
Re-making Memory on Matiu and Other “Settlement” Sites

Rachel Buchanan

Re-making Memory on Matiu and Other “Settlement” Sites

Rachel Buchanan

Abstract

This article, written by a historian descended from Māori (and Pākehā) early settlers in Wellington, has three purposes. It reinscribes some whānau (extended family) history, hapu (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribal) histories onto the sites that co-hosted the *Contained Memory Conference 2010*: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and Massey University, Wellington. It then explores two possible approaches to the problem of reclaiming history or remaking memory on the 18 sites “handed back” to Wellington Māori in the recent settlement of a long-standing historical claim, against the Crown, for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. The first approach was to “re-touch” all the archival evidence generated about two of the “returned” sites—the harbour island, Matiu, and its small neighbour, Mokopuna, and the second was to visit the sites. These visits were a way of constructing whānau memory from the ground up. Through them, I have learned to cherish these disparate and frequently abject places, our ragged little spoils of “settlement”.

Keywords: Māori, Wellington, memory, history, archives

In 2005, the delicate remains of three sand- and shell-encrusted whare ponga (Māori dwellings made from native tree fern) were discovered amid the ruins of a recently demolished 1906 building on Taranaki Street, Wellington. The Wellington Tenth Trust, the body that represents descendents of Māori leaders living around the harbour in 1839, had urged the developers to undertake an archaeological dig at the site because it was so close to the original foreshore.¹ The request was prescient. The whare, which can now be viewed through glass windows in the basement of the Bellagio Ataahua Apartments, are the only ones known to have survived anywhere from the early nineteenth century. They are the ruins of Te Aro Pa, once home to about 130 Māori who had migrated south from Taranaki in the 1820s and 1830s.² Some of my Māori tīpuna (ancestors), including Taranaki rangatira (chief) Hemi Parai, lived there. Nearly 180 years on, they are still making their claim to the place.

Four years after this precious portion of the past emerged from the ground, Taranaki Māori in Wellington settled the historical Treaty of Waitangi claims against the Crown.³ The process had taken 22 years and resulted in a settlement package that included: a public Crown apology; a \$25 million payment; and the vesting—or “return”—of 18 sites to the Port Nicholson Settlement Trust (Taranaki Whanui Ki Te Upoko o te Ika).⁴ The land on which the whare were discovered was not among these sites. It remains “lost property”.

What has been “returned” as “cultural redress” is a disparate portfolio of property that includes: Matiu (Somes), Mokopuna (Leper), and Makaro (Ward), the three islands in Wellington Harbour; Pipitea Marae on Thorndon Quay; three former school sites in Waiwhetu and Wainuiomata; Point Dorset Recreation Reserve, and Wi Tako Scenic Reserve; the beds of two lakes (Kohangatera and Kohangapiripiri) hidden behind the folded hills over the other side of the harbour at Eastbourne; and a rare dendroglyph site.⁵

The unearthing of the whare and the settlement of the Treaty claim raised many questions for me, both personally and professionally. As a university-trained historian, I learnt that history was something external. History was a narrative summoned into existence by the historian as a result of extensive research in the archives. As one of the 14,000 registered beneficiaries of the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust, I have learnt that history is just as likely to be embedded in places (the earth, a marae, a person’s name) and that it will reveal itself when the moment is right. I have laboured to incorporate these two different perspectives into my scholarly writing. The Settlement Trust negotiating team had to work very hard to secure the return of any property at all, but what is it that we have settled for? How can I be an active and ethical custodian of this returned land (as a descendant and as a historian)? How do I resolve the problem of the absence of contemporary or historical whānau (extended family) memories or histories about most of these seemingly random and frequently abject “settlement” sites?

Flawed regimes of national collective memory in Aotearoa New Zealand continue to marginalise, elide, or silence public memories about Māori people and places.⁶ A related problem is how to ensure that national or international

histories and memories, such as those shared by scholars at the *Contained Memory Conference 2010*, can sit alongside micro-local indigenous ones relevant to the sites where the conference was held. The lives of h (non-Māori) pioneers in Wellington (including my relatives, the Wallaces) are well documented, but the same is not true for the place’s Māori pioneers.⁷

As historians Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edmonds have recently argued, attempts to “decolonise geography” tend to be theoretical. Writing about (white) settler colonialism, they state that:

*... little scholarly work attends to the particular and often violent historiographies in settler colonies themselves on the ground, the very micro-conditions which underpin, produce and reinforce settler spaces in our nominally postcolonial societies.*⁸

My whakapapa (genealogy) connects me with the two host sites of the *Contained Memory* conference: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and Massey University, Wellington. I will therefore begin with a brief reminder of the Māori history of the land around these significant institutions. After this, I deal with two of my experiments in being an ethical and engaged guardian (kaitiaki) of “settlement” land. One of the many things my Māori ancestors lost in the early to mid-nineteenth century was narrative control over the place that was fast becoming Wellington (when it had been Te Whanganui a Tara).⁹ The violence of settlement included, for my extended whānau at least, a rupture in inter-generational story-telling.¹⁰

The harbour islands are the most prominent pieces of land returned in the settlement. I decided to try and literally “re-touch” all the archival evidence generated about these taonga (treasures) between 1839 and 2008, and so re-claim narrative control over these places.¹¹ My second approach was more about my feet. As a new landlord, I spent some time with family walking around our new properties. Although we come from Wellington, the parcels of land were containers empty of any family memory and I wanted to start filling them up. This article describes my two attempts at grappling with the problems of making histories of Wellington that honour the continuity *and* discontinuity of Māori occupation here.

Two non-settlement sites: Te Papa and Massey University

While marae (meeting places) are usually sites of deep significance to a particular whānau, hapu, or iwi, at Te Papa the marae’s purpose has been adapted and extended beyond the boundaries of geography. Te Marae, on the fourth floor, is an embodiment of “the spirit of bicultural partnership that lies at the heart of the Museum”.¹² Carved figures face outwards, towards the harbour, the heads and beyond, beckoning all-comers to “feel at home on this marae”.¹³ It is appropriate that a national museum should look beyond the place where it stands, but it is also important to remember that Te Papa is built on reclaimed land that contains local history.

Te Aro Pa was once at the harbour’s edge, as the mussel, pipi, limpet, and oyster shells embedded in the walls of the unearthed whare attest. In 1845, one of my Pākehā ancestors, John Wallace, painted a watercolour on Thorndon Beach, Wellington. Looking out to sea, he drew five whaling boats and canoes leaving “Te Aro Pah”.¹⁴ My Māori and Pākehā forbears once swam, fished, and sailed over the place where Te Papa now stands. One of our ancestors, Arapera Rongouaroa, known as “the belle of Te Aro Pa”, swam out “after the *HMS Galatea* to say goodbye to the Duke of Edinburgh on his departure from Wellington” in 1869.¹⁵

Figure 1. A map of Te Aro Pa, Wellington. Archives Reference: MA-MT 12 9/150, Archives New Zealand, The Department of Internal Affairs Te Tari Taiwhenua. Published with the permission of Archives New Zealand.



Arapera’s home was gradually destroyed between 1839 and the early twentieth century by earthquakes, by the white settlement, and by the hostility of government officials towards ongoing Māori occupation of the site. In the late 1870s, most of the pa land was taken “to provide access to reclamation and what was to become Taranaki wharf”.¹⁶ In 1844 my tīpuna, Hemi Parai, signed a Deed of Release for Te Aro but the pa itself (including the gardens and burial grounds) was supposed to be reserved.¹⁷ In 1847, Lieutenant Colonel William McCleverty, who had been appointed to settle the New Zealand Company’s land claims, made a similar promise.¹⁸ Māori Land Court documents signed by Parai and his relatives in the 1860s provide evidence of many more government promises that land at Te Aro

“shall be inalienable by sale or by lease for a longer period than twenty one years” and would be held, instead, by Māori and “their Heirs and Assigns forever”.¹⁹ By 1874, the Crown had begun to declare portions of the pa to be “Waste Land of the Crown”, and by the 1880s the remaining portions of Te Aro were “taken for Public use as a road”.²⁰ In 1881, only 28 people were still living at Te Aro and their home was bisected by the new road.²¹

Māori Land Court documents provide information on succession of the blocks of land owned by Parai. He died in about 1877 and at the time two of his children, Te Awhi Parai and Mohi Parai, were living in Taranaki with their mother, Pirihihi Matangi. Both children were involved in the non-violent ploughing protests at Parihaka, a large and influential Māori settlement in Taranaki that was invaded by the Crown in 1881.²² These two were arrested and imprisoned at Mt Cook, Wellington, and then at Ripapa Island, off Lyttelton Harbour near Christchurch.

In the 1840s, the settler administration built military barracks over the garden beds at Pukeahau, one of the many cultivation grounds that had fed people at Te Aro Pa. One of the brothers, Te Awhi, was only 14 when he was arrested and sent to Mt Cook and then Christchurch.²³ Te Awhi and the others arrested were not given a trial. One of Massey University’s campuses is at Mt Cook in the former Dominion Museum and National Art Gallery building and the National War Memorial is in front of it. There is a very modest memorial, erected by Māori, in front of the university building to recall the unjust imprisonment of men like Te Awhi. However, the war memorial itself acknowledges neither New Zealand’s wars of foundation nor the (Māori) histories of the land on which it stands.

An archival tour of the islands

Matiu and Makaro are the two biggest islands in Wellington Harbour. Historian, Angela Ballara, writes that Ngati Ira, who occupied the land around the harbour in the eighteenth century, built pa on both islands and the islands themselves also served as refuges.²⁴ Matiu retained this status as a refuge in the early nineteenth century when many Taranaki people fled south to escape inter-tribal warfare. In 1835, hundreds of landless Taranaki refugees left Matiu for Wharekauri (the Chatham Islands), 800 kilometres east of New Zealand. They travelled on the purloined brig, *Rodney*.²⁵ Before they went members of one Taranaki tribe, Ngati Mutunga, gave land they had occupied around the harbour (including land at Te Aro, close to where Te Papa is now) to their Taranaki relatives.

Then, in 1839, the New Zealand Company’s supply ship, *Tory*, sailed into the place they called Port Nicholson. The company’s Principal Agent, Lieutenant-Colonel William Wakefield, “bought” most of the land around the harbour and renamed Matiu, “Somes”, after Joseph Somes, an English shipping magnate and the Company’s deputy governor.²⁶ The harbour islands were supposed to be reserved and held in trust for the future benefit of the descendants of the 16 chiefs who signed the 1839 Deed of Purchase.²⁷

But only two years later, in 1841, the Crown’s representative, Governor William Hobson, proclaimed these islands to be Crown reserves.²⁸ The islands remained in Crown ownership from then on. Matiu was a human and animal quarantine station, a prisoner of war camp (in two world wars), the site for an anti-aircraft artillery battery and de-gaussing station, a graveyard, and a fort.²⁹ A maximum security animal quarantine station operated on Matiu between 1972-1995. The islands have been vested to the Settlement Trust to be administered as “scientific or historic reserves”. A kaitiaki (guardians) board oversees the administration, but the Department of Conservation continues to manage the islands and enforce bylaws.³⁰ The islands are in Māori hands again, but our ownership is limited by the reserve status. We could not, for example, decide (as entrepreneurial Wellington mayor, Michael Fowler, did in the 1980s) to announce that we were doing a feasibility study to establish a casino on the island.³¹

The Fowler plans for a casino—and the letters of disgust from “morals campaigner” Patricia Bartlett’s Society for the Promotion of Community Standards—were contained in some of the hundreds of archival documents I examined as part of my project to “re-touch” archival documents about our islands.³² I scoured the diverse holdings at the Alexander Turnbull Library and the National Archives, and read defence, agriculture, conservation, and wildlife records.³³ I looked at the diary of a German doctor, Max Buchner, who was emigrating to New Zealand on the *Euphrosyne* in 1878. Eight of the ship’s passengers had died of typhus on the voyage out and two more passed away on Matiu during a dismal 55-day quarantine.³⁴ Buchner wrote: “We found ourselves alone on the small island ... surrounded by raging seas which separated us from the rest of the world. We were the banished.”³⁵

I discovered some amusing things as well. In World War I, 296 enemy aliens were interned on Matiu. One of these men was Rinaldo Zahn, a 31-year-old Austrian-born, Australian resident who had spent the past nine years touring British countries, especially New Zealand and Australia, as a showman at the Fuller’s Vaudeville. He was captured in August 1914 in Wellington. Zahn applied for parole and the New Zealand Police collected character references from John O’Donnell, the manager of La France, a woman who had been showing at Fuller’s Vaudeville, and from Myer Myers, “manager for the Siamese Twins lately showing in Manners St”.³⁶ While on Matiu, Zahn earned money by tattooing other prisoners, using a machine sent to him in 1917 by a man who was a prisoner of war on Gallups Island, Boston.³⁷

In World War I, prisoners of war shared the island with quarantined animals, such as a Pomeranian dog that came from Durban on the *Marama*, a white poodle from San Francisco via Sydney on the *Manuka*, and two sleigh dogs that arrived from Antarctica (with polar explorer, Sir Ernest Shackleton) on the *Aurora*.³⁸

Matiu’s neighbour, Mokopuna, is a tiny island also known as Leper Island in memory of Kim Lee, a Chinese man suspecting of having leprosy, who was quarantined in a cave and died six months later in March 1904. By 1919,

Department of Internal Affairs files reveal an escalating anxiety about the safety of tuatara (a prehistoric New Zealand lizard) on all the harbour islands, and in 1920 six were released on Mokopuna.³⁹ In 1948, the Wildlife Division of the Department of Internal Affairs killed the rabbits that had overrun Mokopuna and replanted native trees such as taupata and ngaio.⁴⁰ In 1957, the island was declared a wildlife sanctuary. From the early 1980s volunteer groups such as the Lower Hutt branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society raised seedlings, planted new trees, and controlled weeds on Matiu as well.⁴¹

While the archives tell many interesting historical stories, the most powerful of all for me is the one about the efficiency and totality with which my nineteenth and twentieth-century Māori forbears were banished from Matiu. Aside from a few lines in a 1940 newspaper feature story (“evidence of Māori ... occupation has been found on the island—beds of charcoal high up, pipi shells and fish bones as well as fields of greenstone in the rough or in the process of being fashioned as artefacts”), I found nothing else about Māori occupation.⁴²

It was not until I got into the local government archives from the 1990s that I met people I recognised. In 1995, the Wellington and Hutt City councils invited Wellington Māori to a workshop for “stakeholders” of Matiu. The animal quarantine station had closed and the island’s future was up for discussion. The meeting recognised Te Ati Awa’s “pre-eminent” claim to the island.⁴³ Te Ati Awa leader, Ngatata Love, addressed the group on behalf of the Wellington Tenth Trust. He explained that the island had not been included in the sale of land to the Company and noted:

*... one time the tangata whenua could live off the harbour and now could not do so because of pollution. They had also been banned from visiting the island because of its status as a prisoner of war camp and quarantine station. Its European history is only a short incident in its longer history.*⁴⁴

The next month, Dr Love and fellow Taranaki kāumatua (elder), Teru Wharehoka, were at the ceremony to open the island to the public. Wharehoka was photographed gazing back to Wellington “from Somes Island, known to his ancestors as Matiu”. Dr Love said it was the first time he and Wharehoka had even been on Matiu: “Every child from Wellington and the Hutt has looked here and wondered why this taonga [treasure] has not been available to them.”⁴⁵ Two years later, in 1997, the Geographic Board renamed the island “Matiu-Somes”.

To unearth the “longer history” referred to by Dr Love, I needed the skills not just of the historian, but of archaeologist, geologist, and botanist. The paper archive I had been so keen to explore could actually tell me very little.

Figure 2. The author on the steps of the old grandstand at Wainuiomata Secondary College, Wellington, 5 August 2010. Photo: Ben Buchanan.



A settlers' settlement tour

Kāumatua (elders), Ngatata Love and Teru Wharehoka, placed great value in standing on Matiu. This was how the island became “available to them”. I have learnt that in the Māori world, history starts from where you stand.⁴⁶ First, though, there was the problem of finding these places I wanted to stand on—the other “settlement” sites listed in the Port Nicholson Block Trust 2010 annual report.⁴⁷ Most of them were unfamiliar to me.

I visited Korokoro Gateway (a place where gypsy caravans often park), Steeple Rocks (a nudist beach) and Shelley Bay (the former naval base purchased by the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust), with my mother, Mary, my daughter, Antonietta, and my niece, Tusiata. With my father, Leo, and my brother, Ben, I went to Wi Tako Scenic Reserve in Upper Hutt. We ignored a Department of Conservation sign that forbade anyone to enter—“because dead pines are a significant hazard” and the tracks were not maintained by the department—and squeezed through the supplejack onto a slippy, narrow, path dappled with late afternoon sunlight.

Earlier that day, we had had a look at the three schools the trust now owns—Waiwhetu Primary and Wainuiomata intermediate and secondary college. The college is derelict. The classrooms are boarded and the boards tagged. Windows are smashed and the steps of the old grandstand are rotten.

Figure 3. The author’s brother, Ben, and father, Leo, Wi Tako Scenic Reserve, Upper Hutt, 27 August 2010. Photo by the author.



We also visited a site that contains an extremely rare example of Māori art: the dendroglyph (a carving made on a living tree). There are three by the lakes Kohangapiripiri and Kohangatera, the only known examples on the New Zealand mainland. Liz Mellish, then CEO of the Wellington Tenth Trust, told us that she believed the dendroglyphs had been carved by one of our ancestors in the 1830s or 1840s.⁴⁸ We unlocked Burdan’s Gate and drove out towards the heads. From the crest of a steep hill we could see the two silver lakes and much toi toi, flax, grass, and gorse. There were no trees. After a long search, we took a path that led to a swampy wetland and there was a rickety fence and a karaka tree, gnarled and modest, shaped by the winds into a flat-topped green flat flying east. The grey trunk was lumpy and indented, like skin when a tattoo has been removed. We touched it carefully, struggling to identify the shapes.⁴⁹

I wondered if the carver worked alone or in a team? Was the carver a “graffiti artist” or a “stonemason”? Were the pictures like a tag—“I am here”—to be read by members of other iwi or were they a memorial engraving: “We were once here but now we are not.” Did the carvers chisel pictures that would make sense at the time, or were the patterns meant to expand with the tree, presenting messages to be deciphered by generations to come, by people like my brother and I? If the tree continues to flourish and expand, will the carving eventually disappear?

The tree is a historical marker with a fence but no sign. The only other place in New Zealand where you can find dendroglyphs is the Chatham Islands.⁵⁰ Perhaps this mainland carving was the work of someone who had been there and come back? Or perhaps the carver was a Taranaki person familiar with the ancient, mysterious carved rocks and reefs that can be found along the coast in that province.⁵¹

Figure 4. The author’s father, Leo, and the carved karaka tree, Lake Kohangapiripiri, Wellington, 27 August 2010. Photo by the author.



Is memory like the tree or is it like the carving on the tree? Many dead trees are turned into paper. Is history the stories we write on paper, nothing more than a sign that memory has died? Or, has memory merely shifted from intergenerational oral transmission to text-based archival material? What are archives anyway? Archives New Zealand is built on land where Māori used to grow vegetables. The collections it houses, like those in every archive, have grown through selection, rejection, exclusion, and destruction.⁵² In this sense, as architectural historian, Kent Kleinman, has observed: “The archive is more accurately described as a machine for forgetting.”⁵³ For every voice, plan, or record in the archive, there are many more that have been excluded and so been “forgotten” or silenced. My failed quest to reclaim (Māori) histories of Matiu in the national and local archives was proof of this.

Some concluding remarks

Colonisation was (and is) a global process, but it is also a local one. In the early nineteenth century, there used to be 29 marae dotted around this harbour. For my ancestors, and other Taranaki Māori who migrated south to live here from the 1820s onwards, the process of colonisation led to the destruction of every one of the eight major marae. Te Aro became a name associated with a suburb rather than a marae. Matiu-Somes, like Ripapa, Otamahua, and Quarantine islands, became a quarantine station to “protect” New Zealanders from introduced human and animal diseases.⁵⁴

“Māori-ness” became associated with rural, rather than urban, places. Marae contain, enact, and interpret history and memory. We lost so much of that here at Te Aro and elsewhere in Wellington. The national museum built its own marae while the original one for this place lies buried just up the road. The dialect spoken

by the people who occupied Te Aro is fragile but Taranaki people are working very hard to preserve and transmit this taonga.⁵⁵ One innovative strategy is to form a partnership with Archives New Zealand and provide “access to important records, written in te reo Taranaki, from 1860 to 1900”.⁵⁶

We—the descendants of Taranaki people—have been given back some land in recognition of the injustices that occurred in Wellington, but colonisation means that many of the sites returned to us contain the memories of others.⁵⁷ As Jonathan Lear has argued in *Radical Hope*, his brilliant analysis of the utterances of Plenty Coup (the last great Chief of the Crow Nation in the United States), the point is not one of narrative control. Lear writes: “For the issue that concerns us is not who has the power to tell the story, however important that might be; it is rather how power shapes what any true story could possibly be.”⁵⁸ For Māori from Wellington (and Taranaki) the issue is also deeper than competing narratives; it is what stories are actually possible (and useful) in the face of such profound cultural devastation. Initially, when I visited these sites and thought about them, all I could see were continuities between the (colonial) past and the present. Perhaps I had been looking at the wrong past, the shallow past, rather than the deeper, “longer history”.⁵⁹ To my surprise, I have come to see, in the seemingly random 18 sites handed back to us, an echo of a much earlier Māori point of view. These sites—the former naval base at Shelley Bay and the many other places over which the Settlement Trust has sale and leaseback rights (such as the National Archives and the National Library) or first right of refusal to buy (including Te Papa itself)—remap the deeper Māori past onto the present. Point Dorset, Shelley Bay, the wakaama next door to Te Papa, the Railway Station social hall, the land on Thorndon Quay, the Korokoro Gateway at Petone, Matiu, Makaro, and Mokopuna, and then around across the sea to Eastbourne and the lakes with their dendroglyphs, form a necklace around the harbour, re-stoking our fires of occupation.

Figure 5. Antonietta Hope Buchanan Gentile, the author’s daughter, throws rocks at a rainbow, at a departing ship and at Makaro Island and Te Aroaro-o-Kupe, Wellington, 24 August 2010. Photo by the author.



Endnotes

¹The Wellington Tenth Trust has its origins in the 1839 Deed of Purchase in which 16 Māori rangatira (chiefs) “sold” what was then known as Port Nicholson to the New Zealand Company, a British-based property speculation firm. In return, these chiefs were promised that a tenth of every bit of land sold should be reserved, in trust, for their heirs forever. For information on Te Aro Pa see Wellington Tenth Trust, “Cultural Impact Report 39-43 Taranaki Street, Te Aro Pa,” January 2004, 3. See also my discussion of this find in Rachel Buchanan, *The Parihaka Album: Lest We Forget* (Wellington: Huia, 2009), 257-60. I would like to thank the many people who have helped me with this article including my whānau, Neville Gilmour, Liz Mellish, Joanna Sassoon, and the two anonymous peer reviewers whose comments prompted a significant rewrite.

²Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 244-54.

³The Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand’s founding document, was signed in 1840 between the British Crown and 540 Māori rangatira. The British signed a document in English while Māori signed a text in Māori. Debates continue over the contradictory meanings of these documents. Broadly, Māori believed the Crown had acknowledged their ongoing rangatiratanga (chieftanship) over the land while the Crown believed Māori had ceded sovereignty over it. Claudia Orange’s *The Treaty of Waitangi* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, 1987) is a good starting point for understanding the many meanings of the Treaty.

⁴See “Taranaki Whanui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika Settlement Summary,” Office of Treaty Settlements, accessed September 14, 2011, <http://www.ots.govt.nz>. For one history of Māori interactions with the Crown in Wellington see “Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ona Takiwa Report on the Wellington District,” *Waitangi Tribunal Report 2003* (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2003).

⁵The harbour islands were named, in the tenth century, by Māori explorer Kupe. The biggest two, Matiu and Makaro, were named after the explorer’s nieces or daughters. The other small one, Mokopuna, means grandchild or great-grandchild. The English names were bestowed in 1840 by the New Zealand Company. For a full list of the 18 sites and varying mechanisms in which they have been offered as cultural redress (e.g. some are “fee simple” and some must be administered as “Māori reservations,” or scenic, recreational, historical or scientific reserves) see “Taranaki Whanui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika and The Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust and The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand” Deed of Settlement of Historical Claims, accessed September 14, 2011, <http://ots.govt.nz>, 24-25.

⁶Rachel Buchanan, “Why Gandhi Doesn’t Belong at Wellington Railway Station,” *Journal of Social History*, 44 (2011) 4: 1077-93.

⁷For a discussion of commemoration of the Wallaces, especially their significant place at the old Bolton Street Cemetery, see Buchanan, “Pioneers,” in *Parihaka Album*, 235-68. The Wallaces have a strong archival presence at the Alexander

Turnbull Library (hereafter ATL). The library holds the papers of John Howard Wallace, a historian, and letters written by William Ellerslie Wallace and art by their father, John Wallace. The history of Māori occupation of the land around the harbour is far more complex and stretches back to Kupe’s discovery of the harbour in the tenth century. Since then, successive waves of different iwi have occupied the place now known as Wellington. In the early nineteenth century, Taranaki iwi fleeing south to escape war displaced iwi that the Waitangi Tribunal described as ‘Whatonga-descent peoples’ (including Ngai Tara, Rangitane, Muaupoko and Ngati Apa, and Ngati Ira). By the 1830s, Taranaki iwi, especially Te Ati Awa, had claimed occupation rights to the harbour, and in its 2003 report the Waitangi Tribunal reinforced Te Ati Awa’s mana whenua status. When I use the phrase “Māori pioneers” I am referring to my ancestors who helped found the city of Wellington while also acknowledging the Māori who were there before Taranaki people arrived.

⁸Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edwards eds., “Introduction: Making Space in Settler Colonies,” in *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) 2.

⁹Te Whanganui a Tara means “the great harbour of Tara”. The harbour was named by Whatonga, who explored the great harbour and named it for his son, Tara. See “Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ona Takiwa Report on the Wellington District,” 17-18.

¹⁰That said, several of my relatives, including Raumahora Broughton and Mike Walsh, have been working very tenaciously to reconnect all of us with whānau stories about Māori Wellington. See Raumahora Broughton, *Charles Taare Warahi Wallace 1848-1932* (Palmerston North: Massey University, 2010). This whakapapa book was made for a whānau reunion held at Hutt Park from 14-16 January 2011.

¹¹I am using the word “re-touch” in two ways. I mean I wanted to literally put my hands on the papers, maps, and photographs generated about our island, but I also wanted to re-touch this material, to reshape it to my own ends. In this sense I am referring to the way photographers re-touch an image.

¹²“The Marae”, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa website, accessed June 21, 2011, <http://www.tepapa.govt.nz/WhatsOn/exhibitions/Pages/TheMarae.aspx>

¹³“The Marae”, <http://www.tepapa.govt.nz/WhatsOn/exhibitions/Pages/TheMarae.aspx>

¹⁴John Wallace, “View of Wellington Harbour from Thorndon Beach,” 12 July 1845, watercolour and pencil, 253 x 422 mm, drawings and print collection, ATL, Wellington, Ref B-079-007. For a discussion of this drawing and Te Aro Pa in the 1840s see Buchanan, “Pioneers,” *Parihaka Album* 243-258.

¹⁵Broughton, *Charles Taare Warahi Wallace*, 18.

¹⁶Some of the last Māori to hold land at Te Aro Pa included Tamati Wiremu Te Wera and Raniera Erihana. In 1906, Erihana and the Public Trust sold “section 24” to Thomas J Young while Te Wera retained “section 12” until 1902. See Tenth Trust “Cultural Impact Report” 1-2 and *Nga Tupuna o Te Whanganui-a-Tara* (Wellington:

Wellington City Council, 2001) 39. For a discussion of the forces that destroyed the pa, see Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 253-57.

¹⁷Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 208-211 and “The 1844 Deeds of Release,” in *Report on the Wellington District* (Waitangi Tribunal) 145-86.

¹⁸See “The McCleverty Transactions,” *Report on the Wellington District*, 227-58.

¹⁹See, for example, Hemi Parai and Sir George Grey, 27 November 1866, “Grant Under the Native Lands Act 1865,” Māori Land Court, Wanganui, Te Aro Block Order file.

²⁰These phrases are all used in documents held at the Māori Land Court in the Te Aro Block Order file.

²¹Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 256.

²²For an overview of these events, see Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 23-55.

²³Native Land Court of New Zealand sitting, 31 March 1880, where James Booth appointed a trustee on behalf of Awhe (i) Parai (14 years) in regard to Te Aro pa sections 6 and 9, Māori Land Court Aotea District, Wanganui, Te Aro Block Order file.

²⁴ For an excellent overview of early nineteenth-century Māori Wellington see Angela Ballara, “Te Whanganui-a-Tara: Phases of Māori Occupation of Wellington Harbour c. 1800-1840,” in *The Making of Wellington*, eds. D. Hamer and R. Nicholls (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1990) 9-34.

²⁵Ballara, “Te Whanganui-a-Tara,” 26-29.

²⁶Ballara argues that the “sale of Te Whanganui-a-Tara by Te Wharepouri and Te Puni was itself an act designed to set the bounds of their mana over the harbour, ‘Te Whanganui-a-Tara’, 33.

²⁷Port Nicholson Block (Taranaki Whanui Ki Te Upoko o Te Ika) Deed of Settlement, 2009, 8-9.

²⁸*Report on the Wellington District*, 110. For popular, mid-twentieth century understandings of ownership and uses of the island see “Now a Home of Aliens and Penguins,” *The Weekly News*, Auckland, 29 May 1940. This article asserts: “The Crown took over Somes Island from the New Zealand Company about 1850 about the time that grants were issued for 1600 town acres.”

²⁹For an overview of quarantine in New Zealand, including human quarantine on Matiu, see Gavin McLean and Tim Shoebridge, *Quarantine! Protecting New Zealand At The Border* (Otago: Otago University Press, 2010).

³⁰“Te Ngonga o te Piukara: The Sounds of the Bugle,” *Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust Newsletter*, 32, 6: March 2010.

³¹“R.D. Muldoon to Michael Fowler,” 30 March 1981: “This is to acknowledge your letter of 25 March—reference 31/269—in which you comment on a resolution passed by the Wellington City Council welcoming the concept of a casino as a tourist amenity in Wellington ...” Ref 00001: 1129:31/269, Part 2, Wellington City Archives (hereafter WCA).

³²B.P. Caughley, Director, Intercissors for New Zealand to Mr Fowler, 25 March 1981, and Patricia Bartlett to Mr Fowler, 6 March 1981, File 00001:1129:31/269, Part 2, WCA.

³³The Alexander Turnbull in Wellington is part of the National Library of New Zealand. It collects and protects published and unpublished material relating to the peoples of New Zealand and the Pacific.

³⁴Buchner papers, ATL, 7.

³⁵Max Buchner papers, ATL ms-papers-5630, 6.

³⁶“Report of Sergeant Vyvyan R. Tayler, Relative to Zahn Rinaldo Austrian Prisoner of War on Soames Island and Applicant for Parole,” 29 August 1914, Manners St Police Station, AAAB 482 (Department of Justice), Rinaldo Zahn file, ANZ.

³⁷Mr Lezke to Mr Zahn, 15 May 1917, Zahn file, ANZ.

³⁸Department of Agriculture, Industries and Commerce, Live-stock and Meat Division, Particulars of Quarantined Stock, Somes Island Quarantine Station, month ending 30 April 1917, AANR (Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries) Acc W3209, Somes Island Quarantine Station 1912-1920, ANZ.

³⁹J. Allan Thomson, Director, Dominion Museum memo to Under Secretary for Internal Affairs, “Tuatara Lizards,” 26 November 1920, “Wildlife Somes & Mokopuna,” ANZ.

⁴⁰“Island Regenerated: Native Plants Flourish Again,” unidentified news-clipping, 4 March 1953, ANZ.

⁴¹“Matiu (Somes Island) Reserve Working Plan Community Focus on an Island Habitat,” Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawha, working party draft to consultative group, 1994, Ref: 00444: 283: 23/27/2 Pt2. WCA.

⁴²“Now a Home of Aliens and Penguins,” *The Weekly Times*, Auckland, 29 May 1940, AAAC W3179, “Wildlife Somes & Mokopuna,” ANZ.

⁴³Ngatata Love, Wellington Tenth Trust/tangata whenua, Notes on Somes Island/Matiu Workshop, 2 June 1995, Parks and Reserves: Somes Island 1988-1994, Ref 00444:283:23/27/2, WCA.

⁴⁴Love, Notes on Somes Island/Matiu Workshop, 2 June 1995, WCA.

⁴⁵“Somes Island likely to be renamed within two years,” *The Dominion*, 2 August 1995.

⁴⁶In part, this insight is based on the concept of turangawaewae—which are places where Māori feel connected and empowered. It can be translated, literally, as turanga (standing place) and waewae (feet).

⁴⁷“Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust Annual Report,” 31 March 2010, 19.

⁴⁸Liz Mellish, CEO Wellington Tenth Trust, personal communication, 26 August 2010. See also “Pencarrow Lakes: Conservation Values and Management January 2002”, 8, accessed October 25, 2011, <http://www.doc.govt.nz/upload/documents/parks-and-recreation/places-to-visit/wellington/Pencarrow-Lakes.pdf>.

⁴⁹Archaeologists have suggested the dendroglyphs are marked with “fish” motifs, including a representative of a killer whale, “Pencarrow Lakes”, 8.

⁵⁰For information on the very uncertain future of these trees and a project to preserve the information carved into them, see Kiran Chug, “Scanner gives old Moriori Art New Life,” *The Dominion Post*, 10 April, 2010.

⁵¹Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 196-97.

⁵²Terry Cook, “Remembering the Future: Appraisal of Records and the Role of Archives in Constructing Social Memory,” *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*, eds. Francis Blouin and William Rosenberg (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006) 169. Cook, an eminent Canadian archivist, reminds us that state archives around the world select “for long-term preservation as society’s memory roughly 1-5 per cent of the total documentation of major institutions and considerably less from private citizens”.

⁵³Kent Kleinman, “Archiving/Architecture,” in *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory*, 55.

⁵⁴McLean and Shoebridge, *Quarantine!*.

⁵⁵Te Reo o Taranaki was formed in the 1980s to “manage and co-ordinate a strategic direction for the regeneration and continued development of Taranaki reo ... the Indigenous Reo (regional Māori language variation/dialect)”. See Te Reo o Taranaki website for more information, accessed October 25, 2011, <http://www.taranakireo.co.nz/index.php?page=about>

⁵⁶“Celebrating the Partnership with Taranaki Iwi,” Archives New Zealand website, accessed October 25, 2011, <http://archives.govt.nz/about/news/2009/12/celebrating-partnership-taranaki-iwi>

⁵⁷Kiran Chug, “Somes Sweet Home After 50 Years Away,” *The Dominion Post*, undated clipping, 18 December 2009.

⁵⁸Jonathan Lear, *Radical Hope: Ethics in the Face of Cultural Devastation* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2006) 31.

⁵⁹Love, Notes on Somes Island/Matiu Workshop, 2 June 1995, WCA.

Bibliography

Ballara, Anglea, “Te Whanganui-a-Tara: Phases of Māori Occupation of Wellington Harbour c. 1800-1840,” in *The Making of Wellington*, eds. D. Hamer and R. Nicholls (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1990) 9-35.

Banivanua Mar, Tracey and Edwards, Penelope eds., *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Broughton, Raumahora, *Charles Taare Warahi Wallace 1848-1932* (Palmerston North: Massey University, 2010).

Buchanan, Rachel. *The Parihaka Album: Lest We Forget* (Wellington, Huia, 2009).

Buchanan, Rachel. “Why Gandhi Doesn’t Belong at Wellington Railway Station,” *Journal of Social History* 44 (2011): 4.

Chug, Kiran, “Scanner Gives Old Moriori Art New Life,” *The Dominion Post*, 10 April 2010.

Chug, Kiran, “Somes Sweet Home After 50 Years Away,” *The Dominion Post*, undated clipping, 2010.

Kleinman, Kent, “Archiving/Architecture,” in *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*, eds. Francis Blouin and William Rosenberg (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006) 54-60.

Lear, Jonathan, *Radical Hope: Ethics in the Face of Cultural Destruction* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2006).

McLean, Gavin and Shoebridge, Tim, *Quarantine! Protecting New Zealand At The Border* (Otago: Otago University Press, 2010).

Nga Tupuna o Te Whanganui-a-Tara (Wellington: Wellington City Council, 2001).

“Taranaki Whanui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika Settlement Summary,” Office of Treaty Settlements, accessed September 14, 2011, <http://www.ots.govt.nz>.

“Te Ngona o te Piukara: The Sounds of the Bugle,” *Port Nicholson Settlement Trust Newsletter*, 32, March 2010.

“Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ona Takiwa Report on the Wellington District,” Waitangi Tribunal Report 2003 (Wellington: Legislation Direct, 2003).

“The Marae,” Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa website, accessed June 21, 2011, <http://www.tepapa.govt.nz/WhatsOn/exhibitions/Pages/TheMarae.aspx>

Wakefield, William, “The Company’s Purchases of Land From The Natives 1839 to 1942,” *Appendix to the Report of the Court of Directors of the New Zealand Company*, 12 (London: The Company, 1844) 43F.

Wellington Tenth Trust, “Cultural Impact Report 39-43 Taranaki Street, Te Aro Pa,” January 2004, 1-27.

Biographical note

Dr Rachel Buchanan (Te Ati Awa, Taranaki, Ngati Ruanui) is the author of a history-memoir, *The Parihaka Album: Lest We Forget* (Huia, 2009). In 2011 she was awarded the Australian Book Review’s Sidney Myer Fund Fellowship to research and write a major essay on archivists, archives, and personal papers. The resulting piece, ‘Sweeping Up the Ashes’: The Politics of Collecting Personal Papers, appears in ABR’s December issue. Buchanan is an honorary research fellow in the School of Historical and European Studies, La Trobe University, Melbourne.

Email: rachel.buchanan@latrobe.edu.au