

REVIEW OF THE
'WĀHI TAPU AND KĀPITI COAST RESEARCH REPORT'

Report for Kāpiti Coast District Council

Des Tātana Kahotea PhD

October 2015

1.0 Introduction

In April 2015 I produced a report which reviewed the 'Wāhi Tapu & The Kāpiti Coast Research Report' by Pātaka Moore (2012), Wāhi Tapu Site Reports¹ and submissions for five Wāhi Tapu sites in the Kāpiti Coast Proposed District Plan (PDP). An objective of my report was to identify any additional research and assessment recommended to respond to the submissions to the Wāhi Tapu sites. The material on the five Wāhi Tapu sites has now been superseded by my later research which is contained in individual reports for the sites ie Taumānuka 3F, Makahuri, Pukehou Urupā, Kaiwarehou and Taewapirau. However, the analysis of the Moore report remains valid, and it is considered useful to now cover this in a separate report. I have also updated some of the overview information previously provided about urupā and pā.

2.0 Wāhi Tapu & The Kāpiti Coast Research Report

The 'Wāhi Tapu & the Kāpiti Coast Research Report' is about the process used in researching and collating material for Māori cultural heritage which has been defined as wāhi tapu for the Proposed Kāpiti Coast District Plan ('PDP'). The use of wāhi tapu to signify cultural heritage has been an approach taken by the iwi and hapū of the Kāpiti Coast who have operated collectively for Resource Management Act purposes as Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti. The methodology used by Moore was Kaupāpā Māori Research which emphasises establishing a relationship, respect and an empowering process with hapū and iwi informants, and recognising the primacy of iwi and hapū knowledge. Kaupāpā Māori research method and practise uses Māori cultural values as its ethical foundation compared to other professional and academic disciplines with their specific code of ethics.

Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti comprises the three iwi of Kāpiti Coast District Council area and was established in 1994 to represent tāngata whenua roles and interests to the Council under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). This role was extended to the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). The three iwi Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa migrated from their areas of origins from Taranaki, Te Kaokaoroa Ki Te Pātetere and Maungatautari, and Kāwhia in the 1820s to the Kāpiti Coast. Through battle and key intermarriages they replaced Rangitāne and Muaūpoko and established their mana of the area with their occupation and settlement.

In 2010 a Wāhi Tapu Reference Group was established to undertake the research process and provide on-going advice to Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti. Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti, for the Historic Heritage section of the PDP, has utilised a traditional approach and concept, wāhi tapu, to define

¹ The wāhi tapu site reports were prepared by Pātaka Moore on behalf of iwi.

their Māori cultural heritage. Policy 10.1 category (d) of the PDP cites historic heritage as including ‘*Wāhi tapu and other places and areas of significance to iwi*’. The use of the term ‘wāhi tapu’ is to emphasise the cultural and spiritual aspects of their heritage places and areas, and it incorporates places and areas of significance. This is articulated by values such as rangātiritanga, kaitiakitanga, tikanga, mauri, tapu, noa and rāhui that define wāhi tapu². The heritage that is emphasised by Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti is the sites and places associated with the establishment of their mana and occupation since the 1820s, of pā, kāinga, mahinga kai, wāhi tapu, burial grounds, tauranga waka, tauranga ika and other sites and places.

Heritage sites and places require specific information to provide validation and certainty for location and cultural values for district plan purposes. The incorporation of Māori heritage in the planning process has been recent, since the RMA, and majority of Māori heritage is located on private property because of the historical processes of colonisation and land alienation. This places demands on quality of supporting information for Māori cultural heritage where Māori have been refining and developing the knowledge and expertise required for cultural heritage management in the absence of academic and professional support. There are many factors that impact on gathering information for the recording of Māori cultural heritage for RMA purposes and key elements are any prior or previous research that has been conducted which can be utilised for heritage research and assessment, and funding. Moore made the following observations that placed limitations on his research and assessment³:

- No specific plans (Iwi Management Plans) that aim to protect and enhance wāhi tapu throughout the district (p 23).
- Scarce iwi knowledge (p 27).
- Reliance on secondary historical sources (p 27).
- Inconsistent levels of information and availability (p 27).
- Variability between iwi on wāhi tapu information.

This is a common and consistent theme throughout Aotearoa and the Waipounamu, for many iwi and hapū, wāhi tapu or heritage sites have not had the same cultural retention objectives as other cultural knowledge such as waiata (traditional songs) and whakapapa (genealogy). There has been no concerted effort in the past to undertake a programme of capturing the memory and knowledge of kaumātua or others who had this knowledge relevant to heritage places and sites.

² Moore, Pātaka. 2012 Wāhi Tapu & the Kāpiti Coast: A Research Report p 15-16.

³ Ibid.

Treaty of Waitangi claims and hearings has been a process where archival and document research, interviews and evidence of kaumātua and other people with knowledge are utilised. Importantly with the Treaty claims there is funding, although variable, which has allowed material to be accumulated which can be used for wāhi tapu. The use of historians and other professional experts and their research and reports is a major contribution to Waitangi claim and hearing process.

For RMA heritage objectives, there is little consistency of funding compared to the Treaty of Waitangi process and it is dependent on Councils who do not generally have a funding policy for tāngata whenua heritage identification and assessment. Councils depend on the goodwill of iwi and hapū to provide cultural information for the heritage provisions of the district plan and this generally does not happen because of funding requirements to undertake this task. This is not expected from other fields such as landscape and ecology.

To acquire a good level of material for wāhi tapu identification and assessment, requires substantial resourcing for research and consultation with iwi. Moore in collaboration with iwi and hapū has achieved a reasonable level of information to support the wāhi tapu in the PDP but, with the submissions against some wāhi tapu, further research and assessment is required to get these wāhi tapu confirmed as listed in the district plan.

Moore emphasises tāngata whenua or mana whenua views, values and knowledge and he uses Carkeek who identifies significant sites and places⁴. Carkeek's book is an important historical and heritage document but if it used as a secondary source for district plan heritage sites there are limitations. Carkeek does not make any extensive use of the primary data which he sourced from the Native Land court minutes of evidence produced for land title investigation. The use of traditional narratives for district plan heritage requires specific information about place where primary sources and precise location is valued whereas, for history, it is the presentation of the past that is valued. However, the work of Carkeek is important for the places he identified in the book which provides valuable support of heritage places for district plan purposes.

Wakahuia Carkeek is the author of *The Kāpiti Coast* first published in 1967. The book attempts to reconstruct historical events in the Kāpiti district using Native Land Court material. The book contains narratives about the peoples who settled the coast prior to Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa and Te Ātiawa, people who descend from the Kurahaupo and Tokomaru waka. It has a section Place Names of the Kāpiti Coast which is a list of 258 places including Kāpiti Island and maps of place

⁴ Carkeek 2004. *The Kāpiti Coast. Māori History and Place Names of the Paekakariki-Otāki District*. Reed. First published 1967.

location, something that Waikato Iwi historians Pei Te Hurinui Jones and Leslie Kelly did not undertake for their publications on 'Tainui'. Carkeek would have understood the value of such a section in his book because of the impact of intensive residential and land-use development along the Kāpiti Coast since the 1910s on places of cultural significance. Moore drew information from this section for his wāhi tapu site reports. Initially, Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti identified 474 wāhi tapu sites to be added into the PDP. These wāhi tapu were sourced from historical literature such as Adkin (1948) and Carkeek (1967). However, after initiating this research project, work with Te Whakaminenga and iwi members resulted in an increase to 622 sites⁵. These were then reduced to the 41 additional wāhi tapu that are included the PDP. Out of these, ten submitters⁶ objected to the wāhi tapu on their properties in the PDP. Overall the challenge from property owners has been on the low side but this is influenced by the fact that the location of wāhi tapu in relation to private property owners was a factor in the selection of the wāhi tapu sites⁷.

The precautionary system identified by Moore⁸ and used by Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti is a standard approach to information sharing by iwi and hapū because of how they value and respect this knowledge. Three levels of sensitivity were used as database indicators to manage information. For the highly sensitive sites for iwi, limited information was shared with the Council or was not made public, and consultation with iwi should occur for the provision of additional information. The next level of sensitivity was cautionary where some information was withheld by the iwi, but consultation needed to occur. At the next level, information was made public but there was still a requirement for consultation⁹.

However it becomes problematic when dealing with private property owners where a policy of providing as much information as possible helps these property owners to acquire some understanding of the background and how Māori value cultural heritage that may be on their property.

3.0 Wāhi Tapu Site Reports

In my report of April 2015, I considered the five wāhi tapu listed in the table below. This included consideration of the specific Wāhi Tapu Site Reports prepared by Pātaka Moore on behalf of iwi.

⁵ Ibid. p.29

⁶ Submissions 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 Waikanae Golf Club (Inc); 78-1 P Brownie, 171-1 The Brownie Trust, 207-1 L Brownie; 263-31, 263-38 Maypole Environmental Ltd; 272-5 Te Anau Trust; 344-7, 344-9, 344-10 J Rice; 350-4, 350-6, 350-7 P Keene; 497-10 RNR Trust; 557-1 D Castle

⁷ Pātaka Moore pers. comm January 2015.

⁸ Moore p.31

⁹ Moore p30-31.

Plan ID	Name	Type	Iwi	Group	No of submitters
WTS0127B	Taumānuka 3F	Tauranga Waka, Tauranga Ika, Mahinga Kai	Ngāti Raukawa	D	1
WTS0137	Makahuri	Pā	Ngāti Raukawa	D	16
WTS0183A	Pukehou Urupā	Urupā	Te Āti Awa	A	1
WTS0318	Taewapirau	Pā and urupā	Te Āti Awa	B	3
WTS0206	Kaiwarehou	Pā	Te Āti Awa	D	2

The writer was impressed by the quality and amount of information and mapping for the five wāhi tapu site reports considered. To attain this level requires substantial resourcing, research and support from both tāngata whenua and Council. This had been supported by earlier preliminary work done by Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti.

Submitters question tāngata whenua knowledge and memory of place because of the emphasis today on expert research skill and knowledge. Tapu and its system of cultural avoidance is a central value to Māori cultural beliefs relating to human bones and burial places, and experiences of tapu provides the knowledge and memory people have today.

As stated above Moore emphasised the knowledge of tāngata whenua including the publication of Carkeek whom he treated as an informant rather than a source of primary data with Carkeek's references to various minute books. My April 2015 report noted that there appeared to be sufficient primary information from archival sources including minute books to address criticisms of inadequate information stated by submitters. I have since undertaken additional research which is contained in separate site reports for each of the wāhi tapu.

4.0 General Discussion

4.1 Burials / Urupā

Three of the five wāhi tapu areas considered in my April 2015 report relate to burials and a burial ground. Many urupā were first made public or identified and surveyed when investigation of title was conducted by the Native Land Court. There are many cases around Aotearoa where urupā were not surveyed and with land alienation the memory and knowledge of these places dissipates with

time. Some land has been used as an urupā for a considerable period of time without being formally set aside as a reservation. This can happen when, at the time the land was partitioned, an area was set aside for an urupā but, through an oversight, the application for reservation status was never made or completed.¹⁰

Ururupā are the core of Māori traditional religious belief and cultural practice in the past and today where the relationship between the dead and the living, ancestors and descendants are highly valued and acknowledged with customary beliefs and behaviour. Ancestors were central to Māori traditional religious beliefs and notions and burial places, which came in many forms, were the most sacred and revered places. They were tapu and this practice is maintained today.¹¹ There is a relationship between the dead and the living. It is the obligation of the living to ensure the dead, their relatives, are buried in the proper place and to protect them from disturbance and desecration. This applies to centuries old ururupā of ancestors. They are resting places are places of great mana and tapu and to disregard wāhi tapu should never be considered.

There were no physical signs (tohu), monuments or physical elaboration to identify burial grounds and individual burials. This was not a Māori cultural practice, but in the process of hahunga tupāpāku¹², chiefs were housed in elaborate structures of wood, fibre, feathers and plant material. There was generally no physical indication that the area was a burial ground such as posts or markers, before the era of headstones. There was also no uniformity to burials as internment in the ground meant were generally dispersed over an area. What was important was the burial ground or ururupā, or the area for the hapū or whānau, rather than the acknowledgement of buried individuals with a marker. It also meant an individual or mass burial area as unmarked graves could be protected from any disturbance or desecration from enemies where any outward signs would indicate the area as a burial place. In cases where old burial grounds were surveyed, boundaries did not necessarily reflect the distribution of burials.

The introduction of Christianity and cultural domination through colonisation brought changes to Māori burial customs and practises. The presence of missionaries on the Kāpiti Coast and their influence and the decline of inter-iwi warfare with British colonisation meant burial grounds were established close to the inland kāinga and settlements.

¹⁰ Judge Stephanie Milroy 2014. Urupa Reservations. <http://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/Māori-land-court/judges-corner-1/judges-corner-previous-articles/urupa-reservations#legislative-history>

¹¹ Mead, S. 2003. Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values. Huia Publishers p 67

¹² Bone cleaning ritual

Māori found themselves surrounded by property owners and land users who did not share their cultural beliefs relating to wāhi tapu and burial grounds although the British understood outdoor burial grounds which was an English specialty.¹³ The attitudes to burial grounds and kōiwi (bones) were different from Māori. The first comprehensive burial law was passed in 1882 which brought all land used for burial under a common legal structure irrespective of how the land had come to be set aside. This did not apply to Māori burial grounds or urupā. The Cemeteries Act 1882 required local authorities to provide cemeteries which are still the case today.

Legal protection for Māori burials is the Pouhere Taonga 2014 Act and the Ture Whenua Act 1993. Prior to 1993 the Court had the ability under s 439 of the Māori Affairs Act 1953 to recommend land be set apart as a Māori Reservation for the purposes of a burial ground. This power continues pursuant to s 338 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

The RMA and district plan heritage provisions, and Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 become important for the protection and management of burials on private land.

4.2 Pā

Submitters opposing the wāhi tapu sites in the PDP respond not only to the potential impact on future development or land-use on the property but the identification of sites as pā because they do not display any distinctive earthworks associated with pā sites. They also cite past land-use activity as being detrimental to the pā, meaning any physical damage or changes to the pā should mean low cultural values. From the tāngata whenua perspective and tikanga¹⁴, any general ground disturbance does not compromise the values of a wāhi tapu where tapu and cultural values remain because of certain past use such as burials and the metaphysical association of ancestor and place.

The establishment and occupation of pā is central to the history of Ngāti Toa, Te Ātiawa and Ngāti Raukawa on the Kāpiti Coast. This begins with the initial arrival of Ngāti Toa and Taranaki iwi and their battles with the resident iwi followed by the coming of Ngāti Raukawa in 1824 and 1825 and four further migrations by various Taranaki iwi to the Kāpiti Coast between 1824 and 1834. In 1834, the year of the last Taranaki heke, tension between Ngāti Raukawa and Te Ātiawa over resources arose culminating in battles between them at pā around the Ōtaki River mouth and Haowhenua near Te Horo. Tension remained between Ngāti Raukawa and Te Ātiawa with another major battle Te Kuititanga in 1839 with the initial attack by Ngāti Raukawa on the Te Ātiawa Waimea pā in

¹³ English Heritage 2011. The Heritage of Death. Conservation Bulletin Issue 66

¹⁴ custom

Waikanae followed by further skirmishes and battles in the area. Ngāti Raukawa and Te Ātiawa had two to three pā in their respective areas of Waikanae and Ōtaki which were the major residential pā for their hapū but also had a number of smaller pā that were hapū specific.

Carkeek identified 24 named pā in his publication and there are only eight pā recorded by New Zealand Archaeological Association in the PDP area. Evidence presented to the Native Land Court investigating title to land and administering partitions between the Waikanae River and Waitohu Stream reveals more pā. Te Watene Taungatara of Ngāti of Te Ātiawa identified Opoua (on the coast), Upokotekaia, Pikihoru and Tiwaepirau (sic Taewapirau) along the Waimeha Stream¹⁵. Ben Ngaia identifies 14 pā around Waikanae and he identifies Upokotekaia and Taewapirau but not Opoua and Pikihoru¹⁶. These pā were erected and utilised by hapū on land they occupied and cultivated.

Kāpiti Coast is a narrow coastal plain where extensive sand dune systems create the undulating topography which dominates much of the coastal landscape bounded by the foothills of the Tararua Range. The pā are built on the sand dunes at the river mouths, along streams and inland. No pā has been recorded or identified on the foothills of the Tararua Ranges.

Along the Kāpiti Coast, occupants of pā were adapting to the natural contours of the dune rather than undertaking major earthworks to create living floors and defence. When muskets became the major weapon in warfare this brought about changes in the way pā were defended and where they were located. There was no need for extensive earthworks for fortifications, high hills with natural defences such as steep sides, and extensive modification for living and activity areas during the era of stone and wooden weapons. The main pā of Te Ātiawa were Kenakena and Waimea where Te Ātiawa sheltered together but there was also other pā occupied by hapū when they were not in Kenakena and Waimea (fig. 2). This was the same for Ngāti Raukawa where Ōtaki was the first major pā but this was replaced by Pakakutu and Rangiuuru where Ngāti Raukawa sheltered and there was a series of smaller hapū pā when the hapū were away from the main pā.

The mismatch between the NZAA recording of pā and the traditional and historical references is partly the background to archaeological site identification and surveys recording for the NZAA site recording scheme but the main element for the Kāpiti Coast is that pā are built on the sand dunes. The building of pā on sand dunes does not leave any recognisable physical features that pā in other parts of the country are noted for. These are earthworks of ditches and banks for defence, terraces

¹⁵ OMB

¹⁶ Ngaia, B. 2011. Cultural Impact Assessment. Mackay's to Pekapeka Expressway. The Takamore Trust.

and platforms that were created to make level living spaces and pits for kumara storage and in most soils remain today as recognisable surface features. When a pā was established on a sand dune there was little physical alteration and living floors or house sites were placed where they could be in the uneven ground. Or it may be the nature of the sand dune that once occupation has ceased given the unstable nature of sand, surfaces change until the fixing by vegetation. Another factor is the short period of occupation of the Kāpiti Coast from the 1820s to the 1840s where many of the pā were only occupied for very short periods and may not show sub-surface archaeological features or detail that archaeologists are familiar with in other areas. Bruce MacFadgen's observations of the archaeology of the Kāpiti Coast has been the late period sites identified from oral accounts and dated to just before and after European contact. Many, described as pā, are located along waterways and the inner boundary of the dune belt. The pā sites contrast with the earlier sites by the sparse occurrence of shell midden, fish and bird bone, and imported stone. The settlement pattern is dispersed¹⁷". McFadgen is referring to the accounts of Carkeek and Adkins.

What distinguishes pā for archaeologists from other settlement types such as kāinga, is the presence of defences, palisades and ditch and banks. There have been few pā recorded by archaeologists along the Kāpiti Coast where residential development along the coast has destroyed many pā and recognisable surface pā features cannot be distinguished in the sand dunes. There has been little archaeological research investigation conducted in the area, with only site recording over the years. However development under the RMA has meant the conduct of archaeological assessments and monitoring especially works for the new coastal highway. There has been no excavation conducted of a pā site so we know very little about the archaeology of a pā along the Kāpiti Coast.

Table 2 NZAA Pā Site Records (see figure 1)

NZAA site number	Site Record Form Information	Site Recorder
R26/93 Whareroa Pa	1964 - Large sand hill immediately north of Whareroa stream. Covered in flax and lupin, Crown land. 1989 - Covered in vegetation. Traces of midden near bottom of seaward slope. Small intact deposits (3) near top of the hill.	

¹⁷ McFadgen, B.1997 Archaeology of the Wellington Conservancy: Kapiti-Horowhenua. A prehistoric and palaeoenvironmental study. Department of Conservation

NZAA site number	Site Record Form Information	Site Recorder
	1998 - A large sand dune on both sides of the Whareroa Stream in QE Park. Note that previously SRFs record the site as being on the north of the stream only. In fact the original pā was on the dune to the north and later occupation moved to the lower area. Prehistoric occupation sites, a metal button clay pipe fragments	S. Forbes
R26/270	Ditch bank defences 1996 On hill above Paekakariki Recorded by Adkin notebook 1960.	
R26/94	1963 - Wainui pā prominent sandhill Extensive midden traces in vicinity, midden on top.100 ft long ditch, 30 ft deep. 2004 - Large dominant crest, modification by road and viewing platform. Site covered in vegetation.	J Daniels Mary O’Keefe
R26/263 Te Moutere	1994 - Small pā on tongue of sand jutting into swamp. Single ditch. Source - Adkin 1948 “Horowhenua”	A.Walton Destroyed
R26/36 Haowhenua	2011 pā – 3 pits and 5 possible terraces. Haowhenua pā - name provided by Te Waari Carkeek.	Catherine Barr
R26/285	1998 - Promotory pā high terrace above Waikanae River. Source of information - Adkins notes. Pa O Toata	
S25/56	Island pā sourced from Adkin and aerial photo	

These are pā that have remained relatively intact.

Rangiuru Pā

In an application for partition for the Taumanuka 3 block in 1896, many gave evidence describing the building of the Rangiuru pā and Pakakutu pā, their purpose and use, the distinction between a pā for fighting and a non-fighting pā, the location of the pā, the hapū who occupied and the cultivations associated with the pā which were generally in the vicinity. Tamihana Te Hora said Ngāti Raukawa settled from Kāpiti after Heke Kawheke at Ōtaki pā south of the Ōtaki River, on land given by Te Rauparaha and Waitohi¹⁸ to Ngāti Huia¹⁹. Cultivations were on the north bank as far as Waitohi There was no pā at Rangiuru and Pakakutu at this time²⁰.

¹⁸ Te Rauparaha’s sister

During the first hostility between Te Ātiawa and Ngāti Raukawa in 1834, Ngāti Raukawa shifted from the Ōtaki pā which was at the Ōtaki River mouth on the western side of the river to the other side to Mangapouri, a tributary of Rangiora and built a new pā which was called Rangiora. Rangiora pā was occupied until the 1850s²¹ and a number of people recorded visiting and describing the pā.²² A large proportion of the Rangiora pā was surveyed as Taumānuka No 5 in 1878 (figs 5-6). The writer examined the block in March 2015 during the same period field visits were made to Taewapirau and found that Rangiora pā is located in sand dunes close to the coast. The appearance today of the pā, is a series of irregular humps and hollows with small flat areas (stream flats) along the Mangapouri stream (figs 7, 8). The topography is similar to Taewapirau. Pakakutu was a pā close to Rangiora and erected at the same time and figure 4 shows the pā with palisades and structures nestling in the irregular surfaces of the dune.

5.0 Conclusions

This report reviews the 'Wāhi Tapu and the Kāpiti Coast Research Report' by Pātaka Moore 2012. The report set out the process used in researching and collating material leading to the identification of wāhi tapu in the Proposed District Plan. The approach taken by the author was thorough and reflected the focus on archival material supported by iwi and hapū informants.

My April 2015 report reviewed five Wāhi Tapu reports prepared by Pātaka Moore on behalf of iwi for Taumānuka 3F, Makahuri, Pukehou Urupā, Kaiwarehou and Taewapirau. I also considered submissions opposing those wāhi tapu. At that time I commented that the reports were of high quality but could be supplemented by additional archival research. I have since undertaken that research and it is contained in separate site reports for each of the wāhi tapu.

This current report also provides some information about urupā identifying their importance to iwi as wāhi tapu, and describing changes in Māori burial practices and customs over time. Finally, the report contains information about pā, and identifies that there is a difference between the Māori and archaeological construct of pā.

¹⁹ Ōtaki pā now the River Reserve.

²⁰ Tamihana Te Hora OMB4 p237

²¹ Hema Te Ao OMB4

²² Rev Hadfield 1839

Bibliography

Barr, Catherine. 2013 Pekapeka to North Otaki Expressway Project: Assessment of Effects Archaeology. Opus report for New Zealand Transport Agency.

Carkeek, Wakahuia. 2004. The Kāpiti Coast. Māori History and Place Names of the Paekakariki-Otāki District. Reed. First published 1967.

Davidson, Janet. 1987. The prehistory of New Zealand. Longman, Paul. Auckland.

English Heritage 2011. The Heritage of Death. Conservation Bulletin Issue 66

Macmorran, B. 1969. Octavius Hadfield. Wellington.

Mead, Hirini Moko. 2003. Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values. Huia Publishers

Moore, Pātaka. 2012. Wāhi Tapu & The Kāpiti Coast: A Research Report

Milroy, Judge Stephanie. 2014. Urupa Reservations. <http://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/Māori-land-court/judges-corner-1/judges-corner-previous-articles/urupa-reservations#legislative-history>

Otaki Minute Book 4