Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Iwi
P.O.Box 50
Waitangi
Chatham Islands
0800MUTUNGA
iwitrust@nmow.co.nz

Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri

Special Factors (1) Relevant to Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Settlement Redress

Impact of the Native Land Court (1870 to 1900)

Compiled by:
Tom McClurg, Lead Negotiator
September 2016

Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Iwi
P.O.Box 50
Waitangi
Chatham Islands
0800MUTUNGA
iwitrust@nmow.co.nz

The Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Iwi Trust represents the collective interests of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri, and is a mandated iwi authority for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Māori Fisheries Act 2004. Although the Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Iwi Trust speaks for Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri on a number of matters, the mana and decision-making powers remain with Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri, according to Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri tikanga/kawa.

Our Purpose

- To be the repository of the collective Tino Rangātiratanga of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri
- To represent the collective interest of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri and be the legal representative of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri in relation to the collective interest
- To make and pursue the settlement of claims on behalf and for the benefit of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri under the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975
- To be the mandated iwi organisation for Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri

Benefit Provision

To advance the social and cultural development of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri beneficiaries and distribute benefits directly or indirectly to beneficiaries, irrespective of where they may reside, when and where the Trust may decide.

Tikanga

To promote and preserve, protect and maintain the identity, mana, Tino Rangātiratanga, culture, history, traditions, arts and crafts, tikanga, reo, and taonga tuku iho of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri.

Contents

Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Iwi
P.O.Box 50
Waitangi
Chatham Islands
0800MUTUNGA
iwitrust@nmow.co.nz

Special Factors (1) Relevant to Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Settlement Redress

Impact of the Native Land Court (1870 to 1900)

It is generally accepted that the Crown institution of tenure reform beginning in 1862 was contrary to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and had long term deleterious effects on Māori. These general effects are summarised on page 8 of the Rekohu Report (WAI 64) published by the Waitangi Tribunal in 2001. The Tribunal found that these effects were unusually severe on Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri[1] and these unique consequences were relevant to the negotiation of any compensation:

"*We consider that the impact of the tenure reform* (on Wharekauri) *was far more than is generally appreciated in New Zealand. It had many of the same consequences of land confiscation. Negotiated compensation is recommended for both groups. Referring particularly to Ngāti Mutunga, since Moriori have other heads of claim, the main loss affecting them was the loss of land without approval, as customarily required, the main loss that affects them in the present is the loss of tribal, corporate capacity in respect of all the land that remains. Compensation should be directed to tribal responsibilities in social cultural and economic development.*

There is a further concern. Māori are about 47 per cent of the island's population compared with about 13 per cent for the mainland. Māori land comprises about 11 per cent of the islands while it is about 7 per cent of the mainland. The effect of absentee ownership is more marked on the islands owing to distances. The consequence is also inimical to cultural ethics whereby those on the home base have priority. The title system has marked effects on Māori productivity and housing, more so than on the mainland. The effect is also considerable on the maintenance of a viable island economy." (WAI 64, pp 8 & 9)

In the body of its report, the Tribunal develops the detail of specific prejudice that came from the Land Court tenure including: [from p.190]

- "Land reform weakened the social order."
- "Through land reform or tenure conversion, Māori lost the right to decide for themselves how their society should evolve."

[1] The term 'Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri' in this note is an umbrella term that encompasses all Chatham Island Maori and their descendants who arrived on the *Rodney* in 1835. It includes people who at that time may have identified themselves in various ways including Ngāti Tama, Kekerewai, Ngāti Haumia or Atiawa etc.

- Re 10-owner rule "Most of the people were thus excluded from the new legal title and thereby denied their formal land rights."
- Lasting prejudices were listed as being ownership fragmentation, title fragmentation, absentee ownership and acculturation, [p.196]

The Tribunal also identified specific impacts on Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri through the social change wrought by the imposition of land tenure reform [p.201] viz:

- a breakdown of the former social norms,
- a division of the people from the leadership
- a division of the tribal society into 'haves' and 'have nots'
- bitter litigation in the Native Land Court over about 30 years
- Court control of Māori social and economic progress.
- Māori lost the facility to manage social change on their own terms, as they had done before.

On the impact of the 10-owner rule: people were excluded and disproportionate and unequal awards resulted. The Tribunal has commented:

- "The essence of Māori society had been effectively destroyed." [p.206]
- "... the Crown eventually intervened, but it acted too late to effect an adequate remedy. [p.205]
- "...30 years after the original awards. Bitter argument and litigation and a complicated series of sales, successions, and further partitions had occurred in the meantime and it was impossible to restore a reasonable allocation to all who were entitled." [p.208]
- "The result was a few owners with large shares, a large number with small shares, and the fragmentation of title, in unworkable allotments, through a plethora of partitions."[p.208]
- "All were cut out in a mosaic of strips, so that, from the beginning, there were immediate problems of fragmented shares, uneconomic interests, and useless partitions"[p.209]

The Tribunal's view of the consequences of title reform through the Land Court:

- "It took the power from the cultural base and dissipated it beyond the Chathams' seas.
- It took away from the Māori tribal structure the right and power to decide, and left certain individuals with limited power in a new, non-customary, and exploitative framework." [p.210]

On the overall social cost:

- "It has led to social divisions; constrained leadership; inhibited cultural development; led to an unequal apportionment of wealth; exacerbated tribal dispersal; prevented Ngāti Mutunga from exercising their Treaty right to manage their own affairs in accordance with their own preferences and to determine their own future and direction..." [p.211]
- "These effects remain evident today and constitute real constraints on social and cultural development. The lasting impact is on the people as a corporate entity." [p.212]
- "It has also to be considered that the effect of the dispersion of people and absentee land ownership is more marked in the case of a remote island." [p.212]

Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri agree with the Tribunal that the effects of tenure reform were unusually severe and amount to a significant special factor in the

negotiation of any settlement redress with the Crown. There are four reasons why the Native Land Court process was especially damaging to Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri.

1. The close scheduling of Compensation and Land Court sittings created an insuperable barrier to the effective presentation of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri interests in both of these Courts.
2. The thirty-year delay between the 1870 Native Land Court hearings in Wharekauri and their rehearing in 1900 made it impossible for the injustices and problems created in 1870 to be effectively addressed.
3. The unusually large social cost referred to, but not fully expounded, on page 211 of WAI 164 relates to the destruction of the unusually well-developed framework of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri mana motuhake that predominated on the Chatham Islands from 1835 to 1900.
4. The consequences for Māori who were disenfranchised of interests in land on Wharekauri as a consequence of Native Land Court processes were unusually severe.

Close Scheduling of Taranaki Compensation Court and Wharekauri Native Land Court Hearings

In the mid nineteenth century, Ngāti Mutunga had two turangawaewae (Wharekauri and Taranaki) where tribal interests had to be represented and defended in Land Court processes. There is ample evidence (particularly from the 1850s onwards) of significant communications between Wharekauri and Taranaki and the movement of people and resources between those places in response to the respective issues or opportunities that arose. In 1865, the entire Taranaki rohe of Ngāti Mutunga was confiscated under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863. However, "loyal" Māori could apply to the Compensation Land Court for the award of entitlements to receive land within the confiscation lines.

Taranaki Compensation Court hearings began in 1866 and Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri sent a delegation of chiefs to attend these initial hearings at which Chatham Island Māori were found to have forfeited any rights to claim land as a consequence of the Court's application of the '1840 Rule'. The Court determined that Ngāti Mutunga had been effectively driven out of Taranaki by 1840 and had subsequently failed to recover those lands. This disappointing initial result encouraged Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri to redouble the vigour with which they would represent their interests en-masse at the Compensation Court hearings scheduled for March 1869.

About 120 Māori returned on the *Despatch* to New Plymouth in December 1867. In early 1868 the Crown sent William Rolleston (at the time Undersecretary in the Native Department) to the Chathams to report on the conditions of the Hauhau prisoners there and to actively discourage Chatham Island Māori from returning to Taranaki. With the help of the Resident Magistrate, Captain Thomas, a list of those wishing to return to safeguard their interests was prepared for the Government. When Rolleston's and Thomas's attempts at persuasion failed, a Bill was introduced to Parliament to prevent Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Māori from returning to the mainland. The Bill was defeated by the Opposition who argued that the Bill would contravene the general right of New Zealanders (including Chatham Island Māori) to free passage within the breadths of New Zealand.

Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri then chartered the vessel *Collingwood* and around

150 Chatham Island Māori landed in Taranaki on 28 November 1868. This was an expensive process and prior to departure, funds had to be raised for the charter, to support people while in Taranaki for the hearings (their traditional turangawaewae having been confiscated) and to meet any up-front costs (such as survey) from any successful outcome of the hearings. These funds were a combination of savings and money generated by entering into land leases with Pakeha graziers and by borrowing from others. There were substantial uncertainties about the likelihood of success, the timeframe and costs of translating any such success into land ownership and occupation.

As was the case in all such hearings, failure to attend in person resulted in exclusion of any claim by the absentee. For example, at the Oakura hearing, 872 claimant names were submitted but 569 were excluded as absentees and a further 188 excluded as rebels. In Waitara South, 238 claims were rejected as being from absentees and 149 were disallowed for non-appearance of claimants before the remainder was divided into loyals and rebels.[2]

The rules adopted by the Compensation Court meant that claimants from Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri had to navigate three extremely demanding criteria. First, absence from the hearing would invalidate any claim. Second, any suspicion of support for the 'rebels' would invalidate any claim. Third, proof of non-participation in the 'rebellion' by being away from the area by Chatham Island residence would potentially invalidate any claim. Nevertheless, Ngāti Mutunga (collectively) did ultimately achieve some limited success in Court. From Titoki to Urenui, 35 persons were to receive a total of 6,450 acres and from Urenui to Te Rau-o-te-Huia, 52 persons were to receive a total of 3,450 acres. However, this success was an illusion. The Mutunga lands had already been sold by the Government to settlers, no reserves had been set aside and there was no land available to give effect to the Compensation Court agreements.

The Tribunal in the Taranaki Report summarises the overall outcome as follows: *The Compensation Court made 518 determinations entitling loyal Māori to 79,238 acres by way of compensation, which represented about 6 percent of the confiscated area…*[3] *In 1880, the West Coast Commission reported on Māori claims that the promised land had not been provided. Fourteen years after the agreements had been made, Crown grants had still not issued for 79,823 acres, or 96 percent of the land that had been promised…*[4] *Although this court was set up to make a proper inquiry and provide justly for Māori, it gave justice to no one, becoming lost in its own legal bureaucracy… It was unfortunate for most Māori; this was their introduction to 'the law'*.[5]

The departures in 1867 and 1868 temporarily reduced the Māori population on Wharekauri to a lower number than the Moriori population. However, twenty-eight Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri representatives remained on Wharekauri to protect the interests of the iwi generally. This group included significant chiefs such as Pomare and Toenga. It is incorrect to describe these events as an 'abandonment' of Wharekauri by Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri and it is significant that none of those returning to Taranaki at that time took their

[2] Taranaki Report, Waitangi Tribunal, page 145 and 147.

[3] Ibid. Page137

[4] Ibid. Page 142. Presumably the Court made other small awards over and above the 518 determinations in 3.

[5] Ibid. Page 138

ancestors with them (as was the case when the settlement on the Auckland Islands was abandoned). A contingent of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri returned from Taranaki to attend the 1870 block title investigations being held on the island. Most Māori, however, were stranded in Taranaki as they attempted to deal with the rather haphazard findings of the Compensation Court. The awards of the Compensation Court took a decade and a half to actually implement as such land that was awarded was generally unsurveyed, had often already been alienated and the passage of time compounded uncertainties about entitlement and succession to awards.

The final resolution of land matters in Taranaki was followed quickly by a return migration of eighty to one hundred Ngāti Mutunga to Wharekauri in the mid eighteen eighties. This restored the Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri population of the Island to pre-1870 levels.

The conduct of the Taranaki Compensation Court ensured that the commitment of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri to represent themselves in Taranaki was a disaster. It consumed a large amount of tribal wealth to no end, leaving many tribal members without the means to return to Wharekauri after their failure to achieve awards or to be able to subsequently convert awards into the basis for economic livelihoods. It also meant that physically and financially, the tribe was badly placed to almost immediately represent its interests before the Land Court on Wharekauri in 1870 and it undermined social cohesion. The experience in Taranaki confirmed that the Land Court process in actuality was that of dog eat dog. Some individual Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri used the absenteeism rule to personal advantage against individuals who lacked the means to return to Wharekauri in 1870. The response of the majority of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri to these experiences was to increase support for Te Whiti whose position was to boycott the Native Land Court. Those who followed his teaching guaranteed their disenfranchisement.

Thirty Year Wait for a Review of the 1870 Native Land Court Hearings

The Wharekauri 1870 Land Court Hearings were successful for Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri in that the Court accepted that Māori had established and maintained customary control and occupation of land there. Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri also supported the granting of land by the Court to Moriori in several instances but made it clear that this was not evidence that Moriori were entitled to any land in the absence of such support. When informed by the Court that not more than ten names would be recorded on land awards, the Ngāti Mutunga response was to place representative grantees on the titles who were viewed as trustees for a wider and unnamed group of beneficiaries with customary interests in the land. Although the jurisprudence already emerging in 1870 was that named grantees were owners, not trustees, there is considerable evidence that grantees did act faithfully as trustees in most instances, meaning that land continued to be utilised and managed according to custom in practice and traditional patterns of social organisation and land use were thereby retained under a legal regime designed to precipitate their disappearance. Under the ongoing leadership of chiefs who were also grantees, these community arrangements were resilient enough to accommodate both commercial leasing of land to pakeha run-holders and, as pastoral experience and access to livestock increased, direct participation in pastoral farming also increased.

The application of the 10 owner rule, the exclusion of absentee claimants, the allocation of land on the basis of the Court's own idiosyncratic evaluation of mana and other aspects of the 1870 decisions eventually gave rise to many objections. The largely customary arrangements that had continued after 1870 came under increasing strain as the true gap between the law and custom was crystallized by land partition hearings in 1885 and 1887. The Court was keen to accommodate partition but only to grantees or their successors and the 1887 title awards were protected from review or adjustment by the Court for thirteen years in spite of immediate and widespread complaint and opposition to those partition decisions.

However, there was no rehearing on Rekohu until 1900, 30 years after the original awards.[6] Even then, the 22,000 acres awarded to the Pomare family in 1870 and subsequently confirmed was excluded from the 1900 hearing. That re-hearing did not re-establish the communal ownership undermined in 1870 but subdivided land between competing individuals and mostly small family groups often into small and uneconomic blocks. In the intervening years a significant amount of land had been sold and was thereby excluded from the re-hearing. For instance, Te Matarae and Te Awapatiki blocks were excluded for this reason.

The consequence was that the 30-year delay in achieving a re-hearing was a classic example of 'justice delayed is justice denied'. The re-hearing produced a very partial and inadequate acknowledgement of the injustices created in 1870, 1885 and 1887. Much of the evidence presented to the Court reaffirmed Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri raupatu, ringakaha, ahi kaa and mana motuhake simultaneously indicating the impossibility of adequately reconciling these customary concepts and interests with the Court's desire to allocate particular blocks of land to particular individuals. Even to the extent that redress was offered to claimants, the passage of time severely limited the land available for this purpose and the way in which this was delivered by the Court in 1900 created a new set of problems. The Court seems to have tried to give most claimants something but did so in an ad hoc fashion.

The main outcome of the 1900 review was the widespread imposition of individualised titles which finally collapsed the surviving traditional collective land use arrangements under the auspices of chiefs/grantees/trustees leading to the negative consequences listed by the Tribunal above. It is testament to the underlying strength of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri customary arrangements that it took four separate, major and fundamentally hostile Land Court interventions over a thirty-year period to extinguish them.

The Destruction of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Mana Motuhake

Crown efforts to impose sovereignty over the Chathams were unilateral, slow, weak and selective in the sense that they often involved the exercise of the prerogatives of State power (such as taxation) rather than its responsibilities (such as the opportunity to vote). The Chatham Islands were not included as part of New Zealand until 1842 in response to British fears that the islands might be annexed by Germany (see separate Special Factors Paper 2). In this Article 1 vacuum, Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri mana motuhake persisted, developed and adapted to meet the various economic, security and other challenges faced by Chatham Island Māori in ways that seemed apt to them at the time. This evolved framework was therefore unique in many ways and was not undone until after 1900 although it was under attack from 1870 onward. The eventual collapse of

[6] Rekohu Report (Wai64), Waitangi Tribunal. Page 209.

these cultural arrangements therefore resulted in the collapse of something without exact parallel and that loss is a significant special factor.

There was no permanent Government representation on Wharekauri for thirteen years after annexation and when it arrived it took the form of Archibald Shand who was both collector of customs on the Chatham Islands and resident magistrate. His arrival in 1855 was objected to by Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri who had not been consulted on, or even informed about, his appointment and who were reluctant to recognise his right to exercise any great authority over them. (Mr Archibald Shand*) … arrived at Waitangi with his family in the brig Workington without a constable or any means of enforcing his authority…Shand thought that the resistance to his arrival was linked to the chiefs' concern that he might oblige them to pay debts to Europeans and restrict their access to tobacco and liquor. More broadly than that, however, they were probably showing concern for their presumed right to govern*.[7]

In fact, as Shand would quickly learn that right was more real than presumed and applied to European settlers and missionaries as well as to Māori and Moriori. In 1858, he proposed to buy a parcel of land from the missionaries. Some Māori opposed to this transaction intervened and some cattle were killed before Shand sought the protection of the Māori chiefs and thereafter dealt with them directly. Engst [one of the Moravian missionaries] would later write that, in general, '*titles or grants of land from Natives [were given] to White people who take a woman from the natives, but that that gave them no claim to land except to cultivate it as long as they happened to live with the woman*. He added: *if they left the island their claims were cancelled – if any dispute arose amongst the natives they did not dare to interfere and had to ask permission to cultivate or make any use of what was in the land that they might happen to want. The Māori action is explicable in terms of their own law*…[8]

The rather unpopular and incompetent Archibald Shand was replaced as resident magistrate by Captain William Thomas in 1863. *At first, Thomas informed the people that they should settle their own 'petty disputes' and only come to him if they could not agree, and journal entries for late 1863 and early 1864 observe that Māori and Moriori were managing cases themselves, though possibly separately. On 3 October 1864, an official runanga was created under the [Native District Regulations Act 1858] with six members including Tapu [a Moriori]. Little is known of the runanga's deliberations, as it appears that Thomas was informed only when his assistance was sought to complete regulations*.[9]

This indicates that Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri mana motuhake remained relatively undisturbed even though the quality of Crown representation in the person of Thomas had been upgraded. Practical Government influence and even presence on the island therefore remained minimal until the arrival of the Hau hau prisoners in 1866. (see separate Special Factors Paper 2). Even then, that presence was not focused on regulating the Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri population but on the prisoners – and reportedly in an increasingly lackadaisical fashion.

Even when Ngāti Mutunga numbers on Wharekauri were near their lowest ebb, there is evidence that their influence over both the Moriori and Pakeha

[7] WAI 164, page 69

[8] Ibid. Page 92

[9] Ibid. Pages 81 and 82

population was disproportionate in keeping with their mana whenua status. This influence was illustrated by some farcical events from September 1872[10], which led to the suspension of the Collector of Customs and Resident Magistrate, R. J. Lanauze. A groundless panic gripped the settlers on Chatham Island that they were under imminent threat from the actually much smaller and less well armed Māori population. Interestingly, the settlers also feared that Moriori would make common cause with Ngāti Mutunga. Although laughable in many ways, these events could not have occurred if Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri lacked the capacity to inspire dread which is a useful practical pre-requisite to the expression of, or imposition of, mana motuhake.

Mana motuhake as exercised by Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri required quite radical and rapid responses to the changing economic circumstances of the Chathams. From 1835 to the mid-1850s Māori on Wharekauri developed a successful 'potatoes and pigs' economy supplying visiting whaling vessels and export markets (notably Australia) with a range of local produce. This production and trade was organised under customary social structures and land tenure which simultaneously supplied all local needs. It was a desire to tax this trade which motivated the appointment of a collector of customs. Ironically, the arrival of Archibald Shand more or less coincided with the disappearance of the whaling fleet from the Chathams grounds which eliminated the produce trading opportunities that Māori had become reliant upon.

The economic alternative that was developed by Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri was to offer leases of selected areas of the islands to three or four Pakeha runholders. These areas excluded kainga areas and areas employed for cultivation. The desire by lessees for better legal definition of these leases provided the impetus for application to the Native Land Court to issue title to customary lands. The second economic model employed under customary arrangements was therefore a continuation of subsistence agriculture supplemented by land rents from graziers. As mentioned, this model underwent further modification in the 1880s when Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri became increasingly directly involved in pastoral farming themselves.

Through the whole of the 19th century, Wharekauri Māori were actively involved in production and trade in various goods to meet export demand and to satisfy their demand for imported manufactured goods and livestock such as horses. The goods traded and the technologies to produce them changed dramatically over that time but customary Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri social and land arrangements proved themselves sufficiently flexible to respond successfully to the rapid changes in the agribusiness model employed up until the collapse of those collective arrangements after 1900. In addition to these large economic challenges, Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri had to cope with continuing devastating viral pneumonia and measles epidemics in the 1830s and 1860s which similarly affected the Moriori population. Other disasters included the destruction of settlements at Port Hutt and Waitangi by the French in 1838, the dispute between Ngāti Tama and Ngāti Mutunga at Waitangi in 1840 and the destruction of the settlement at Tupuangi by a tsunami in 1868.

The overall position of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri was that in practical terms they exercised an extraordinary degree of autonomy according to their contemporary view of what was fitting. In essence, compared to most mainland

[10] See: *Panic among the settlers – a fiasco in A Decade of Disasters:* in: *the Chatham Islands from 1866 to 1875, Chapter 24, Rhys Richards and Bill Carter.* Published by Paremata Press 2009.

iwi, Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri held on to mana motuhake over Wharekauri (described by Judith Binney generally as the independent and continuing authority of Māori in their own land) until a later date. It was the Native Land Court decisions of 1870, 1885, 1887 and 1900, rather than the more muscular and direct expression of Government authority, that ultimately undermined and destroyed that mana motuhake. The extent of that destruction was greater than elsewhere because those customary arrangements were more complete and had proven capable of meeting all the enormous challenges faced by Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri up until 1900. The loss associated with its destruction was therefore also greater.

The Consequences of Disenfranchisement

Failure to obtain individual title and loss of communal land had exceptionally severe consequences for Wharekauri Māori. This process of disenfranchisement began in 1870 and was resisted to some extent by grantee/trustees until 1900. Even those who received land grants in 1900 often found that they were incapable of supporting themselves either as a lessor or pastoral farmer because of the small size or poor quality of land parcels awarded. Māori in these circumstances elsewhere in New Zealand were forced to enter the labour market, but usually in the vicinity of their customary home. In the case of Wharekauri, there were very limited employment opportunities locally and landless Māori there were forced to seek employment in New Zealand. Disenfranchisement therefore meant virtually the same as exile.

Exile is generally regarded with dread in tribal societies because it means the loss of the everyday communal social, cultural and economic support that are integral to whanau and hapu membership. There is no substitute for the richness and security of this existence and even Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri who subsequently carved a viable existence for themselves and their families in the Pakeha world off-island generally mourn its loss. Few economic exiles in those early generations became sufficiently wealthy to maintain regular visits to Wharekauri as was their wish. Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri who sought employment in New Zealand were handicapped by the limited education available on the Chatham Islands and also suffered culture shock, particularly in urban environments. This culture shock and trauma was no doubt experienced by many Māori who left their customary rohe in search of work in the twentieth century. However, there is no doubt that the experience of Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri was extreme and often without the consolation of possible occasional return for events such as tangi.