of Maori Students at the Victoria University of Wellington, 21 to 23 May 1964, pp. 25, 29.
the actual extent of a statistical phenomenon, especially one as rapid as Māori urban migrations. Consequently, the Crown failed to gauge the scale of the rapidly changing and widespread nature of Māori urban migrations. In his report, Hunn projected that it would take until 1980 for the urban Māori population to outnumber rural-dwelling Māori. The reality was, however, that Māori urban living would come to represent the majority proportion of the Māori population in less than five years after his prediction was made. Hunn’s view that urbanisation was inevitable may have been a watershed moment for state policy, but for Māori in cities, it was already obvious. 21

In cities, Māori continued to explore and determine ways to maintain their Māoritanga. Confrontations about identity and what it meant to be Māori in the city led Māori to pursue Māori cultural forms through community groups and organisations, especially urban whānau. Since some young Māori continued to find urbanisations difficult because of living at distances from whānau, there were different strategies employed to help. One anonymous writer, for example, described how the lack of contact with home was a depressing experience. ‘When I’m only a hundred yards away from the hostel, I always think there is a letter for me’, she wrote. ‘It is heart-breaking when there is nothing. It makes me want to cry. If there is one it is just like winning the Mammoth Lottery.’ 22 To adjust to such perceived isolation, some young Māori made frequent trips home while establishing their life in the city. This process, Matthew M. Bennett described, was an important way for him to reconfirm his decisions and maintain his mana whenua connections. ‘I had this huge need in me to be connecting back home all the time’, he explained, ‘so for the first four years I was coming back home at least every third week and I’d count on that process to charge my batteries up in order for me to be able to spend my time in Wellington.’ 23

22 Te Timatanga 1: The First Māori Pre-Employment Course conducted by the Wellington Polytechnic for the Maori Affairs Department, February 1966, Hilliard, Noel: Papers (ARC-0438), MS-2593/398, Hocken Library, Dunedin, p. 19.
23 Matthew M. Bennett, interview, Kohupātiki, Napier, 24 April, 2010.
For Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark, regular trips home were important because not only did she desire to maintain connections with whānau still living there, it was also her emotional home, where her thoughts went every day.

I used to go home every week after work. Friday, I'm gone. Yeah, every week, until I found my 'Elvis' and I then used to stay away from going home [laughs]. I used to go home every week, I used to tangi to go home, go home to my whānau.... and I still go. Well, home is where your heart is. You can be living somewhere else, but your whakaaro ki te wā kainga, your thoughts are still at home.24

For some, however, moving to the city was hard, but returning home was harder. RTN’s connections with her home were incredibly important, and as a young woman her mother sent her down to Wellington by for a better life. In the city, she was so homesick that she felt unable to return home. Only after years of going ‘wild’ in the city was RTN able to settle into a life in Wellington and from there, return home.

After unanswered letters from my mum to her friend Molly, who had moved elsewhere from Lower Hutt in 1963, my mum wanted me to get away from the unemployed country lifestyle I had become accustomed to, in the hope that the city would give me better employment opportunities and stop me from getting in to trouble with all my cousins and college friends. So she packed my bag, gave me a 50 pound note to travel with my aunty and uncle who were coming down to Wellington to visit whanau. While we were down here my aunty helped me to find employment and hostel accommodation in Thorndon.

I was very homesick, sad, hurt, disillusioned and disconnected from my family and because of this very rarely went back until five years later. With the new friends I made down here we frequently went to parties, nightclubs and dances at the old Ngāti Pōneke dance hall and marae, which was where the High Court and the current bus stop is today. By this time I became comfortable and much happier with my new life in Wellington.25

With more and more Māori moving into cities, such difficult experiences of moving into the city became increasingly represented in art, literature and the media. In these

24 Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark, group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010.
25 RTN, interview, Wellington, 14 April, 2010.
media, Māori experiences of urbanisation were communicated as narratives of cultural loss and loneliness. The 1960 novel *Maori Girl* by Noel Hilliard, for example, told a story of a young woman named Netta from Taranaki who moved to Wellington for work. In 1961, Public Relations Officer to the Maori Affairs Department, Melvin Taylor, reviewed this book for *Te Ao Hou* and called it ‘the New Zealand Novel of our time’. He expected that many Māori would relate to Hilliard’s characters and through Hilliard’s depiction of a plight common to Māori throughout the country, audiences would gain a better understanding of urbanisation, a major social problem for Māori.

I can hear many a Maori saying, ‘that sounds just like what happened to Kura, or Wai or Bubs,’ for it is a story that has been lived many times though no other writer has seen it so clearly or painted it so vividly as Mr Hilliard.

This is the problem that administrators necessarily paint with cold statistics. This is the major social problem of our time. This is the plight of the Maori people in their migration from country to town. This is that problem, in the raw, crying out for an answer.

The problems he referred to included Māori difficulties gaining suitable accommodation in the city and resisting urban ‘temptations’. These were problems that were being addressed by state policies for Māori, preventing Māori becoming part of the ‘Māori Problem’. As *The Hunn Report* described, hostel living would continue to provide young Māori ‘somewhere to stay where they feel at home among their own kin.... Otherwise they are more or less adrift in unfamiliar surroundings.’ In 1962, for example, the Wellington City Teachers College Māori Club put on a play called ‘The Legend of Wiremu’ that described one young man’s struggle with urban temptations. According to a reviewer in *Te Ao Hou*, the play was ‘concerned with the emotional crisis that so often faces the average Maori boy from the average Maori country home when, relieved of parental control and free from communal discipline,

---

28 *The Hunn Report*, p. 44.
he enters city life.’ So to avoid such emotional crises, the state guided young Māori women and men into hostels, thereby bypassing the discrimination by some landlords that prevented young Māori acquiring accommodation in the city outside of official structures. ‘Many Europeans refuse to let their dwellings to coloured people, especially in high-class residential areas,’ wrote Kenneth C. Gartner for in *Te Ao Hou* in 1965, because of ‘fear of a drop in the value of the property’.

There were ways around such attitudes though. Ngāti Pōneke had an active role in helping young Māori access what they needed in urban-living. Lifetime Club member Laura Taepa and her husband Canon Hohepa Taepa, for example, were approached on numerous occasions to vouch for young Māori seeking private accommodation. It also helped that by the 1960s, there were higher chances that young migrating Māori already had relatives living in the city as a result of prior migrations. This lead to one detailed criticism of Noel Hilliard’s book stating that Netta’s (fictional) experience of moving into the Wellington area and being completely disconnected from her home area was unrepresentative of most Māori experiences. Pae Ruha, for example, had family in the city, but the enjoyable things about the city meant she also initially avoided letting her whānau know she was in the city. Her first trip into Wellington was a holiday, and only when she had spent some time getting to know the city did she decide to visit members of her family who lived in Wellington. For Pae Ruha, the city was a friendly place.

**Author:** Why do you think you didn’t tell your relatives that you were [in Wellington]?

**Pae:** Simply because I wanted to see, to go around Wellington. You are bound to honour your relations wishes if you’re going to stay with them, you know? And I wanted to be free and I was young enough to do that, to be free to roam,

---

31 See, for example, Ngati Poneke Tribal Committee: Minute book, 1947-1953, MSY 3385, ATL, Wellington.
so to speak; to see all the places in Wellington to familiarise myself with different parts of Wellington. I don’t think I realised at the time that I would be coming back to Wellington, but it was to be a holiday and that’s how I treated it by making sure that I knew Wellington.

And at that time I found Wellington to be quite a friendly city. That was before all the high rise buildings and so on went up, and people smiled even if they didn’t know you, as you walked up and down the streets the people smiled. People didn’t look as if as they look today, sort of all the cares of the world on their shoulders, so to speak; you know, rushing here, rushing there. In those years they were a bit carefree looking I suppose, they didn’t seem to carry all the anxieties and all the cares on their shoulders as they moved from point to point, they had time to smile as they passed. And most people, who knew and understood Māori and were Māori, would say ‘kia ora’.

Pae Ruha’s experience moving into the city in the early 1960s was thus atypical if we are to focus only on the numerous tales of disconnection and loss. But the reality was that with larger populations of Māori in the city, the need to actively seek urban Māori community had lessened, and Māori were able to find their own urban whānau outside of the main urban Māori groups in the area, including Ngāti Pōneke. Even though by the 1960s, attendance at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall had peaked, there were increased numbers of urban Māori who did not participate in the Club beyond the weekly dances, if at all. Welfare Officer Don Manunui estimated in 1963 that although the Ngāti Pōneke Hall was always busy and in demand, those young people attending Club dances on Fridays and Saturdays were representative of several hundred Māori who were not regular members. Different Māori clubs were held at the Hall three nights a week, and every weekend a popular band had a longstanding contract to play at dances. On weeknights, it was not unusual to have between 30 to 80 Māori attend for clubs, but some Māori, like Pae Ruha and Matthew Bennett described below, still sought fellowship elsewhere. After Pae Ruha arrived in the city, she went with some

---

34 Te Pae ki Omeka Joy (Pae) Ruha, interview, Newtown, Wellington, 11 March 2009.
friends to attend a Ngāti Pōneke Club practice, but they soon decided that it was not for them.38

But even if people like Pae Ruha and others did not become regular members of Ngāti Pōneke, Māori in the city still commonly attended the weekly dances held at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall. As Matthew Bennett described, attending dances at Ngāti Pōneke became part of his wider urban whānau network that substituted for the social connections he had experienced at home. When Matthew Bennett moved to Wellington from the Hawkes Bay to attend Victoria University, he had whānau who were already involved in the Ngāti Pōneke community before him, but he also made new friends with other Māori like himself, who had moved to Wellington for work and university. Through his informal networks of friends, he was kept up to date with both local and national Māori, iwi and whānau news.

My focus [in Wellington] was really firstly on my job, secondly on trying to get an education and thirdly, on a cultural perspective.... But what was happening for me was that I was slowly starting to build up my own infrastructure in Wellington. Here [in Napier] we have a very close affinity to our religion and so I was developing that down in Wellington. I was getting the cultural outlets through Ngāti Pōneke. I was developing other contacts within Ngāti Pōneke itself so I was extending my whānau over there as well, whānau ties.

But I also was developing a network around myself of people who were in similar situations as myself, who had graduated to Wellington, gone down there in the first instance to be going through university and were working in government jobs a lot of us, so that was really quite empowering for us all. And then we had our own rugby and netball teams because we were not just male, there was male and female, who were partly based at university and partly based down at the Hotel Debretts. And Debretts became our marae in a sense because it was the, well not just the hotel that we all gravitated towards, but it was the social hub that we had. And from a Māori perspective we had the ability to go down to Debretts on a Friday or Saturday night and find out exactly what was happening, from a Māori perspective, not just in Wellington,

38 Te Pae ki Omeka Joy (Pae) Ruha, interview, Newtown, Wellington, 11 March 2009.
but nationally, because we had all the public servants, the Māori public servants coming down to Debretts and that was really, really good.\(^{39}\)

Like Matthew Bennett and the others interviewed for this thesis, such networks of Māori and urban whānau definitely allowed for them to get ‘used to’ living in the city in ways that did not require assimilation or integration at the expense of their Māori or iwi identities. Although young Māori in towns and cities could be described as being ‘drawn from the four quarters of Maoridom and... a rootless people’, there was plenty of evidence for the ongoing roles of Māori social and cultural systems in urban areas. When Bernie Kernot studied Māori youth groups in Pukekohe between March 1961 and June 1962, he noted that ‘no Maori considered himself entirely rootless’ despite their participation in an urban-located, pan-īwi organisation.\(^{40}\) Instead, because they acknowledged that members came from a range of backgrounds, their operation allowed them to use tikanga to distinguish themselves from the tangata whenua iwi also living there.\(^{41}\) ‘In this way’, Kernot explained, they ‘were able to articulate [sic] with other Maori communities at hui and achieve some measure of acceptable identity distinct from the non-Maori community which surrounded and encompassed them.’\(^{42}\)

Pan-īwi community was similarly valued by Māori in Wellington city. For example, the activity of the Ngāti Pōneke community in Wellington, which through the 1960s, demonstrated pan-īwi characteristics like Kernot had observed.

But in the late 1960s and during the 1970s, this desire for pan-īwi organisation also contributed to the establishment of gangs as rule-bound social groups, consisting of young, urban Māori who in some way experienced relative social or cultural ‘deprivation’ in the city.\(^{43}\) Although such organisations existed informally throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Jarrod Gilbert has argued, it was not until the large increases in urban-born Māori in the late 1960s that Māori gang membership ‘exploded’.\(^{44}\)

\(^{39}\) Matthew M. Bennett, interview, Kohupātiki, Napier, 24 April, 2010.
\(^{40}\) Bernie Kernot, People of the Four Winds, p. 64.
\(^{42}\) *Ibid*.
\(^{43}\) Jarrod Gilbert, Patched, p. 9.
\(^{44}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 43-49.
Membership was also constantly supplemented by new Māori in the cities. Rei Harris, who established the Black Bulls gang in Wellington in 1970, remembered that ‘[i]t was rare to find a Maori born in Wellington in those days and we decided that, since we were from different tribes, we’d get something together.’ However, unlike the formal and informal gangs of this time, the Ngāti Pōneke community encouraged a pan-īwi community that resisted being defined as a group on the margins of society. They instead described themselves as an īwi of the city that was not equal in status to mana whenua īwi, but an important part of the Māori urban community nonetheless. This was made clear through the objectives that Ngāti Pōneke still held to establish a marae for Ngāti Pōneke in the city.

To fundraise for new premises, the Ngāti Pōneke community used their good relationships with government leaders, and in the early 1960s, members of the government continued to express support of the Ngāti Pōneke community. In March 1961, new Prime Minister Keith Holyoake wrote to Walter Nash that the Ngāti Pōneke Association ‘are certainly doing very good work indeed for the Maori people’.

Holyoake also informed Fred Katene that Ngāti Pōneke’s continued use of the Hall, for the time being, was secure. ‘The Government appreciates the valuable service the Association is performing’, he explained to Katene, ‘and I am happy to assure you that the arrangements for the use of the building by the Association will continue on the same basis as hitherto.’

During that year, however, plans were initiated to demolish the Hotel Cecil buildings as part of a government development scheme. The Ngāti Pōneke community responded accordingly. They aimed for their new urban marae to not be a hall or some other type of building used ‘like a marae’, but instead be a marae complex that
would accommodate customary needs as well as urban and pan-iwi activities. This Ngāti Pōneke initiative was similar to other urban Māori communities in the country who were exploring types of urban marae at the same time. In Auckland in particular, where numbers of Māori were higher than anywhere else in the country, there was a similar effort being undertaken to build an urban marae for Māori in West Auckland. This type of urban marae was different to urban-located tangata whenua marae such as for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei in Auckland and Taranaki Whānui at Waiwhetu. Instead, the Ngāti Pōneke community wanted a different type of marae for a non-tribal organisation where membership was not defined through whakapapa.

Whether whakapapa based or not, urban-residing Māori argued that marae in urban areas were invaluable for those who were distant and separated from the positive influences of whānau and kaumātua. In promoting the building of the West Auckland marae as a community centre for Māori and Pacific Islanders, Ike Amos emphasised that the marae and the community of people integral to that marae would provide urban Māori with social and cultural examples that were much needed in urban areas.

The greater number have no cultural centre or a ‘home away from home’. Here then lies the challenge to all Maori people, elders in particular — what about the children and youth of today? Traditionally their cultural centre would be the home marae. The twentieth century and its ever increasing growth frustrates this almost to the point of impossibility[sic]. Why then should they be deprived?50

The solution was urban marae for Māori in the cities, and if that meant a marae that was multi-iwi or even multi-racial in its orientation, that would be far more helpful to urban Māori than the lack of any such venue. As Amos argued, ‘in my opinion, sacrifice of tradition in one or two directions would be far wiser than total loss in the next generation.’51

51 Ibid.
For Ngāti Pōneke, the need for a permanent marae was becoming more and more important, especially because they continued to report a healthy membership. In 1965 the Ngāti Pōneke Club released an album of their songs, which reflected their many recent successes in kapa haka competitions. In support of the album, a reviewer in Te Ao Hou wrote that ‘[t]his durable group has old boys and old girls spread throughout the length of New Zealand, and it has won a well-deserved reputation for consistent excellence of performance in the cultural field, as well as having a noble record of public and patriotic service. Its successes in Maori competitions throughout the years would fill this page, its services to Maori youth are legion, its lists of members and ex-members read like a Who's-Who of Maoridom.’

And unlike the West Auckland Māori community, the Ngāti Pōneke members had a close relationship with the mana whenua iwi, including through shared membership. Bill Nathan, for example, joined in 1955 and held several leadership positions through his many decades of service. Bill also identified with the mana whenua identity of Taranaki Whānui. In fact, according to Bill Nathan, participating in the Ngāti Pōneke community enabled him to stand tall as Māori and as Ngāti Pōneke. After performing with Ngāti Pōneke alongside the groups from Ngāti Porou, the Waikato and Tāmaki Makaurau, he remembered that the pan-tribal nature of Ngāti Pōneke meant that in performances, their multiple iwi influences gave the Pōneke group a unique character that was often unparalleled.

And rather than expecting people to ‘leave their tribal identity behind at the gate’, Ngāti Pōneke held an urban tribal identity that was not intended to compete with a person’s personal tribal identities. Thesis student Yvonne M. Poole found that that Ngāti Pōneke clubs provided a ‘home away from home’ for Māori in the city that acted

52 Alan Armstrong, ‘‘A Record from Ngati Poneke Club, Review of ‘Songs of the Maori’’ Te Ao Hou, No. 52, September 1965, p. 59.
53 William (Bill) and Donas Nathan, personal communication for the purposes of the 75th Reunion of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, May 2012.
54 This quote is conveys Tapsell’s interpretation of membership in Hoani Waititi Marae in Auckland, a perspective based on the contrasts between the urban marae and other, mana whenua marae in the Auckland area. Paul Tapsell, ‘Marae and Tribal Identity’, p. 157.
against expectations of Māori assimilation. Poole stated in her thesis that there was definite value in Māori urban clubs that maintained Māori cultural and social forms in towns and cities. By providing spaces for the self-defined ‘orphan members’ of iwi, the clubs of Ngāti Pōneke were sites of traditional forms of knowledge as well as sites of adapted forms of Māori culture for modern, city living. These clubs while preserving and reviving ‘traditional’ Māori culture, do advance it’, she argued, referring to Māori cultural forms in the city.

And despite being supportive of integration, the Ngāti Pōneke community was, ultimately, non-assimilationist. Similar to earlier in the century, young urban-located Māori continued to use the Club to articulate their identities as iwi, as Māori and as Ngāti Pōneke. In 1963, Alfred and Alexander Reed described that the persistence of Māori ‘today’ was because ‘Ka Hao te Rangatahi’ - 'a new Māori society has emerged from the old'. Despite challenges, they wrote, Māori ‘are retaining their identity as the Māori people' because of many pan-iwi Māori organisations including church, political and sporting groups, but also due to ‘the Māori Youth Club movement’ of which Ngāti Akarana and Ngāti Pōneke were most prominent. The ability to maintain iwi identities as a result of membership in Ngāti Pōneke was further emphasised by long-time and founding Club member Vera Morgan in 2012 when she described that the Club played an important role in providing space for her to express herself as Māori when she was in the city. She explained that when she was in her mana whenua home in Northland, she identified firstly as a descendant of Ngāpuhi. When she travelled to Wellington, however, she switched to an identity as Ngāti Pōneke – her ‘whānau away from home’.

55 A brief version of this song was provided in Yvonne Poole, ‘Historical Foundations of Māori Youth Clubs, a) Ngāti Pōneke’, in ‘Māori Youth Groups’; and for a full version including the Māori language verses, see Witarina Harris in Grace et.al., The Silent Migration, p. 92.
56 Yvonne Poole, ‘The Effects of These Clubs Internally and Externally, A. The Internal Community’, in ‘Māori Youth Groups’.
57 Yvonne Poole, ‘Conclusion’, in ‘Māori Youth Groups’.
58 A.H and A.W Reed, in association with the Polynesian Society, Ratana, p. 109.
59 Vera Morgan, on ‘The Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club celebrated their 75th anniversary at the marae of Pipitea’, on Native Affairs, Series 6, Episode 14, 11 June 2012.
The continued activities of the Ngāti Pōneke Association therefore stood as an ongoing contradiction to such expectations of urban assimilation and a vehicle for continuities in Māori identities. By the time that the Māori population became a majority urban-residing one in 1966, the Ngāti Pōneke Association and the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club had become just two amongst many organisations in the city, but their ongoing operations since before and during World War Two, and their multi-generational membership was part of the Ngāti Pōneke community’s well-regarded character among the wider Wellington community. This final section of this chapter provides a postscript of Māori urbanisations after Māori became a majority urban-residing population. It touches on interactions in Wellington between the pan- iwi organisation of Ngāti Pōneke and the mana whenua iwi of Taranaki Whānui. It indicates what urbanisations meant to Māori at a time when wider Māori issues were coming to the forefront of public attention.


When Māori were first recorded as an urban residing population in 1966, their urban migration movements were slowing, but they were far from finished. From 1966 to 1971, the urban Māori population increased from 61.6 percent to 70.7 percent, and in the five years following, increased further, to 76.2 percent. Māori also continued to move into towns and cities at rates that exceeded non-Māori rural-urban movements. Between 1971 and 1976, non-Māori migrations to main urban areas increased by 0.7 percent, while Māori migrations to main urban areas rose by 8.1 percent in the same period. Correspondingly, Māori migrations out of rural areas between 1971 and 1976 resulted in a population decrease of 6.6 percent, while non-Māori movements during
the same five year period resulted in a decrease of only 1.3 percent. Thus the Māori population continued to be mobile, including those urban-ward migrations as well as movements within urban areas. For example, at the 1976 census, just over 40 percent of the Wellington regional Māori population had moved house at least once in the previous five years. This figure was considerably higher than the national Māori average of 32.9 percent; and the central Auckland figure of 35.7 percent.

Urban Māori populations were also increasing more than ever through births, especially as rural Māori fertility rates dropped significantly during the 1970s. Although urban Māori fertility rates were lower than those of Māori in rural areas in the decades preceding the 1970s, by 1971 the gross fertility rate for urban Māori had become 11 percent higher than the rural rate. Since a large proportion of inter-regional migrating Māori were aged between 15 and 29, the decline in rural fertilities was most likely the result of the urban relocation of the most fertile members of the Māori population. Between 1970 and 1984, for example, the rate of births for Māori mothers aged younger than 25 years old increased, demonstrating that young Māori mothers were increasing in numbers.

This meant that Māori were still transitioning demographically. Although Māori had exhibited fertility rates after the war that exceeded the non-Māori ‘baby boom’ rates during the same period, Māori fertility rates became increasingly similar to those in the non-Māori population during the 1970s. This decline in Māori fertility rates has been attributed to the influences of urban lifestyles. According to demographer Ian Pool, factors influencing the decline in Māori fertilities included intermarriage with Pākehā New Zealanders who were ‘a population with low fertility values’. By 1983,
for example, the total Māori fertility rate was 2.2 live births per woman, only slightly higher than the non-Māori rate of 1.9.\textsuperscript{65} Also, despite a significant amount of urbanisations, Māori in towns and cities still numbered low compared to Pākehā urban populations. Although most of the Māori population was urban residing in 1976, they made up only 8.6 percent of the total urban population. That year, 83.6 percent of non-Māori were resident of towns and cities.\textsuperscript{66} In a city like Wellington, this meant there was an urban Māori population of 21,489 within a total urban population of 327,414 (approximately 6.6 percent).\textsuperscript{67}

Across the country, Auckland was still the location of the most urban Māori in the country, and Wellington and the Hutt Valley continued to be a home for the second largest number of Māori. In 1971, Auckland was home to 45,777 Māori, which was 20.1 percent of the total urban Māori population; and Wellington and the Hutt Valley was home to 15,558 Māori, a much smaller 6.8 percent of all urban Māori. By 1976, both Auckland and Wellington urban areas had increased in their populations, but Auckland continued to dominate. That year, Auckland contained 60,110 Māori (22.3 percent of the total urban Māori population); and Wellington and the Hutt Valley had 21,489 (8.0 percent).\textsuperscript{68} Beyond these two main cities, other urban areas had smaller Māori populations in terms of raw numbers, but with lower Pākehā populations they had higher proportions of urban Māori. For example, similar to earlier in the century, a site of a high proportion of urban Māori to urban Pākehā in 1971 was Gisborne, which by then was home to an urban population of which 19 percent were of Māori descent. Despite their much larger numbers, the urban centres of Auckland and Wellington-Hutt Valley were only seven percent and five percent of Māori descent respectively.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., pp. 166-167.
\textsuperscript{69} New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, 1971, pp. 18, 20, 22.
However, the distribution of urban Māori throughout the urban spaces of Wellington and the Hutt Valley meant that there were some places with much higher proportions of Māori residencies. In 1971, for example, close to two-thirds of the total urban population resided in the main city and Lower Hutt, but the urban Māori population was mostly resident in suburban areas that included Porirua and Wainuiomata (Figure 19). One result of this was an increase in Māori clubs based in other areas of the city. While previously, Ngāti Pōneke had been the only performing group for central Wellington, they now stood alongside a number of other Wellington Māori groups. Between 1965 and 1969, Ngāti Pōneke started appearing in events alongside other groups such as Mawai Hakona, a club for Māori based in Upper Hutt, and the Wellington Anglican Māori Club, founded and led by the Reverend Kingi Ihaka. Nonetheless, in 1968, the Club was still holding regular meetings on Mondays with an average of 60 people attending practices at the Lambton Quay club rooms. The Club was also able to put together performing groups of any size needed for an occasion, and with many junior members and kaumātua, the total regular membership of the club was estimated to be well over 100 people.

Ngāti Pōneke also continued to provide spaces in their hall for a range of Māori groups and clubs. From the late 1960s, this began to include groups established to raise awareness about Crown wrong doings and the rights of Māori as tangata whenua. The Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1967 was a specific point of protest for many Māori of the time because that act introduced the increased powers for the state to gain ownership of Māori land. Although the 1967 Act intended to ‘promote the effective and profitable use and the efficient administration of Maori land in the interest of the owners’, in practice this included a system by which Māori land valued under $50
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would be compulsory acquired by the Māori Trustee, who then had increased abilities to on-sell that land to the Crown. This was unacceptable to many Māori, including young Māori residing in urban areas, who were more able than ever to use their access to pan-iwi groups and structures to promote Māori and non-Māori awareness of such issues. As Ranginui Walker described, urban residencies meant that young Māori were more knowledgeable about ‘the institutional structures of metropolitan society’, and as a result were ‘a new generation of leaders more suited to their times’.74

In Wellington, this included well-known activist groups made up of young urban Māori. Their leaders were influenced by protest movements overseas and ‘[f]reed from rural strictures’, they used protest activities to bring attention to Māori issues.75 They particularly made use of the media to promote their messages. In 1968, for example, a group of Wellington Māori began publication of a newsletter called Te Hokioi, promoting coverage of Māori struggles connected with class issues.76 As the tangata whenua of Aotearoa, they argued that Māori deserved a primary role in determining their present and future. They considered that disproportionate Māori representation in things like poor educational achievement and unemployment had too long been addressed by paternalistic policies and an expectation that Māori should be ‘picking themselves up by their bootstraps’. Young urban Māori thus turned the focus of discussions of the ‘Māori Problem’ back onto the state. Ngā Tamatoa was such an activist group that was formed in 1970, and over the following years they focussed their protests on annual Waitangi Day celebrations as a forum to raise awareness of the Crown’s role in determining Māori disadvantage. The more extreme active Māori groups even characterised Pākehā as competitive, exploitative and power


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1971 Māori Population</th>
<th>1971 Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>146,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>58,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petone</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>9,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Urban Area</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>10,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hutt</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>25,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>3,6044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainuiomata</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,6434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,558</strong></td>
<td><strong>307,629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hungry, with ‘[t]he inequality within society stemm[ing] from the characteristics of Pakeha individuals’.¹ As Ranginui Walker wrote in 1973, ‘[t]he failure to look at historical factors that have produced angry Maori youth in our cities... is seen as a Pakeha problem.’² And urbanisations were a direct focus of many of these discussions.

Ngāti Pōneke, however, continued to have a good relationship with the state, even if they were sometimes critical of state policies for Māori. The activity of the Club during World War Two and in ‘spar[ing] no effort to make New Zealanders, both Maori and European, appreciative of Maori culture’ meant that Ngāti Pōneke was still held in high esteem by government officials.³ This was a good thing because state support was necessary for the lengthy fundraising drive for the Ngāti Pōneke marae plans.

In 1969, Ngāti Pōneke leaders negotiated with officials to identify a possible site for their permanent marae. In September, the Minister of Māori Affairs announced that the Ngāti Pōneke Association was to be presented with an opportunity to build their new community centre at a site on Thorndon Quay. This was to be a ‘focal point for the Maori community of Wellington’. Bill Nathan, acting as the Vice-President of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, stated that ‘we are tremendously thrilled by this action of the Government in giving us a site on which we will be able to continue what we have done for so long.’⁴ From the government’s perspective, Ngāti Pōneke had a proven track record in aiding young urban-migrating Māori to adapt to city living, and the Minister of Māori Affairs explained that the government’s decision recognised Ngāti Pōneke’s assistance over the previous three decades. ‘In these days when everybody is worried about the crime rate amongst Maori youth’, Duncan MacIntyre explained, ‘institutions such as Ngati Poneke have a tremendous value in catering for the young people who move into the city.’ In expectation that the generous offer from
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the government would be accepted, Bill Nathan stated that the next big task was to finance the building of their marae, the cost of which was not yet known.\(^5\)

But this cooperation with the state did not mean Ngāti Pōneke was uncritical of government policies for Māori. Although their previous encouragement of Māori integration helped them receive certain benefits from the state, Ngāti Pōneke also started to be more explicit in their intentions of retaining Māoritanga in urban areas. For example, in 1964 the Club was reported as contributing ‘publicly in aid of a wide variety of worthy causes, as it is felt that such performances can do much to further mutual under-standing, both cultural and social, between Maori and Pakeha’; whilst in 1971 this was refined as meaning more about Māori control of such expressions of Māoritanga.\(^6\) That year, Paul Reeves, a long-time Wellington resident, Anglican Bishop of Waiapu and descendant of the Te Ātiawa hapū of Puketapu, spoke at a fundraising luncheon for Ngāti Pōneke. In front of an audience that included Prime Minister Sir Keith Holyoake, opposition leader Mr Hugh Watt and Wellington Mayor Sir Francis Kitts, he said that urbanisations were the source of ongoing challenges for Māori and iwi. Reeves told the audience that Māori control of changes in recent times showed that Māori were capable of controlling their own destinies.

Hikurangi is still there, the river still flows, but where are the people.... Many have chosen to live elsewhere.... We have problems because we live with change. The problem is not to bring about change, but to keep control of the changes we bring about.\(^7\)

Beyond the desire to retain Māori identities in urban areas, the focus of debate was now changing to emphasise Māori control of such strategies. Although Māori had done this already through the twentieth century, this growing sentiment within the Club reflected the influence of the young Māori groups who sought more radical change. It also showed increasing Māori frustration that they continued to be side-

\(^5\) \textit{Ibid.}\n
\(^6\) ‘Maori Clubs’, \textit{Te Ao Hou}, No. 49, November 1964, p. 34.

lined by the larger non-Māori majority.  

Some unification was achieved between seemingly disparate iwi and other types of Māori groups to protest against Crown actions through putting the focus on colonisation, with the state being responsible for Māori landlessness, dispossession and more. In particular, as Hauraki Greenland described, ‘[l]and as turangawaewae (a place to stand) formed the basis of a more all-embracing attack on the values and institutions of Pakeha society’.  

It was during this time, that Māori were coming together to argue that despite urbanisations they ‘will never be’, as Pae Ruha stated when interviewed for this thesis, ‘manuhiri in [their] own country’.  

Shifting ideas about urbanisations as a consequence of colonisation and assimilationist intent by governments meant that Ngāti Pōneke continued to negotiate what it meant to be an iwi in the city. As Hill has argued, while the adaptation and continuation of rangatiratanga was successful through the twentieth century, it was not without its challenges; and in the words of Hugh Kawharu, the ‘path’ for urban Māori was ‘tortuous and strewn with many surprises’. Ngāti Pōneke experienced challenges, both on local and national levels, and these were epitomised by the tensions that arose when the pan-iwi Club was asked to appear on behalf of all Māori at celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1973. Although Ngāti Pōneke had generously stepped in to replace the original group who were no longer able to attend, that was the last time that Ngāti Pōneke would perform at Waitangi. This was partly because in the early 1970s, Māori focussed on Waitangi Day celebrations as a way to increase awareness about the status of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand policy and law.
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In 1971, Ngā Tamatoa protested at the celebrations at Waitangi, and a year later they called for a boycott of the event. Joined by other urban-educated, young Māori, they planned protests for Waitangi Day 1972, to emphasising the importance of the day to Māori.13 ‘Maoris are fearful that they will become a landless people in their own country’, a member of the Federation of Māori Students stated. ‘Integration and Assimilation are now dirty words to many Maoris’.14

Figure 20. Members of Te Pātaka Māori Group, including Ngāti Pōneke members, were involved in a welcome for the Beatles when they came to Wellington in 1964. Lifetime Club member Donas Nathan is standing just behind John Lennon. ‘The Beatles and an unidentified Maori group at Wellington Airport during their New Zealand tour’, in Hill, Morrie: Negatives of Wellington and national events and personalities, Ref 1/4-071859-F, ATL, Wellington.

The Waitangi Day celebrations at which Ngāti Pōneke was present in 1973 was, accordingly, an instance when Māori and the state demonstrated their differing views on the importance of the day. At the celebrations in February 1973, Prime Minister Norman Kirk announced that from the following year, Waitangi Day would become a national public holiday celebrated as ‘New Zealand Day’. For Kirk, this was an action intended to bring all New Zealanders, regardless of ethnic background, together to

13 Richard S. Hill, Maori and the State, pp. 150, 154.
celebrate the shared experiences of Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand. Holding the hand of a young Māori boy, Prime Minister Kirk aimed to project an image of peaceful race relations between Māori and Pākehā, and between Māori and the state.15

Māori welcomed the increase in status of Waitangi Day, but sought more significant measures, and for their part, the state was also introducing ways to recognise these Māori aspirations. Māori protests continued through the 1970s in reaction to continuing instances of contentious Māori policy by the state. The Māori Land March 1975 was similar to other marches held by minority ethnic groups against governments overseas, and in New Zealand, it became an iconic (but fleeting) moment of Māori unity against the state in the post-war decades.16 The Labour government between 1972 and 1975 introduced a new policy for Māori which has been described as a letting go, finally and once and for all, state intentions for the full assimilation of Māori. In their short and ‘crowded’ three years, they amended, introduced and passed legislation that recognised Māori desires for recognition of their rangatiratanga and acknowledged their losses under previous administrations. In 1975, the Treaty of Waitangi Act was passed recognising the Treaty as a founding document of New Zealand and establishing a permanent commission of enquiry into contemporary breaches of the Treaty. The significance of this Act would be huge and its impact wide ranging, especially as Māori protests continued to bring attention to grievances and claims against governments beyond the present and into the past. One thing was clear: the 1975 Act emphasised the importance of both tribal categories and the rights of individual Māori. Any person of Māori descent could now bring a claim against the actions or inaction of the Crown.

In the city of Wellington, Ngāti Pōneke faced new challenges. As a long-time location for Māori who sought connection with Māori systems and structures whilst far away

16 See Aroha Harris, Hīkoi: Forty Years of Māori Protest (Wellington, 2004), pp. 68-77, especially pp. 70, 76; Richard S. Hill, Māori and the State, pp. 162-169.
from their home place, Club members began to accelerate their work to acquire a space and raise funds to build a permanent marae for their operations in the city. Their marae building and shift in focus towards a more overt expression of Māori social and cultural forms was impacted upon by the cultural ‘renaissance’ in which young Māori were seeking to reconnect with their tribal roots that had been ‘left behind’ when they, their parents or grandparents had moved to the city. This cultural ‘renaissance’, Hill has argued, was inappropriately named because instead of sacrificing iwi, hapū and other indigenous connections through urbanisations, Māori identities continued to be articulated on several interacting levels.¹⁷ As the 1970s continued, the Ngāti Pōneke identity as an ‘iwi of the city’ thus became increasingly contrasted with mana whenua identities.

In 1969, the Ngāti Pōneke community received a site for their marae that was significant not only because of the overt expression it provided of the Ngāti Pōneke connection to the area, but also because it was also a location that made their path forwards inseparable from the histories and ongoing presence of Taranaki Whānui. The location at Pipitea was the site of an historical Māori community of Taranaki Whānui descent, one which iwi members continued to consider as part of their customary area of interest in Wellington. Thus with a pan-Māori marae built on the site on Thorndon Quay, different Māori identities were interacting. Although Ngāti Pōneke were anchored into the landscape as urban-located, but more importantly as Māori, in this location, their permanent home meant significantly overlapped interactions with the mana whenua iwi. After an exhaustive fundraising process, the marae was opened in 1980, and the opening was attended by tangata whenua and other Māori. Significantly, the Chairman of the Ngāti Pōneke Association that year was Ralph Love, son of Ripeka and Wi Hape Love and strongly connected to the mana whenua iwi at Te Whanganui ā Tara.

Both prior to and after the opening of the Ngāti Pōneke marae at Pipitea, therefore, there were major overlaps between Ngāti Pōneke and the mana whenua. When Ralph Love wrote his introduction to the 1980 programme for the marae opening from his position as both President of Ngāti Pōneke and a member of Te Āti Awa from the Wellington region, he balanced recognition of Ngāti Pōneke as a service to all Wellingtonians with a Māori understanding of urban Māori connections to space. He wrote:

This Hui today is a momentous gathering for it marks, not only the relighting of the Ahikainga, (the fire of the Marae) which was extinguished over 100 years ago, but also the establishment and recognition of the Turangawaewae for Ngati Poneke and all the accepted community standards of Maori and Pakeha which Ngati Poneke stands for.  

The idea that the location of Pipitea could become a ‘türangawaewae’ of the Ngāti Pōneke community, whilst still being ‘our marae’ of the mana whenua iwi, points to the significant overlaps between iwi identities. Love spoke not only as a leader for his iwi, but also as the president of the non-sectarian, non-iwi, non-racial based community institution of Ngāti Pōneke. In his introduction to the opening of the marae at Pipitea, he wrote that ‘Ngati Poneke has reached its ultimate’, ‘it has its Iwi, its turangawaewae, its own Marae to stand on.’ In stating this, Love described Ngāti Pōneke in tribal terms – iwi, tūrangawaewae, marae. By recognising that the members of Ngāti Pōneke had a form of tūrangawaewae in the Wellington urban area, he recognised the whānau and individuals in the club as having a historical claim in the area within tribal conceptions of identity. ‘The Marae is now in being, alive and “kua ka te ahi”’, he summarised, adding that ‘the fire has been rekindled.’

But as time went on, the Ngāti Pōneke community received flak from some Māori who disagreed publicly about the status of Ngāti Pōneke as being like an iwi. Instead, it was argued that whakapapa or descent-based identities were of ongoing (and even
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increasing) importance for a population that included a majority of urban-dwelling members. Questions were asked about how Māori identities should interact in urban areas. Hugh Kawharu, from the ‘urban encircled iwi’ of Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei, mused that ‘[t]radition offers no precedent for this – for manuhiri who come to "stay", and perhaps produce a generation or two of their own (and not necessarily with the assistance of the tangata whenua): thus Ngati Akarana, Ngati Poneke, Ngati Pamutana and the like.... A key problem here, for actors and analysts alike, turns on the matter of symbolism, [that is], on the way identities are created, manipulated, expressed and recreated.’

Hirini Moko Mead further argued in 2003 that ‘[a]s rallying points for action and for calling the people together the whānau, hapū and iwi have no peers. People respond to the call of their whānau, which remains the most supportive and important group in the life of any Māori.’ As a result, the author summarised that urban groups could not replace whakapapa as a significant tool for Māori social organisation. ‘[N]o one pretends that Ngāti Pōneke is equal in status to Te Āti Awa,’ he argued. ‘Ngāti Pōneke is an honorific term. The tikanga is that the tangata whenua of a region are always recognised by urban groups.’

However, the ongoing participation of Māori in the Ngāti Pōneke community, including not only urban Māori but also the founders and their descendants, emphasised a type of whakapapa relationship between Māori who were once not kin, but who became like kin through their urban iwi. In the Ngāti Pōneke history, The Silent Migration, Vera Morgan remembered that it was whānau that drew her to the Club. ‘I was never one for action songs and that. It wasn’t the reason I went there. For me it was whānau. Even today – being together. Those of us who are still alive from those early days have a real love for each other.... I think that’s the biggest gift any organisation can provide.’

Although opened in 1980, the decoration of the marae also took another 15 years, and this too was a way in which multiple Māori identities
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were evident. The whakairo that filled out and surrounded the building recognised the roles of the many Māori leaders who had been instrumental in encouraging the continuity of the Club, including Āpirana Ngata, Maui Pomare and Lady Pomare, as well as the Tahiwi brothers, the Loves and many others.

As Māori became a majority urban people, there were still many challenges to be confronted. These challenges included shifting expectations about what it meant to Māori in the city, with pan-iwi identities and mana whenua identities overlapping, complimenting and sometimes competing with each other. Wellington was a unique case in this sense because the major pan-iwi organisation of Ngāti Pōneke had more often than not, worked in consultation with the mana whenua iwi, and had maintained connections with them through all the changes in governments, policies and social environments. Through urbanisations, Māori had not only grown in their interactions with non-Māori populations, they had increased in their interactions with other Māori from different backgrounds. From these challenges, Māori both worked together and disagreed on many matters, but by the 1970s there was at least one point of broad agreement: that a problem in urbanisations and its associated phenomena was a consequence of ongoing colonisation. As a result, Māori argued that it was time Māori issues were in the hands of Māori themselves, once and for all. Urbanisations were increasingly no longer viewed as simply progressive and for the betterment of Māori, and Māori had their own ideas about how they would determine their lives in urban areas. Māori activities in towns and cities demonstrated that although urbanisations had threatened their assimilation, the ongoing presence of Māori identities proved otherwise.
Chapter Eight: ‘Māoritanga is Māori Business’

‘Urbanisation has undoubtedly facilitated full or partial Maori inclusion into national, regional, and local life... but it has not, as many Europeans hoped or still expect, necessarily ensured the development of a mono-cultural society but rather a bi-cultural one. The experience of a move to the cities, and the new found social and economic opportunities, have led frequently to a resurgence of a Māori concern for identity, for a revival and flourishing of Maoritanga rather than its demise.’

Kerry Howe, 1977.

Over the twentieth century, Māori shifted from being a majority rural located population to one that was mostly resident in towns and cities. In doing so, many Māori lived far from their homes and from their families. They were challenged to adjust to social, cultural and economic systems that seemed foreign, and they were also granted insights into both the benefits and disadvantages of those modern lifestyles. In towns and cities, Māori had greater access to employment, educational and enjoyment opportunities, but they also experienced feelings of disconnection and loss. As a result, many Māori sought fellowship with other Māori in situations similar to themselves, and urban Māori communities developed.

Through the twentieth century, the ways in which urbanisations were viewed impacted upon the ways in which they were understood and are remembered by Māori. In particular, ideas that urbanisations removed man from his ‘natural’
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environment’, whilst at the same time being progressive, extended from non-Māori urbanisations until they were also applied to Māori. A major outcome of such discussions as they changed over the twentieth century was that ideas about urbanisations became intertwined with ideas on modernisation, integration and assimilation.

Māori also observed the connections being made between moving to a city and the loss of their culture or identities, but for the most part, they fought against such assumptions. For some, this meant a deliberate and active struggle to maintain and promote Māoritanga, but for others it was something they presumed they would achieve. This thesis has shown that this can be seen in the way that although widespread urbanisations did occur – and present urban-residing rates of the Māori population are around 84 percent – this majority urban-residing population cannot easily be referred to as ‘urban Māori’. Instead, Māori acceptances of ‘urban’ as being a word that can be applied to them are diverse. In the words of Wikitoria Paaka when she was asked about what urban Māori meant to her: ‘[i]t’s only a title, it’s only a name. I still prefer to be called Māori rather than urban Māori. That title doesn’t really concern me. To me, it has no meaning. It has nothing.’

The reasons why some Māori do not like to be referred to as urban emerged from a number of sources through the twentieth century, including media commentary and government policies towards Māori. A major point to emphasise is that much of the dialogue about urban Māori that gained attention during the 1990s was around Treaty Settlement processes that exposed diverse perspectives on what ‘urban Māori’ meant. This thesis has shown, however, that the roots of discontent with ‘urban’ reach much further back in New Zealand’s history than the 1990s. For example, when non-Māori urbanisations occurred, they were part of broad-reaching economic trends in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but they were still initially seen as removing ‘man’ from his rightful connections to nature. But despite such ideas, urbanisations

continued nonetheless. Over time, understandings about what it meant to be urban-residing became connected to modern lives, which also were characterised as Pākehā.

This thesis used the Wellington area as a case study to explore the ways that urbanisation experiences are retold by Māori as being part of longer migration and iwi-specific histories. As well as histories of change, they are histories of Māori migrations throughout the motu, as well as of colonisation – a process that made Māori ‘rural’ in conceptual terms. Through the nineteenth century, the development of settler communities and their towns and cities created urban lives that consisted almost completely of Pākehā. Even though some Māori became part of the growing urban areas because towns and cities grew around their tribal homes, Māori land loss and state policies for Māori edged most iwi outside of urban areas. By the time that Māori returned to cities as part of twentieth century urban migrations, they by necessity involved the mixing of identities in towns and cities. This not only included Māori with Pākehā, but also iwi with iwi.

This thesis has shown that such iwi-iwi interactions made the urban areas of Wellington and the Hutt Valley locations of an interesting history of urbanisations. This involved co-existence, cooperation and competitiveness between the iwi with longstanding claims to the area as mana whenua, and the distinctively urban and pan-iwi organisation of Ngāti Pōneke. These organisations contrasted with one another because they consisted of memberships based in different criteria of inclusion. The mana whenua, such as for Taranaki Whānui, included members defined on the basis of whakapapa as descent; and Ngāti Pōneke included members defined on the basis of whakapapa in much broader terms: including as a wider category of Māori. Drawing on new research conducted for this thesis and evidence from the works of a number of recent authors, this thesis has shown how these different types of Māori social organisation were ways in which Māori ensured the maintenance of Māoritanga through urbanisations.

And ultimately, urbanisations were a process through which Māori identities were contrasted and interacting, but in which layered Māori identities thrived. This was
reflected in the evidence provided by all interviewees for this thesis and described throughout the chapters, including Wikitoria Paaka cited above. For her, Māori identities were dynamic, robust and pervasive. There was no doubt that her living in the urban spaces of the Wellington and Hutt Valley areas meant that she was anything less than the Māori woman she was, including all her identities of whānau, hapū and iwi.

The contrasting urban and iwi social organisations of mana whenua iwi and Ngāti Pōneke were also supportive of urbanising Māori well before official structures had been set up to accommodate such Māori. Urban groups and iwi responded quickly to the growth of Māori populations in urban areas, and they provided strategies for Māori adjustment to urban lifestyles that centred on Māori community. The building of the mana whenua marae, Te Tatau o te Pō, for example, was partially a response to these increasing Māori populations. Opened in 1933, this marae provided an appropriate location for mana whenua iwi and hapū to express manaakitanga for guests, and consolidate their own iwi objectives and identities. Thus, although many histories on Māori urban migrations have focussed on World War Two as igniting a massive growth of Māori urban migrations that took place in the decades following the war, this thesis has shown that Māori urban living had not only been taking place well before the war, it was already engaging in assisting Māori in their urban migrations.

During this time, Māori emphasised that they desired to retain, maintain and grow their Māoritanga in urban areas. This became increasingly clear to Pākehā and the state through the twentieth century. In some cases, these Māori desires were explicit. The criticism directed at the Crown during the country-wide celebrations of the centenary of the signing of the Treaty, for example, was about the Crown’s failure to recognise historical Māori grievances against multiple governing administrations. Other times, the desires to retain Māoritanga were indirectly expressed. For example, the consensus by many Māori, often discussed outside of the ‘ear’ of the government,
that they should ‘kia mau ki tō Māoritanga’ – hold onto the things that made them Māori.

The work of the Ngāti Pōneke was perhaps one of these indirect expressions of the maintenance of Māoritanga because of their excellent relationship with state officials. During the war, they demonstrated their commitment to national causes by representing Māori in performances at the National Centennial Exhibition, and prior to the establishment of the Māori War Effort Organisation, they actively recruited Māori men for war services. They were also dedicated to fundraising for soldiers and civilians based in Wellington. For this work, Ngāti Pōneke received use of a government-owned hall on a pepper-corn rental, demonstrating how well their work was connected to and supported by state officials. According to officials, the Ngāti Pōneke group was an excellent example for future Māori social interactions in the city.

However, the excellent relationship between Ngāti Pōneke and the state was also a way in which Ngāti Pōneke members were able to pursue their own objectives in the maintenance of Māori identities and well-being of urban-located Māori. This was important because Māori urban-residing populations were not temporary: they were still increasing. The Māori War Effort Organisation provided one way that young Māori were connected into cities during the war, especially through the manpowering of young Māori into the city. These networks also played a part in chain migrations that came to influence urban migrations in the post-war decades, especially urban migrations as a result of perceptions by young Māori that the towns and cities were the best place to go for busy and exciting lifestyles. and when such young Māori arrived in the city, they were attracted to the urban community provided by Ngāti Pōneke.

After the war, Māori communities in the city continued to notice the growing numbers of Māori, and it came down to Māori organisations to meet urban-Māori needs. For Ngāti Pōneke, this meant providing access to ‘enjoyment’ and leisure-time activity that would also provide them a base to call their home away from home. In the years leading up to the public release of The Hunn Report in 1961, the Club and community
were continually identified by the government as providing a valuable service to local Māori because of their encouragement of integration. In the 1950s, the Ngāti Pōneke community engaged in the official tribal committee system, but they also continued to operate and assist Māori outside of official systems. They capitalised on increased numbers of young Māori in the city and the enjoyment they provided was based on Māori values – including performances and interacting with international guests.

Thus for members of the Ngāti Pōneke community, encouragement of integrations was not a message of assimilation. Although the Club had been established in 1937 because Māori felt outnumbered in the city, Māori in urban areas in the post-war decades continued to long for fellowship ‘with other Māori faces’. In this context, the reasons the Club continued to operate extended beyond fellowship under a shared Māori identity. Instead, these urban Māori were like whānau, and the Club enabled shared and unique Māori identities to coexist. From its very beginnings, the Club used iwi, hapū or whānau structures to enhance the relationships between members who were not kin. This was more obvious as more and more Māori moved into Wellington and became engaged in Club activities.

And while The Hunn Report and resulting discussions about the future for Māori social and cultural forms in urban areas included perspectives that Māoritanga should dissolve until only the ‘fittest’ elements of ‘being Māori’ would remain, other spoke directly against such messages, emphasising that Māori identities would not be assimilated through urbanisation and integration. Although some Māori continued to experience feelings of cultural loss and isolation from whanau when moving into the city, with more Māori in cities there was also increased opportunities for Māori community, including both urban whānau and whakapapa whānau. The tales of cultural loss that were told then became tales that were not strictly evidence of loss because they were told by Māori who sought to retain and emphasise the importance of Māori identities. In towns and cities, Māori identified with multiple home places, and while they sometimes lived at large distances from their whānau and marae, their supposedly contrasting identities as Māori, iwi and hapū became overlaid in the urban
landscape: Māori moved between, and continuously carried with them, different identities. For Ngāti Pōneke members, this included not only being mana whenua of wherever their iwi might be located, they also increasingly saw themselves as an urban iwi of Wellington. Such multiple and layered identities were demonstrated by all people who provided information on their life stories for this thesis. It is something that existed in Māori identities during the twentieth century, and it is something that persists today.

These layered Māori identities sit beneath the ongoing discussions about what Māori urbanisations were, and what they have meant. A major factor in Māori perspectives on urbanisations has been the state’s ongoing goal of Māori assimilation or, following The Hunn Report, integration – something which has had long-lasting effects on Māori perspectives on urbanisations as being synonymous to assimilation or colonisation. However, in insisting upon integration/assimilation, especially through The Hunn Report, the state underestimated the scale of the necessity and the rapidity of Māori urban migrations, and it failed to recognise Māori desires for the maintenance of Māori, iwi and hapū identities. In the fall-out of The Hunn Report, Māori in towns and cities began to turn the focus of urbanisations away from the discussions of the ‘Māori Problems’ that had filled books and reports through the twentieth century. They now turned the focus onto the ways that the state was responsible. A.C. Walsh, who studied Māori demographics and is quoted by the title for this chapter, criticised the government for selecting the ‘preferable’ elements of Māoritanga, while continuing to deny other important cultural elements such as language, community life and ownership of the land. ‘They are being very presumptuous’, he argued, ‘to tell Maoris what they can and cannot keep of their own culture. Māoritanga is primarily Maori business.’³

Urbanisations have also been identified as a difficult topic, interlaid with cultural and paternalistic meanings that caused them to be understood as one source for Māori
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disconnections to tribal knowledge and identities. And as this thesis has shown, feelings of loss or loneliness when moving into the city were a common experience (although not universal). But although such disconnections were difficult for many, the underlying message to the explicit tales of disconnection was strength and continuity: that urban Māori could – and should – actively retain and maintain Māori values and other taonga in cities. Thus although there were many authors who discussed and promoted the difficulties that Māori had in living towns and cities – and again, for many this was a reality of their experiences – these were also histories that fuelled Māori desires to reconnect with their Māori and iwi identities. They were experiences that drew Māori together to enact fellowship with other Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau.

By 1976, over three quarters of Māori were living in towns and cities and the motives behind the creation of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club remained as valid as ever, being part of urbanising Māori experiences. With more Māori in towns and cities than any time previously, the strength of Māori groups had entered into a different age.

By the end of the period covered in this thesis, urban Māori communities had formed faster, were more widespread, than at any time previous, exceeding the expectations of many. The 1970s were also a time when it became clear that Māori and the state could both be confident that Māori social and cultural forms were not destined for absorption into the dominant, Pākehā culture, and Māori, like Pae Ruha in Wellington, continued to negotiate what it meant to be Māori in the city. For Pae, and for many other Māori, urban living was still a matter of engaging with a ‘dominant’ and Pākehā culture that was unsure about the ongoing relevance of Māori in modern, urban areas. But it was also something that made her sure who she was, and taught her that she had rights to Aotearoa as a person of Māori descent. She reflected on this in 2009 and came to the conclusion that conversations by Māori during the later parts of the twentieth century, in which writers like Ranginui Walker promoted Māori issues, was proof of Māori longevity.

There are quite a few examples over the years where you still get questioned, you know, as to the value or the validity of hanging on to a culture that is
forever changing according to the dominant culture. [Laughs] I’m getting just as bad at using words as the dominant culture [Laughs].

Yes, so, I mean, there is still elements of that about. Although I have said, and I will always say, I give credit to people for trying. And if people are trying, that’s a plus in my book. But if people are deliberately saying, “oh there’s no future in that”, as ours were forced to do; to say, “oh, no use speaking in Māori, there’s no future in that”, that was the kind of learning that was imposed on their generation, that you had to go this way, be assimilated type of thing.

But as has been proven, by writers like Ranginui [Walker], and everybody else who protested over the years that we are not there to be assimilated. You know, we are here because we’re here, and we intend to be here as the iwi Māori or as the indigenous people of Aotearoa.4

As Pae Ruha stated, the continued presence of Māori in towns and cities showed that despite expectations that Māori would assimilate: they did not, and would not. Instead, there are things shared between Māori as the tangata whenua of New Zealand, and things that are unique to whānau, hapū and marae. These are things that have deliberately stood against assimilation.

Urbanisation and urbanisations, therefore, can be difficult to discuss. But by exploring these ideas, this thesis has allowed a unique insight into the ways that longer stories of Māori and migrations have contributed to the lining up of ideas of urbanisation, assimilation, integration and disconnections. The oral history methods used in this thesis were an important factor in exploring this phenomenon, and the interactions with kuia and kaumātua reinforced the fact that Māori experiences of urbanisations are, and were, a topic that related to Māori identities.

Interviewed kuia and kaumātua were shown throughout the thesis as consistently rejecting the idea of ‘urban’ Māori. Although some discussed it as emerging during Treaty settlement processes in the1990s, this thesis has shown that discomfort with urbanisations had its roots in a longer Māori history of dealing with settlers, Pākehā, the state, other Māori and other iwi. To live in urban areas necessitates the increased

interactions between people of different social and cultural backgrounds, but despite the clear concern – both in the past and one that continues today – that urbanisation would mean the loss of identities, this was not a necessity. This thesis has shown that many Māori moved into towns and cities already armed with the tools they needed to maintain and develop what they wanted to achieve.

The final structure of this thesis was the result of an interchange between the perspectives of Māori, who moved into the city during the twentieth century, and other sources of information. I was handed small gifts of information from kuia and kaumātua. Although I was, in no way, able to record their full stories or their complete understandings, the information shared was precious nonetheless. I quoted Pae Ruha at the beginning and end to illustrate this point. While she said ‘well I hate being called urban Māori’, she also said ‘that we are not here to be assimilated.’ Through people like her and people who were active members of their Māori communities (and who still are), this thesis has shown that urbanisation was something that could be perceived as being the same as assimilation, but one Māori also showed was not.

**Further Research**

Following the end of the period studied in this thesis, Māori continued to demonstrate they were dynamic and growing communities by establishing a number of another type of Māori organisation that had not previously been used through the twentieth century, especially in the Wellington area. These groups were taurahere organisations that specifically accommodated iwi identities in areas distant from home places.

The name ‘taurahere’ refers to an image of a rope being bound or fastened to something. The name is used to refer to iwi or hapū groups that meet in an area outside of the traditional spaces of their iwi or hapū. Through taurahere groups,
which are often urban-based, iwi or hapū members are able to maintain their connections to identities grounded in tribal landscapes, far away.

In New Zealand, taurahere groups have the advantage that the distances are not necessarily great between where Māori reside and where they have whakapapa. However, for many Māori, these distances have been large enough that frequencies of returning home were too low. As this thesis has shown, regardless of how close a papa kāinga may have been, such distances were often still felt to be too far, and desires to have friendships with other Māori were compelling. With more and more Māori residing in towns and cities and a broad range of types of groups orientated to Māori interests and experiences, it was only a matter of time before official groups were established to advance hapū and iwi in urban centres that were distant from their customary areas of interest. Initially, many such iwi-centred social groupings were informal gatherings of like-minded Māori who found comfort in associating with other individuals and whānau from familiar backgrounds. Over time, some of these became more formal organisations.

Since taurahere groups accommodated Māori who wanted social connections with other Māori like themselves, they were especially useful for both first-generation urban migrants and the generations of Māori who were urban-born. Although, as Roger Maaka has argued, these groups have been restricted in the amount that they could promote descent-based relationships beyond the broad category of the iwi as a basis for membership, they nonetheless have been an important way for Māori in urban areas to keep in touch. By the 1970s, there were large numbers of Māori who had been born into cities, and this was a period when a number of taurahere organisations were established to maintain the relationships, tikanga and reo between kin. Well-known examples included the Tūhoe marae, Te Tira Hou, that was opened in Auckland in 1973; and the urban ‘hapū’ of Ngāti Awa such as the Ngāti Awa ki Tāmaki

‘hapū’ that was established as the Auckland Mataatua Society Incorporated in May 1975.6

Taurahere organisations are an interesting topic for further research. Although it is now an established part of Māori histories that Māori identities are overlaid and layered, especially in urban residencies as this thesis has shown, there are interesting histories still to be told about the interactions of taurahere organisations with other groups. Christina Gonzalez, for example, has studied Wellington-based Ngāti Kahungunu and their connections with their home places. But beyond considering taurahere and iwi according to a kind of ‘iwi diaspora’, it will be interesting for a study to be produced on the interactions of taurahere with other iwi and Māori groups.7 In the Wellington area, this would include the development of taurahere and their relationships with pan-iwi groups such as Ngāti Pōneke, and also the relationships between taurahere and the mana whenua iwi. As this thesis has shown, the Ngāti Pōneke community was developed out of these same desires of Māori to build and foster friendships with other Māori like themselves. However an exploration of why this was no longer a prime option for some urban Māori who sought iwi and hapū specific relationships instead will likely produce some interesting work on the relevance of Crown policy and especially, the development of the Crown Treaty settlements policy.

It is also an important area for future research given that there are continuities in Māori identities and motivations for moving when looking at Māori migrations ‘across the ditch’. Given the large numbers of Māori now residing in Australia (reported in 2011 as being over 128,000 Māori), an additional area for further research is the layered Māori identities and motivations for urbanisations that have spanned across urbanisations internal to New Zealand during the twentieth century to international

7 Christina M. Gonzalez, ‘‘Be(com)ing’ Ngāti Kahungunu in the Diaspora’, pp. 38-42.
migrations to Australia. From preliminary and anecdotal evidence, Māori communities in Australia still stress the importance of hapū and iwi connections, as well as desires to have fellowship with other Māori. Iwi holding Treaty settlement information hui in Australia, for example, report attendance from not only iwi members but other members of Australian-based Māori communities hungry for connections with home. Despite living in Australia, it is clear that Māori still emphasise their connections to their tūrangawaewae, something that has resonated with the findings of this thesis that showed the ways Māori in urban areas in New Zealand have continued to stress the importance of their connections to home places. As a report on Māori living in Australia in 2009 described, this is particularly evident in the way that Māori tended to view themselves not as ‘ethnic settlers’ in Australia, but ‘long-term visitors’.

Lastly, the findings in the thesis about Māori identities and connections with home places over time are historical in that they ‘belong’ to a certain time period of the twentieth century. However, it is important to emphasise that they are a continuous feature in Māori histories. When Māori moved into Wellington during the 1930s, they wanted to have better access to good employment, housing and healthcare, and they also wanted to remain and grow in their Māoritanga. This was a reason why the Ngāti Pōneke community was established and continued to attract members through its many decades of operation. Despite increasing Māori numbers of Māori in towns and cities, the desires to retain, maintain and grow Māori identities and knowledge was a significant experience for Māori who moved away from their home places throughout the twentieth century. It is also something that fuels Māori to continue to seek such connections and knowledge in 2014 and onwards.

This continuity in Māori histories speaks to the ways that Māori conceptualise history, that is, that history consists of the past and the present, layered upon one another,
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9 Paul Hamer, Maori in Australia: Nga Maori i Te Ao Moemoea (Wellington, 2007), pp. Xii, 43-49.
almost inseparable. Thus for Māori histories, it is common that the past is always ‘present’ and we ‘walk with’ our tīpuna. When interviewees for this thesis discussed their experiences of urbanisations, they also kept in mind the people that they knew, their predecessors and their descendants. At the basis of this thesis, therefore, knowledge about urbanisations and its connections to Māori identities rested upon the foundation of whakapapa, especially connections between people. In short, Māori history is Māori people.

While ideas about what it meant to be urban Māori or iwi or general Māori have sometimes clashed and competed, especially through urbanisations, they have also been an important part of many aspects of different types of Māori identities during the twentieth century. Urban Māori communities played an important role in emphasising not only the importance of Māori tribal structures, but also the significance of varied and layered Māori identities and the ways that they could be maintained. These factors all contributed to the perspectives of the kuia and kaumātua involved in the research for this thesis, perspectives that emphasised that while urban was an important consideration of their pasts, it was not a significant identity character to describe themselves. In the end, urbanisations are stories about people.

He aha te mea nui o te ao? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.
Appendices

Appendix 1: A Note on Oral Histories

The significant methodological considerations for the oral history research for this thesis were explained in Chapter Two. Refer to Chapter Two for more information on the technical matters described briefly below.

The difference between oral history interviews and personal communications are based on the different ways I interacted with people participating in the research. After one or two meetings to discuss the objectives and outputs of the research, the interview would discuss the four guiding questions, which were described in Chapter Two. Follow-up meetings to discuss what was said in the interview and how it should be recorded were considered to be personal communications because they were relatively informal. They were also not necessarily conducted in person, for example, they could be over the phone through email. In this way, interviews were a base from which more reflective discussions could be held. Some participants chose not to undertake a formal interview, but nonetheless participated in discussions about the research. They are recorded as providing personal communications only.

I also note that I decided to limit my use of the unedited oral history material collected for the Ngāti Pōneke oral history, *The Silent Migration: The Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club, 1937-1948*. This was because I considered that use of this primary material would be unnecessary considering that the interview material was subjected to appropriate editing methods before publishing. Instead, the information included in the final book was considered to more than suffice for the research purposes of this
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thesis, especially because in some interviews, kaumātua referred to the final book as providing important insights into Ngāti Pōneke histories.\(^\text{11}\)

Below are descriptions of the participants in the research for this thesis. They are divided as those who participated in oral history interviews and personal communications, and those who participated in personal communications only.

**Oral History Interviews**

Jean Albert, interview, Silverstream, Upper Hutt, 22 April 2009; personal communication, Ōtaki, 8 March 2011.

Through her whānau, Jean Albert (Ngāti Raukawa, Te Whānau a Apanui, Ngāti Whakaue) has had a life time of experiences in Ngāti Pōneke and has held secretarial positions on and off for Ngāti Pōneke since 1962.

Being fortunate to be fully aware of her tribal affiliations, Jean grew up in Omaio in the Bay of Plenty; in Levin she was influenced by her great-grandmother Sarah Gilling of Ngāti Kikopiri; and in Naenae where as a teenager, she commuted to Wellington to attend Wellington Girl’s College. During this period, Jean often attended Church services held at the Ngāti Pōneke Hall with her mother. ‘In fact’, Jean said, ‘it wasn’t until 1957 that they realised I was not an only child and had eight younger siblings’.

Ngāti Pōneke has been Jean’s strongest influence, and as an adult she travelled extensively to Europe, Africa and the Middle East. In these travels, Jean found that learning different customs was very interesting, and as Māori were not well-known around the world, she was often mistaken for being Greek. Jan currently lives in Ōtaki where she is working with the local Māori community to recognise, relearn and re-teach the musical and compositional talents of her koroua, Kingi Tahiwi.

\(^{11}\) The interview material is available at the Alexander Turnbull Library Oral History Centre and it is under the kaitiakitanga of Vera Morgan, founding and life time member of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club. See Interviews for the History of the Ngati Poneke Club and Various Interviews for the History of the Ngati Poneke Club, 1994-1997, Ngati Poneke Club: Papers (MS-Group-1011), MS-Papers-7278-17 and 19, ATL, Wellington.
Matthew M. Bennett, interview, Kohupātiki, Napier, 24 April 2010; personal communication, Kohupātiki, Napier, April 2012.

Matthew Bennett (Te Arawa, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Raukawa) is a former president of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club. Matthew is retired and lives at Kohupātiki just outside of Napier.

Heemi Kara, Susan Rangiaroha (Huhana) Clark and Eruwera (Eddie) Tepurangataua Clark, group interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 10 December 2010.

Heemi, Huhana and Eddie moved to Wellington from the early 1960s. They continue to live in the Hutt Valley and are involved with Ōrongomai Marae, a ‘stop in’ place for urban Māori.

Iris Pahau and Wereta (Rackie) W. Pahau, interview, Timberlea, Upper Hutt, 24 November 2010; group interview, 10 December 2010, Wellington.

Iris and Rackie Pahau have strong networks amongst local and national Māori groups. They moved to the Wellington area after 1960, and continue to reside in Upper Hutt.


Wikitoria Paaka (Ngāpuhi and Ngāti Porou) grew up with whānau in Tokomaru Bay and Gisborne, before moving with her whāngai parents to Wellington as a young woman. In Wellington, Wikitoria married and raised children with her husband. She continues to enact strong whānau and spiritual relationships, is retired, and lives in Lower Hutt.

RTN, interview, Wellington, 14 April 2010.

RTN grew up on three marae with kuia, koroua, whānau and hapū before moving as a young woman to other country areas and Wellington city. She established a life in the Wellington area but remained strongly connected with her home marae. Over time, RTN raised a family in Wellington, where she resides today.

After training as a teacher and moving to Wellington in the early 1960s, Pae Ruha (Te Whānau ā Apanui, Ngāti Porou) became involved in a number of initiatives that saw her become a leader in Māori social and cultural development. During her years in Wellington, for example, she was involved in the Māori Women’s Welfare League, Ngā Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo, Te Ataarangi and many other community organisations. In recognition for her services to Māori and to the community, Pae was the recipient of both the Queen Service Medal and an Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit. Pae passed away in December 2011.


Laura Taepa (nee Black, Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa) and her sisters Meri Mataira, Margaret Smiler and Ola Hiroti, first became involved in Ngāti Pōneke through their mother, Meri Black senior, who was a strong advocate of the Māori welfare activities of Ngāti Pōneke. A lifetime member of the Club, Laura has been involved in many Ngāti Pōneke events since the early 1940s and has continued her association since. Laura married Canon Hepa Taepa in 1945, and has received official recognition as a result of her ongoing work for Māori communities in Wellington. Today, Laura lives in Waiwhetū with her daughter and is a member of the Ngāti Pōneke Association.

Oral History Personal Communications


Wikitoria Keenan (Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Te Whiti) has lived throughout Te Ātiawa territories in her lifetime. She currently lives in New Plymouth.

William (Bill) and Mere (Donas) Nathan, personal communications, Wellington, 2008-2012

Bill Nathan (Te Āti Awa, Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Kahungunu) and Donas Nathan (Te Whakatōhea, Te Whānau a Apanui, Tūhoe, Tainui, Ngāti Raukawa) are community leaders both in and outside Wellington. When Bill joined the Club in 1955, he did so through whānau, joining his mother and two sisters who were already members. Donas joined the Club in 1957. Since that time she has undertaken thousands of performances and led generations of young Māori in
kapa haka. Bill and Donas have continued their service with Ngāti Pōneke and wider Wellington community. Donas was made a life member of the Ngāti Pōneke Young Māori Club in 1975, and Bill is currently President of the Young Māori Club and Chairman of the Pōneke ki Te Whanganui ā Tara Rohe of the Anglican Church.
Appendix 2: A Note on the Māori Voters Rolls, 1908 and 1919

This appendix provides further information on the data collected from the Western Māori Voters Rolls for 1908 and 1919. According to the New Zealand Electoral Atlas, the voting population on the Western Māori Roll in 1908 was 7,274 voters out of an estimated 19,384 Māori of eligible voting age; and in 1919, there were 5,604 Māori voters on the Western Māori Roll from an estimated eligible voting population of 17,445. However, although the data displayed below is a limited sample of Māori populations in 1908 and 1919, it provides an insight into the wider population trends of the period.

Appendix 2.1 and 2.2 show voters from the Western Māori Voters Rolls for 1908 and 1919 who stated Wellington, Ōtaki or Porirua as their home address, the number of those voters who were male or female, and what iwi they stated affiliation to. Appendix 2.1 is based on information from the Western Māori Voters Roll from 1908, and Appendix 2.2 is based on the Western Māori Voters Roll from 1919.

Appendix 2.3 provides information on the locations of all Māori voters on the Western Māori Voters Rolls who stated Te Ātiawa or Ngātiawa as their iwi.
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### Appendix 2.1: Information collected from the Western Maori Electoral District Roll 1908, New Zealand Maori Voters Rolls, NZ 324.64, Wellington City Library, Wellington.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ōtaki, 1908</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Iwi affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Raukawa</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Toa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ātiawa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Porirua, 1908</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Iwi affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Kahungunu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Maniapoto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Raukawa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Toa</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ātiawa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Area, 1908</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāi Tahu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Maniapoto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Raukawa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Ruanui</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Toa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Tuwharetoa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarauru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ātiawa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.2: Information collected from the Western Maori Electoral District Roll 1919, New Zealand Maori Voters Rolls, NZ 324.64, Wellington City Library, Wellington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ōtaki, 1919</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iwi affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iwi affiliation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Apa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Raukawa</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Toa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Arawa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ātiawa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Porirua, 1919</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iwi affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iwi affiliation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Raukawa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Toa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellington Area, 1919</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petone</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iwi affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāi Tahu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Awa / Te Āti Awa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Kahungunu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Maniapoto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Porou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Rangitāne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Raukawa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Ruanui</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Tama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Toa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Tūwharetoa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whānau a Apanui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.3: Voters on the Western Māori Voters Rolls who stated Te Ātiawa or Ngātiawa as their iwi. Information collected from the Western Maori Electoral District Roll 1908 and 1919, New Zealand Maori Voters Rolls, NZ 324.64, Wellington City Library, Wellington.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1908</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Manawatu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Region</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1919</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanganui area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Manawatu</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Region</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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