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HE TOHU O TE WĀIPOUNEMU: ŌNA AWA ME TE TAOKA POUNEMU ATAHAUA

Nā Michael Stevens tēnei whakaahua
ABSTRACT

This research is concerned with Kai Tahu experiences and understandings of the concept and use of the term, landscape. The term itself is one used variously to represent for us as Iwi, the land and the sea including flora and fauna. The Kai Tahu landscape is Papatuānuku, our cosmological mother. Particular areas used for the case studies include the following marae: Ōtākou, Karitane Kaikōura, Tuahiwi, Kā marae e toru o Horomaka, Taumutu, Te Tai Poutini, Hukanui, Waipatai, Arowhenua, Oraka, Awarua and the many places of te rohe pōtae o Kai Tahu i Te Wāipounamu. Material was drawn from literature, the participants formally interviewed and many from within and outside Kai Tahu rohe pōtae. All responses are used to illustrate the ways in which Kai Tahu and some of their non-Kai Tahu spouses express particular definitions of what for each, constitutes and is constituted in the landscape.

Kai Tahu participants' landscape definition includes whakapapa, placenames, identity (personal and cultural), spirituality and sustenance. Elements of these are present to a similar degree for some of the spouses, but not all. This seems largely dependent upon the degree to which they have participated in matters pertaining to Kai Tahu. Degrees of participation and connection may be applied to Tahu people alienated from their kaik, whether urbanised near or distantly domiciled.

Theoretical bases in literature from a number of disciplines are used to discuss perceptions of what anthropologists more usually term 'place' and how Kai Tahu fit this or choose to fit the understanding of cultural others into our world view. The research also looks briefly at the environmental landscape and who presently has power and therefore mana over its use and or misuse, especially in relation to management of Papatuānuku.

Due to the of the type project this thesis is, it cannot finally conclude there is a single Kai Tahu or gender specific perception of landscape. This would never be provable in any circumstance, since it is not scientifically based. It does however, suggest there is an indigenous perspective of landscape that differs from certain Western thinking and within the indigenous perspective, a Kai Tahu epistemological understanding of the landscape based on our theory and knowledge of ourselves.
Preface

In this thesis I have drawn heavily on examples provided in the literature consulted and the interviews conducted with participants from the various areas of Te Wāipounamu and rāwahi on Aotearoa and overseas. A total of 77 individuals have been named, while four at their request, have had their identity kept anonymous. However others long since deceased with whom I have interacted, conversed and known during my lifetime have also been used as sources. Excerpts from the formal interviews are referenced using the full name of the participant followed by a date where known and the year in which the interviews / conversations took place.
AKU MIHI ATU

Ko kā roimata i ētahi wā e heke iho ki āku paparika, he tohu. He tohu maumaharahara ki ia a koutou kua wheturakitia, ahakoa he Taua, he Poua rānei, he tamaiti, he rakatahi koe tonu.

Ka huri au ki ia takata i tautoko, i awhi mai i a au i ēnei mahi rakahau, i ēnei mahi uaua mahaku. He kaha nā te katoa a koutou i te puta i ő koutou whakaaro. Kei roto i te tuhika nei ē koutou kupu, hei whakaatau ki tōu tātou nei iwi, ā mo kā uri ka heke mai. Ki a koutou i tōku whānau, i te whānau whānui mai i Te Tapu a O Uenuku whiti noa ki Rakiura, huri ki Te Tai Poutini atu ki Kahurangi, ki te iwi katoa i Kai Tahu, hei tuara mahaku i kā wā he hoha tēnei. Ki a koe Justine, he mihi aroha ki a koe mō ōu mahi whakahihahira mahaku mai i te timataka atu ki te mutukia i te rakahau, tēnei te mihi tino rawe. Kōrua ko Loraine, koutou ko Leslie, he mahi tino whakahihahira nā koutou mai i a au. No reira, tēnā rawa atu koutou. Āku mihi anō ki ēnei tākata, Ko Anake Goodall kōrua ko Bill Dacker, koutou ko Iaean Cranwell, ko Michael Stevens. Nā tō koutou aroha i hoaturia e koutou i a au kā whakaahua, kā pakoko me kā mahere whenua, kā mihi tino aroha.

He mihi ki a Jacqui kōrua ko Tieme ōku kaiārahi i te timatataki i tēnei rakahau. Tēnā rawa atu kōrua i kā wā i whakahokia e kōrua i a au ki te ara tika. Ka mōhio i kā wa i huri haere au me ōku whakaaro ki tetahi wāhi tino rerekē. Ki a koe Tieme, he mihi nunui mō tōu tino kaha tonu, a, i te wā i tōno tāua ki te piki ake tēnei kaupapa ki he rakahau nui, ahakoa kaore ka taea e koe hei kaiārahi tae noa ki te mutukia. He mihi anō mo ou mahi uaua e pa ana ki tēnei I mua i te haereka ki kā kaimaaka. He kaha hoki koe Jacqui i te mea uaua, no te mea, he whakaaro tino Kai Tahu tēnei. Ā te hekeka i tēnei rakahau whakahihahira kii te Kai Tahu he wahine toa i whawhai ai mahaku. Ia wā ia wā koe i hapai te kaupapa i kā wā e pukuriri ana te kaihautu. He wahine tino toa koe mai i te timata ki te otika o te rakahau. Heoi ānō, nahau te mana wahine. Ki a koe ano Ian, ahakoa kaore koe i whai ki tēnei wahine ahua hoha i ētahi wā. No reira, ki a koutou ōku kaiārahi, kā mihi tino mahana nahaku. Ki a koe Ruth, he mihi, he mihi, he mihi mahau mo ia wā I hapaitia e koe oku whaika mātaira iki te mahi i mahia i te rohoriko iti, ā, i te hanga pukapuka.

Kī tōku hoa rakatira hei whākai, hei tautoko, hei hapai i a au i tō kaha me tōu arohanui. Ka kahattia e koe ki tōku hinekaroi, ki tōku kakau mai rā ānō mai i te timataki atu ki te mutukia i whāi mātaira koe a au. He tino mihi tēnei mōhou, he tino aroha hōhonu mōhou.

Ki te mihi whakahamukia taku mō te wahine i whānau mai i a au, ā ko tōku hākui Nancy. Ahakoa he whakapapa Pākelhā tōhona, he kakau orite ki Kai Tahu tōhona i ētahi wā. He kakau nunui ki ia i kā tamariki tāhau. Nō reira e Nance, ko tēnei te mihi mōhou nā tetahi i āu tamariki. Ahakoa kaore ka taea e koe kia noho i waeka i a mātou ki tēnei taha i te arai, ka mōhiotia e au he kakau tino kī i te whakahi i ia a matou ahakoa mahaku anake te mātāraka pēnei i whai. I noho mokemoke ai tonu kā tamariki katoa koe i puta.
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LANDSCAPE: PERCEPTIONS OF KAI TAHU I MUA, ĀIANEI, A MURI AKE.

INTRODUCTION.

TE TIMATAKA

KO ĀORAKI TE MAUKA ARIKI, KO PŪKAKI TE ROTO, KO WAITAKI TE AWA, KO TE WAKA O ĀORAKI TETahi WAKA ÓKŪ, KO ENEI TE IWI WHĀNUI: KO KAI TAHU, KĀTI MĀMOE, WAITAHA ME TE RAPUWAI.

This thesis aims to explain why Kai Tahu have adopted the term “landscape” in preference to other terms more usually associated with place, identity and environment. It does so by detailing how Kai Tahu formerly allocated and understood whakapapa-based use and access rights to the landscape which for them encompasses both land and sea. Our worldview is based on how we thought, think and relate ourselves to our environment and with our landscapes, which are our tūpuna. Since we are the living whakapapa as well as being both past and future parts of it, we accept this way of understanding as usual. We also accept as usual, that use rights to the landscapes are also about whānau or hapū boundary management and why these are inseparable from identity and the place of Kai Tahu within their environment. The thesis then, brings such rights into the present by tracing the history of the Kai Tahu Claim (Te Kereeme) and the resultant success or otherwise of its settlement through the Waitangi Tribunal hearing and the negotiation process between Kai Tahu and the Crown. Such contestations that exist between Kai Tahu and those Tauiwi outside our world also exist intra-Iwi (amongst ourselves) and inter-Iwi (between Kai Tahu and other Iwi or tribal groups). This is especially so where fisheries allocation is being contested between urban Iwi and Treaty Tribes.¹ The complexities surrounding these issues add to the argument that Kai Tahu perceptions of the term landscape involves far more than “an aesthetic appreciation of place” (Hay 1998: 246).

¹ Those tribes with traditional sea-fishing rights.
Landscape is as much about rights inherited to all things Tahu through whakapapa from which our individual to tribal identity comes, as it is about a Kai Tahu epistemological understanding of our landscape and us as part of it. Our understanding of the term landscape mirrors that of certain other Oceanic peoples’ perceptions of it and how they and we know what we know. In other words, it is our way of expressing our Iwi identity. It does not preclude what some Tauiwi did and may still understand the term to be, where they feel tied to and part of the landscape. However those Tauiwi with whom I have interacted over a lifetime, have seldom understood the term “landscape” as it is understood by the many Kai Tahu quoted within this thesis.

By way of the Treaty of Waitangi, Tauiwi settlers and their descendants needed no further legal identity to gain recognition of their rights to be here on our landscapes. The legal identity that we as a recognised Iwi now have, comes as a result of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Legal Identity Act passed by the parliament of New Zealand. This Act is about a commercial identity that is recognised and required by the government in order for us to undertake certain monetary and other transactions that the laws of the nation require. It is not the type of identity to which I refer in the context of a whakapapa-derived identity though for us, that is still part of our Legal Identity. The type of identity to which the thesis refers comes from an identity derived through birthright and whakapapa Kai Tahu. It is one that acknowledges the landscape as tupuna both in its terminology and thinking, as well the term itself being a politically as well as a practically perceived one. For Kai Tahu as Iwi, the political aspect is also about power and with whom that might now rest since our Legal Identity has been established and our Claim settlement reached. Tauiwi spoken to in regard to this research seldom thought of the physical landscape as their Tūpuna, though their ancestors may have had over a century of contact with and on the landscape (taku mohio). Rather, with one exception, it was perceived of as an economic (or sometimes an uneconomic tract of land) to which their ancestors have deeds of property ownership that is exclusive; or, lease holdings
one exception, it was perceived of as an economic (or sometimes an uneconomic tract of land) to which their ancestors have deeds of property ownership that is exclusive; or, lease holdings over which they as descendants have working rights. That does not mean to suggest however, that rural New Zealanders have not formed attachments to their land. In terms of whakapapa though, they are not ‘of’ it in the literal sense that we conceive of ourselves as being the landscape.

The thesis therefore, is an epistemological presentation of the ways in which we understand the term “landscape.” It is about how we know what we know and continue to explain our place within and as part of our landscapes. This placing of selves comes from perceptions of whakapapa through which we organise our world and are in turn, organised as part of that world. Alongside that, the thesis is about how we continue to be part of the landscapes of Te Waipounamu, though ownership of it has long passed from our hands. The understanding we have of landscape is different from the way of Western academia, from many Tauiwi and perhaps even different from other Iwi. There are for us then, particular epistemological ways in which we understand the term “landscape.” All who were part of this research, all who have been part of my life and the contributions made by each of them are what have informed my ways of knowing and the stories of others I have known over my lifetime. As the writer I am merely collaboratively telling the “her” and “his” stories of Kai Tahu as part of the landscape. Even though most of the understandings have been based on a Kai Tahu epistemological worldview, the thesis contains a chapter on theoretical underpinnings. Though differing understandings and differences in understanding of what is best for Kai Tahu, or what constitutes being Kai Tahu in the landscape cause contestations, the most important aspect of this research is the stories of the many participants. Their stories are based on the pakiwaitara (tales), whakatauākī (sayings and quotes), waiata (songs of various types) kōrero pūrākau (histories) and experiential understandings of themselves and

---

2 We as Iwi have always and continue to believe that the Treaty of Waitangi gave Iwi and Tauiwi obligations.
their tūpuna. The stories they have to tell were passed down directly to them from their many elders both living and since dead, or were learned through written sources based upon kā kōrero o kā tūpuna. It is therefore an oral history of Kai Tahu and their landscapes and seascapes and of their special places in them and in Te Waipounemu.

Outsiders may fit our epistemological understandings into a theoretical parameter of their understanding that is not necessarily ours. I make no deliberate attempt to do this. Kai Tahu like all Iwi have been researched and theorised about for countless decades by other writers and readers who have placed their own or others' research within a theoretical framework. This means we too have been placed within such frameworks. This research though, places many of the same stories previously narrated, within a framework of our own making. That is, its theory is a Kai Tahu theory, and is an insider ethnography. The validity of these may well be contested by both academia and Kai Tahu. Nonetheless, the research and stories it tells are of and by Kai Tahu. Having stated who I am, briefly described the way I wish certain concepts or terms to be understood and how I have chosen to refer to others spoken of within this research, it is timely to add the form of ethnography that will be used.

**TE MOUMOU RAKAHAU I KŌNEI**

"Insider Auto/ethnography" and "Native Theory" will be the means used to grant authenticity to the stories of the research participants and whānau, living and dead. Reed-Danahay’s (1997) text provides a collection of essays of insider ethnographies by Tauiwi or European academics, whilst Bishop (1996) and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) challenge the dominant paradigm regarding the way research is presently undertaken. Smith, in offering an alternative form of research methods, which are "culture-free," is supported by comments such as those of Thaman (cited in Smith: 1999). Thaman states that Smith’s text challenges...
the dominant method where “researchers [have] occupied some kind of high moral ground from which they observe their subjects and make judgements about them” (K. Thaman cited in Smith 1999: Flyleaf). Ranginui Walker describes how Smith uses “a dual framework—the whakapapa of Māori knowledge and the European epistemology in the search for truth in complex human relations” (R. Walker in Smith 1999: Flyleaf). The methodologies and theories espoused by Māori academics such as Linda Smith, Bishop, Shayne Walker and Charles Royal further substantiate a position different to the usual singular form that exists.

It is from an insider's perspective that I approach the research and from that same perspective that I retell the stories of my participants, whānau and hapū members known to me from my earliest childhood memories to the present. Consequently, this dissertation is autobiographical since I am Kai Tahu and will include the shared understanding I have of who I am and the place I occupy in the landscape. It is also an ethnographic record of the stories shared with me by other Kai Tahu whose stories are of them, in and of these landscapes. Lastly, it is Kai Tahu epistemology. Bishop quotes a 1992 article by Graham Smith whose argument he claims is about indigenous approaches to research. Here it is stated that practice of Kaupapa Māori research is “the philosophy and practice of being and acting Māori” (Bishop 1996: 12). Thus there is an assumption within kaupapa research of a taken for granted social, political, historical, intellectual and cultural legitimacy of Māori, in that it is a position where “Māori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right” (Bishop 1996: 12). Kaupapa Māori as research method then, is not merely a paradigm shift located within Western epistemology—though this is not to say that it may not influence Western epistemology—but this method is wholly placed within our world-view. Shayne Walker suggests it is “a Māori perspective or counter narrative [that] provides its own pedagogical framework utilising traditional methodologies” (S. Walker 2000: unpublished paper). That epistemology exists and drives the way we are informed of our place in the world. Our world-view is validated and informed by how we know our connections with and ourselves as parts
of our landscapes. I am not criticising “Insider Ethnography” such as that of Sara Roseneil (1993) and Reed-Danahay (1997) who research themselves as fellow nationals. However, I cannot claim to share an identical position within this dissertation, since whakapapa makes me who I am in the landscapes of Te Wāipounamu and connects me to past as well as future generations of Kai Tahu. As earlier stated, what gives me identity and are part of the Kai Tahu epistemological view of ourselves as the landscape, are the things that inform our theories, our thinking and are our understandings of who and what we are as Iwi.

Except for Pnina Motzafi-Heller, others cited in Reed-Danahay (1997) were not connected by whakapapa to the landscapes of those they were studying; though they had nationality in common. The commonality for those in Roseneil's article was that it specifically focussed on gender and participation in political activism as the defining factor for insider research. The insider research in many of these instances was undertaken on groups that were of interest to the ethnographers who were also participants. Caroline Brettell takes stock of a previous ethnography as she talks of her latest one, a biography of her mother. Since doing the latest biography she concluded that a previous work could no longer be considered in the genre of Insider Autoethnography, since the storytelling of the three Portuguese women in the former work had a strong authorial input from her (Brettell 1997: 243). If the biography of her mother was considered as fitting within the genre of autoethnography, it did so because “parts of [her] lifestory and [her] cultural world are contained within it” (Brettell 1997: 245). Pnina Motzafi-Heller also had religious/tribal connections with the research about which she was writing. Motzafi-Heller did not only do autoethnography in her homeplace or on her homepeople as I have, but also undertook ethnographic research of people in Africa. Even though her article was auto/ethnographical, Motzafi-Haller made the choice to reside in a certain place away from her homeplace (Africa or America). She faced ambivalence in Africa where she was viewed as both “white” and “coloured” as well as having an inner ambivalence regarding her “personal/professional identity” (Reed-Danahay 1997: 15) in addition to a
double experience of “insider” and “outsider” (Brettell 1997: 243). On Motzafi-Haller’s return to her homeplace in Israel, she was once more forced to examine her professional self now as native in comparison with her former professional identity of outsider. Though I could make the choice to locate elsewhere, I cannot disconnect from whakapapa Kai Tahu even when absent from the landscape any more than she could disconnect from her Jewishness. Therefore, there are similarities in the ethical dilemmas that arise when conducting insider research. The difference that arises when doing kaupapa Māori methodology and what drives the research is tikaka-ā-Iwi. In this way, ownership of the knowledge stays with the participants. It is also about “acknowledging whakawhānaukataka and my participatory connectedness with the other participants (as I too am one) [while] promot[ing] a means of knowing in a way that denies distance and separation and promotes commitment and engagement” (Bishop 1996: 23). Thus I am inextricably involved in this research as whakapapa places all Kai Tahu past, present and future in our landscapes.

In any ethnographic research, there are risks that exist in the doing of ethnography. The risk the other participants in this research have taken is in sharing their stories. The risk I have taken arises in presenting us as Iwi who are always political, aspects of which are often perhaps not politically correct. These truths, others’ and mine, have left me open to condemnation and challenge (which may happen to any who have chosen to write a doctoral dissertation). Therefore the personal ramifications for me are not only located within the academy but also within the Iwi, since I am still Kai Tahu, resident in my homeplace.

_Ehara i te Tākata kotahi anō i oho ai i neherā._ (There is usually more than one version of any story). Pepehā, whakatauākī or kupu whakaari such as this, are what embellish a story or are the introduction to storytelling. They, along with waiata kinaki sometimes composed specifically for a particular story, are what add mana to the story, whether pakiwaitara (tales) or history (including so-called legends). In the possessing of this
form of knowledge, stories or the various forms of kinaki which complete them and the recognised ability to relate them to others, mana is bestowed upon the story and storyteller.

That is why when contemporary use of such stories has been used in the pursuit of personal whaimana rather than to enrich whānau, hapū or Iwi knowledge of ourselves, accusations of “mana munching” have been levelled at the individual or individuals who have been thought to have sought personal mana. It is said to have been a misuse of the intended kaupapa for such storying. Whether or not this is so, is also contested. Nonetheless, such practices and counter accusations exist for us. Thus it could be said that stories i nehe rā (from times past) have gone on to produce contemporary truths that may be politically contested. Stories of whakapapa of course are always contested since they confer specific access and use rights to certain areas of landscape upon some of us, while excluding others of us from them. This has always been the way of tradition and there is no reason why, since we have largely managed our special resources from British colonisation to the present, that this ought to be altered. Yet instances may occur in regard to tūī rights to Crown Islands returned to us as part of our Claim settlement. "Leave well alone" is a borrowed Tauiwi whakatauki that has relevance in this instance. It is therefore within such knowings as these and the contestations that arise out of them, that this research is set. The dissertation is ethnography and, in the role of researcher and ethnographer, I am also a direct part of the story and some of the raruraru, which effect and affect me as they do other participants. The research is also the many earlier stated things and can therefore be said to be what one of my supervisors, Ian Barber has termed, “an insider political auto/ethnography.” The actuality for us as Iwi is this: our story as related by us is being presented to the world by means of the academy through another of us; this is as opposed to it once more being an account of Kai Tahu according to an outside ethnographer’s theoretical or analytical approach and perspective. It is because of the latter, that we and I personally, have found many of the representations of Kai Tahu, which exist in the public domain difficult to reconcile with the way many of us understand ourselves. This
lack of understanding has come about because of the more often than not dense theoretical and analytical base of the outsider. As Bishop concludes, “Such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power sharing processes and legitimation of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies” (Bishop 1996:16).

Of various syntheses or histories of anthropology, that by Harris ([1927] 1997: 412-427) provides an overview of the earliest anthropologists and theories they developed. Boas, Malinowski and many of their followers created a school of thought and anthropology as a discipline, where their paradigms believed the study and the writing about cultural others (ethnography), ought best be undertaken using participant observation. Previously armchair theorising on other cultures or ethnology made sweeping over-generalisations that were hugely inaccurate, but adhered to, nonetheless. Theories that existed prior to personal participation in fieldwork continued to be argued while Boas himself, shifted his thinking. He went from what is termed a diffusionist to being the developer of historical particularism, or more accurately cultural relativism. Boas’s thinking assisted enormously in establishment of twentieth-century debates on Nature/Nurture, Genes/Environment, and Psychology/Culture. Ruth Benedict linked psychology with cultural personality types as did Boas’s student Margaret Mead. The former based her theories on others peoples’ experiences, the latter on participant observation, even as she ignored any influence Christianity had made on the group being studied. Nineteenth-century Kai Tahu have been placed in ethnographic histories as hunter/gatherers who were fighters when challenged, though Waitaha are said to have been mild like Moriori. Waitaha though, were without a lore within a law (Tikaka ki tā Moriori), which was anti-war. The beneficiaries of these ethnographic accounts have seldom been Mana whenua Iwi, but furthered the presence of the colonial agenda. My hesitancy and

---

3 In the film, “Feathers of Peace,” there was a kōrero that told of how Moriori gave up combat and fighting. Thus the kōrero concluded that in keeping with their “ture” (law), when Iwi from Taranaki arrived there, that law forbade Moriori to fight back (taku mōhio). Stories related by our own to me have said that Waitaha were peace-loving and that when Māmoe arrived among our Waitaha Tūpuna, no fighting or conquest to establish Mana whenua status was necessary since the Māmoe were taken in or absorbed by Waitaha (taku mōhio).
of the density of it, but that it has reproduced colonial relations where the dominant, usually Western discourse, remains the culture of power. Traditional anthropological theory such as that of Boas, Malinowski, Mead and Benedict has defined theoretical parameters into which they have placed indigenes whom they have studied. This is so, even when we retain agency over our self-definition, as opposed to how we are defined by others. The more recent writing of Keesing (1989), Hanson (1989), Linnekin (1991) and Dominy (1990, 1995) who have accused Hawai’ian and other Pacific Iwi including Iwi Māori of culturally recreating themselves, demonstrates how little the thinking of some ethnographers has altered from the times of Boas and his contemporaries. These accusations have initiated passionate responses to these claims with counterclaims, by Pacific Islanders including other indigenes and us (Trask (1993), Hau’ofa (1993, 1998 and 2000)). For many years it was believed that only the “outsider” ethnographer was objectively capable of “truthfully” representing the who, what and how of the cultural “other,” so in this thesis, I believe that the insider ethnography that I use as the basis of my research, “truthfully” represents the Kai Tahu world-view of themselves, even when aspects of our beliefs may be contested (kā kōrero-ā-waha; taku mohio). The past history of misrepresentation makes us no less suspicious that such theories as are held even now may also encompass and reduce the stories of the Kai Tahu participants' stories to the margins, when the issue for “insider” ethnography is to legitimize my participants' right to make theory--native theory. If theory is the development of ideas in order to make sense of one's place in time and space then, of course, it has to be relevant to its context. The context here is Kai Tahu: Not the glossy form produced out of the structure known as TRONT (Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu), but the form of Kai Tahu that sees a necessity to think and make sense of our lives. As stated in a kōrero-ā-waha, “If we didn't think, we would be robots; and people, not least your participants, think about and tell their stories to explain their lives” (Matahaere 2000: kōrero-ā-waha). Besides, we have variously been placed within other peoples' paradigms and theoretical parameters for over a century and a half,
explain their lives” (Matahaere 2000: kōrero-a-waha). Besides, we have variously been placed within other peoples' paradigms and theoretical parameters for over a century and a half, rather than placing ourselves within our own context. Next to North American Indians in their country, we, as an ethnic group termed Māori, are the next most studied indigenous people in ours (Matahaere 2000: kōrero-a-waha).  

CONTESTED VIEWS

As earlier stated, one inter-Iwi contestation is over the fisheries allocation presently being fought between urban Iwi and Treaty Tribes. Intra-Iwi contestations have always existed within Kai Tahu as they may in other Iwi groups. These raruraru continue to be part of our every day lives, though without the physical whawhai of pre-Treaty times where utu was exacted. Raruraru can often now be (as in former times), an unhealthily divisive or a usefully healthy part of being Kai Tahu. They are not however, exceptional in any way because we conceive of them as an aspect of our Tahu-ness that is expressed as part of our being and world-view of ourselves. We were once famous or notorious for Kai Huaka [or Huanga] (eat relations) feuding, a Kai Tahu trait that has been well documented both accurately and inaccurately. We therefore attach much less importance to many of the contestations amongst ourselves than do non-Tahu who hear or read of them. The more serious rifts we usually attempt to keep in-house, where nothing is thought to be usefully gained from their being publicly aired within or outside of Kai Tahu forums. Inter-Iwi differing positions over fish is a contemporary contestable issue between Iwi who have traditionally sea fished and those who did not, and exist between urban Iwi and Treaty Tribes. There are others that exist between Iwi and Tauiwi over river and lake fisheries, the traditional take of now protected bird and fish species and the right to develop co-management of our landscapes. For Kai Tahu, these

---

4 When I asked Matahaere where she had obtained this fact, she stated that it had been by Ngahuia Te
contestations are also about power and with whom that might now rest since our Legal Tribal Identity has been established and our Claim settlement enacted into law. This has happened, even when settlement aspects are not yet fully existing in actuality. Power as an issue is both inter and intra-Iwi contested and contestable.

Contestation is not the prerogative of Iwi or even Polynesians. It characterises the academy. Borofsky (2000:8) has discussed how the contested viewpoints of truths about Captain Cook have arisen. He reiterates the competing discourses in the ethnographies of Obeyesekere (1992) and Sahlins (1995) where there are contested versions of who the Hawai’ians believed Cook to be (Borofsky 2000: 8). Vilsoni Hereniko (2000: 86-87) also refers to this contestation between the “Sri Lankan” and the “American” over Hawai’ians’ thinking on who Cook was. He makes the point that indigenous Hawai’ians “stand by and watch two foreigners fight over ‘fodder’ that does not even belong to them.” He then compares contested viewpoints of the Kirch and Sahlins' Anahulu (1992) which Dening's review (1994a) stated was “brilliant” and of Sahlins, a “genius.” The review of Kame‘elehihiva (1994a) showed many discrepancies where it was stated, “a knowledgeable foreigner had bad advice about a culture not his own” (Hereniko 2000: 87). The point being made here is that contestations are not unusual or peculiar to Iwi. In fact, they seemingly thrive within Western academia whose belief systems and definitions of cultural others and cultural selves are no less complex to outsiders than are those of Iwi. The difference is, Iwi have no seeming desire to make in-depth research studies of the academics—as yet!

Contestations with Tauiwi, including other Iwi and within our own are integral to our present definition of ourselves as an Iwi. That definition is born of whakapapa and its fount and origin, the landscape. Inter and intra-Iwi complexities surrounding issues of definition of who we are add to the argument that Kai Tahu perceptions of the term landscape are more than those of aesthetically pleasing vistas or awesomely rugged mountainous areas. The

Awekotuku at a research conference.
constant themes throughout the research return to the idea of Kai Tahu as part of, or emanating from, our landscapes that provide our collective and individual mana. That mana both enables and requires us to exercise proper guardianship over the land and seascapes. The thesis is about how Rakatirataka and mana and understanding of how use rights translate into our tribal and smaller intra-tribal unit understandings of landscape and guardianship of it. It has to do with how abuse of such mana by any amongst us in fact, reduces the mana of all. This is often what is thought to be occurring in the eyes of the rest, of individuals who seek self-elevation in the Tauiwi world and in doing so reduce our collective mana. Such behaviour is referred to by the term “mana munching.” That simply means individuals or the individual appears to be seeking glory for him or herself, rather than for what might be in the best interest of whānau, hapū or Iwi. Rakatirataka as recognised and acknowledged by the majority within the groupings mentioned above includes then, all that that might mean, such as joint landscape management and that of the resources that are part of the land and seascapes of Kai Tahu. Or, as others might term it, it is an experiential sense of place that gives us an inherited right to its management and which we, as a Treaty partner, now have as a legal right within the state of New Zealand. That right is conferred through whakapapa, Rakatirataka and mana. Thus management in this sense is understood as having an equal and meaningful contribution towards the most appropriate way in which to care for our landscapes. The constant sites of contestation throughout this research exist within either a Marxist-based materialist interpretation of land use or to that of Tilley (1994), Tacon (1994) and others who speak of the symbolic definition of land, (or the Kai Tahu term landscape). The idea of Kai Tahu as part of and emanating from our landscapes emerges throughout the dissertation as that person/place which provides our collective and individual mana, since it is from the ancestral landscape that we are derived through whakapapa. Mana as Rakatirataka then, enables us to exercise proper kaitiakitaka (guardianship) over the land and seascapes as these quotes demonstrate:
What I think of Rakatirataka or Mana is [that] in the old times there was no one sticking up, everyone was bought up to the left. Now with the way things are at the moment, society demands that we have people sticking up, rising above the crowd. If you go to do a Pakeha thing they say because it's economically viable and you know it's a great investment. This is they way society looks at the moment. This is the way it's got to be, with the [Kai Tahu] investments. There's no such thing as stand [ing] up and say [ing] today, 'Well I think because we're part of the landscape we should not fool around with these, ...with the money ... that's going around, [being] put into these funny things.' Today we'll just sort of ease up a bit because we're part of the landscape. That's Āoraki, the man who was there frozen into stone. It's not a commercial thing; you don't jump up and down on his head right? This is what I think we should do (T. Wesley. kōrero-a-waha, Ōtākou, 1998).

And

There has [sic] been times in my life that have been more apparent than others when I have felt the land crying out to be acknowledged, just in the most simple kind of way, but it seems like the land is in pain because it is not being acknowledged. It has been trodden over, it hasn’t been respected. The ownership thing may change but the land still belongs to us, as we are the people of the land. Let me cite Āoraki for example. Aoraki is our mauka, always has been and always will be. Doesn’t matter what’s happened on pieces of paper. However part of the deal should be that, especially Kāti Huirapa and Arowhenua, that we are (seen as) the kaitiaki of the mauka and that we should always be consulted about whatever’s happening up there. It comes under our manawhenua-ship and we should exercise our Rakatirataka over it for his protection or we are unworthy kaitiaki (T. Jardine, kōrero-a-waha, Te Umu Kaha, 1999).

It is personal mana and pride in homescapes that see most Kai Tahu at hui stand to state from whom they are descended. They do so by using the method above with which the thesis began, parts contained within it, or, a more localised version. Whichever of these used, it will be based on this form of pepeha.5 In this way, we continue to bespeak our landscapes in which

5 Pepeha as defined by H. Williams ([1844] 1985: 274), in his dictionary of Māori Language. Yoon, (1986:480) states that “the Maori pepeha of tribal identity seems to have a closer affinity with the combined characteristics
are embodied our founding ancestors. Using the pepehā as a way of self-introduction the reader (or listener) is informed of those from whom I am descended in the broadest sense of how each of us is defined as he uri nō Kai Tahu. To expand further on who I am in this sense by the use of whakapapa is not essential to the thesis, though whakapapa may be recited at particular times and places which are deemed appropriate. Roberts and Wills (1998:43) state that:

To Maori, 'to know' something is to locate it in space and time. This applies to individual persons, tribes, all other animate and inanimate things, and even to knowledge itself. Fundamental to this ability to locate a thing in [this way] is knowledge of its whakapapa. To know oneself is to know one's whakapapa [and] to know about a tree, a rock, the wind or the fishes in the sea—is to know their whakapapa.

**LANGUAGE USE**

To understand the context in which language throughout this dissertation is framed, it is pivotal at this point to provide some discussion. The language though English, is expressed extensively in the passive voice. Tikaka-ā-Iwi by which all things are guided within Te Ao Māori (the Māori world) sees great strength in the use of the passive. Every person, event or matter to which one refers is thought to be of greater significance than the person or persons narrating it. Te Reo itself though, is not passive and has great strengths not always found in the use of English. Thus, the way in which the research and the stories of the participants have been described or retold in this research, relates to our social places within the hierarchical norms of Iwi society.

In Te Reo, the verb is often split by a modifier and this pattern has been carried over into English. Other patterns in Te Reo have also influenced English expression. Within the thesis it also comes about as a result of my thinking it out in one language while writing it in of motto and maxim rather than those of proverb.” Proverb is what Yoon also states as a word used by others to
another. The language and the way it is used, is based upon and according to the rules of Te Reo which in turn is based upon tikaka-ā-Iwi. It is that tikaka therefore, which drives the use of Te Reo as well as the way in which I have used English in the form of Māori-English. That use best expresses the intended meaning of the words of the participants and how many intended their stories would be best related

Webster argues the loss or erosion of this long-held tikaka is clearly evident in that once things Māori including tikaka or Māori culture and Te Reo were brought within the kaupapa of universities, they became commodified (Webster 1998: 169). The rules governing the subjects within academia effectively negate tikaka-ā-Iwi, just as oppressively as the dominant research paradigm scrutinised by Bishop (1996) and Smith (1999) does indigenous epistemology. Sissons further substantiates Webster's position in that the commodification of tikaka me Te Reo are sites of politicisation and rationalisation. As Webster (2000) and Sissons (1994) have argued, the systematisation of culture (tikaka) has been bound to meet and further the interests of the state. It could also be argued that these actions by the state coincided with the commodification of Tikaka and Te Reo within the academy. Within tertiary institutions and the education system as a whole, both tikaka and Reo were commodities able to be consumed by the masses as opposed to Iwi only (Sissons 1994:108-109) and both could be used as a strategic resource. At a superficial level, the commodification of tikaka and Reo appeared to be meeting both Iwi and state/tertiary needs. Clearly evident, however, is that unless tikaka and Reo are Iwi driven and defined they remain a commodity that will continue to benefit the state's interest rather than those of Iwi. Iwi no longer wish to be in the position the kahawai might usually find itself in relation to the shark, realistically or metaphorically consumed--consumed by the dominant cultural ideology that often gatekeeps how and who Iwi are, either by governmentally induced definition or by institutionally structured research.

describe pepehā.
This commodification of culture along with a singular type of research methodology have prevailed because there are a substantial number of Māori and Tāuiwi academics, who have continued to legitimate its currency within academia. Māori who have become separated from their landscapes through urbanisation and have lost Te Reo and tikaka-ā-Iwi, were supported in the consumption of both which were governed by outsider imposed kawa and beliefs. The types of tertiary learned tikaka-ā-Iwi me tikaka-ā-Reo are the only forms known to many Kai Tahu (and others) raised and educated away from homeplaces. They therefore dismiss as incorrect the mōhio tūtūrū of the home people (K. Davis. 1999: kōrero-a-waha). As a result, the societal norms, which ordered tikaka and Te Reo, were ignored and effaced, as new forms of both became consumable commodities.

Within the dominance of this methodology, Iwi rules have been set aside in favour of those governing the institutions. Whilst I acknowledge there is a need for these rules in many research areas, my own position necessitates that the rules governing the way this research is undertaken is based on kaupapa Māori research (Bishop 1996: 11-33). Although this research has been undertaken within a university and conducted within the rules and regulations of the academy, it has been driven by tikaka-ā-Iwi. The question of whose tikaka is the more acceptable within Kai Tahu, has been a contributing factor to some of the raruraru to which I later refer and address in the dissertation. There is an additional complexity to the binary opposition of tikaka-ā-Iwi versus the commodification of tertiary tikaka whereby a third position needs acknowledgement, as its prevalence will be highlighted throughout the dissertation. The complexity is that this commodified tikaka has been appropriated in a manner that challenges the legitimacy of experiential knowing, so its existence and position cannot be ignored. The raruraru that have arisen out of this complexity involve some of our own who have more knowledge of outside tikaka than of the home people's experiential use and knowledge of it. Many of us raised in our homeplace landscapes are guided by the experiential knowing. It is our way of knowing and understanding our world-view. In
epistemological terms, it has much in common with other Oceanic cultures (see Chapters one, two, three and five) and indeed with at least one group of academic professionals, though some may not admit it. Borofsky (2000: 7, 18) makes comparisons of the commonalities shared by Pukapukans (those he interviewed) and Pacific historians. He states that:

*Both groups value primary sources and believe one should not take a person's testimony at face value. [Instead one should] scrutinize for biases, for unstated personal advantages. Both groups analyze contexts within which testimony is presented to ascertain its validity; and both rely extensively on recognized experts.*

He further states that ascertaining who is 'expert' may be contestable, and adds that other subtle similarities exist such as “the commonly stated opposition between oral and written accounts” (Borofsky 2000: 7). Yet most academics “take academic documentation on trust”.  

TE REO TIKA MAHAKU

The expressing of my thoughts in English is done with tikaka-ā-Iwi and its resulting tikaka-a-Reo in mind. It is important to note that since legal status of Te Reo has been aligned with English, a proviso to “accommodate” its use within the academy recognises that status. The entire thesis could have been written mai i Te Reo since that legal right is available to any student should s/he choose to exercise it. The degree of linguistic competence I have makes it possible for me to have done so. However, for all of the following reasons that was decided against. 1) Tikaka-ā-Iwi is the first and most important to me and to have prevented even one of those who were the kaikoha (gifters) of knowledge from being able to partake of this research would have been to whai mana mahaku (mana munch). 2) Many voices of the silent
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6 According to Borofsky, "few of the twenty nine reviewers of Obeyesekere's *Apotheosis of Captain Cook* actually went back and examined his documentation. Fewer still have checked Sahlins' 1995 documentation, despite the praise the book has received for its meticulous scholarship." (Borofsky 2000: 8). See also Hereniko in Borofsky (2000: 86-87).
majority, as a result of that choice, have had a chance through the academy, to have their stories heard and their opinions fully aired in the (re) telling of their stories. 3) Recognition of the worth of these stories would have been lost had they been unable to read their sharing and retelling of them in this way. 4) Such arrogant behaviour would have ignored and in fact trampled their mana and therefore that of us as Iwi. 5) Other reasons for the use of English came out of respect: a) for the academy; b) for my supervisors and possible examiners, most of who do or may not have had Te Reo. 6) It is also intended that this research may add to the general body of knowledge within the academy and within anthropology in particular, since it is within that discipline that I am enrolled as a student. If the research had been i Te Reo it would only speak to a limited audience. It was therefore, a very deliberate choice to write in English, just as it was in the choice to base the writing of it on tikaka-ā-Iwi. By way of explanation, where the words “kōrero-ā-waha” are used, the informant is Kai Tahu or an indigenous of Te Moananui-a-Kiwa (the Pacific) and may be Polynesian, Melanesian or Micronesian; where “pers. comm.” is used, it is the English equivalent and the informant is non-Kai Tahu and usually though not exclusively a Pākehā Tauiwi.

By utilising the academic arena it has been possible to provide a platform for the voices who are kaitiaki-ā-reo, ā-wāhi, ā-whenua, ā-moana, ā-tikaka, ā kā mea katoa i to mātou nei Iwi. Having defined the self, stated the reason for the extensive use of the passive voice and clarified the language preference, I wish to make clear my intended understanding of other terms and spellings used.

TERMS AND SPELLINGS USED

The most important from my perspective is the way I have chosen to spell Te Wāipounenu. Those I consulted or with whom I discussed the spelling agreed that in the original or earliest spellings, the version I have chosen was the one used (with some variation
such as a “V” for “W,” and it being three as opposed to two words). The only instances where
the present (and better-known) spelling will be used, is when I am directly quoting someone
else’s rendition of it. For many Kai Tahu with whom I have been involved both during and
prior to this research, the use of the term “Päkehä” was not always the preferred word used to
describe all those who were not Kai Tahu Whänui. This was especially so in areas south of
the Waitaki. Tãgata Bola (sometimes spelt as Tãkata Pora), referred initially to the early
whalers and sealers, but came to incorporate all incomers pre and immediately post Treaty
who were of fair complexion. Over time this term was dropped or overtaken by the word
“Päkehä,” the term used by northern Iwi to describe early Anglo-American or European
arrivals to our shores.7 “Tauiwi” on the other hand, literally means all those Iwi who are not
us, but who are part of Te Waipounenu and Aotearoa as citizens or guests, regardless of
ethnic origin or affiliation. Tauiwi as used in this thesis therefore, covers all ethnic groupings
regardless of their former origins. This is the more holistic term used as a personal preference.
Broken down to its basic syllables, “tau” means to “land” while Iwi means “bones” or
“people” of whatever ethnicity who are (or may be) grouped as we have been, Mäori. These
Tauiwi were initially of Anglo-American or European extraction in the collective sense of
coming from the continents of Europe or North America (including Canada, the United
Kingdom and Eire). However, the French who settled in Akaroa or visited in the north, were
referred to by our tūpuna as Tãkata (Tângata) Wiwi. The term Tauiwi as I intend it be
understood in this thesis may now include the many other ethnic groupings who make up the
nation of New Zealand whether their origins are from Asia, the Pacific or the earlier
mentioned areas. It will also mean other Iwi when they are from Aotearoa, but resident in Te
Waipounenu. The term Päkehä has usually defined those of fair skin, but has also been used

7 The word Päkehä is now widely used by most Kai Tahu since northern influences and use of Mäori terms have
become standardised. Nonetheless, I have chosen to use the original Kai Tahu term since the dissertation is about
our perceptions and us.
in a derogatory context. The term Tauiwi has not and does not (to my knowledge), carry such connotations. As it is to be understood within this dissertation, Tauiwi includes all peoples (or Iwi) who are not Kai Tahu. These may sometimes include other Iwi Māori residing in Te Wāipounamu since they too are arrivals or descendants of them. Kai Tahu as defined here, are those Iwi referred to in the pepehā above and who now make up Kai Tahu Whānui such as Kāti Māmoe, Waitaha, Te Rapuwai and others, some of whom are said by “cultural others” (and some of our own) to have been non-human. I however consider the whānui should further include Kāti Kura, Te Kahui Tipua and others mentioned in waiata whakapapa, since we are also descendants of these so-called “non-human” Iwi. Jim Williams states a similar way of thinking to this, but in regard to defining the term “Mauri”:

Mauri, is the life force; the personality; the ancestral contribution which makes an individual unique. The major contributions are seen to have come from defining ancestors: atua. Not only are our ancestors driving us, they are us. And they, and we, are the future generations. This is not so much seen in terms of genetic inheritance, or as a spiritual belief, but as a simple fact (J. Williams n. d: PhD in progress).

I have already stated that we are the landscape since we are descendants of the tupuna who are both the landscape and are us as we are them, and both are future reaka (generations) by way of whakapapa. That contention is shared in the kōrero of many, though not all Kai Tahu with whom I spoke. Whakapapa is rooted in both land and sea and these beliefs are also simple facts, which like Mauri need no further justification or explanation.

The terms “raruraru” and “contestation” are used interchangeably throughout this research. Both are used to describe the real or perceived differences that arise, have arisen and may continue to arise in the future. These contestations are about landscape definition and identity derived from it through whakapapa and landscape uses, which include access and use rights to customary kai and related resources. This is inclusive of fisheries, quota rights and
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* Pākehā is sometimes used to insult in the same way as Hori (mispronounced Horrey) for Māori.
use; landscape management, including the right of consultation with Kai Tahu by external bodies on best use practices of land, rivers, lakes, forests and sea. This will enable Kai Tahu to have a real influence in the prevention of abuses, which occur over our many land and sea resources. Almost all excesses or mismanagement of and contestations over our landscapes have to do with power and control and the way in which landscapes of Te Wāipounenu are cared for, defined and perceived. That is, whether they are considered as landscapes as ancestors or land commodities. These contestations are central to who we are as an Iwi and therefore to the dissertation.

**THESIS OUTLINE**

In Te Tuatahi (Chapter one) the first of many definitions of what constitutes a landscape and how that is defined by Kai Tahu and those other than Kai Tahu, is discussed. The contestations as referred to above as well as a Kai Tahu epistemological understanding of both how we know what we know and therefore construct our knowledge is also included. As we place ourselves in and of the landscape, we continue to humanise that landscape and the use of the pepehā is a further demonstration of that humanisation.

Te Tuarua (Chapter two) examines theoretical understandings as a possible explanation why perceptions of landscape vary between cultures, and more especially between those with different access to power. It does this by looking at perception and social geography studies amongst others. Initially different indigenous beliefs on land use and landscape perception make the comparison that looks at differences and similarities as well as ongoing spiritual connections with land and clanscapes. Oceanic peoples have a similarity of thought where land and sea are seen as part of an inseparable whole in which the sea is conceived of in the same way as is the land. It further compares these perceptions with Western or European ones and concludes that despite the lack of uniformity existing amongst indigenous, the differences
in perceptions and ideology are not nearly so marked as are those which exist between indigenous of the Pacific and Western perceptions of landscape.

Te Tuatoru (Chapter three) is concerned with method and looks at how my research was undertaken and how Kai Tahu understand the term landscape. The area of landscape under discussion covered the whole of the Kai Tahu tribal area where most formal interviews were drawn mostly from people still resident in various Kai Tahu landscape areas. The research has as its basis an understanding that for Kai Tahu landscape exists and that this is the preferred term. Recurring attitudinal and descriptive patterns suggested there were important features contained within the subject matter able to be used as empirical data to do with differences of perception and not only to do with landscape. These covered a range of subjects such as identity, both personal and hapū, and from this identity, a sense of belonging, a sense of knowledge and who knows as well as owns the last.

Te Tuawhā (Chapter four) looks at landscape perception and ideology by incoming colonisers upon newly discovered landscapes. It gives general descriptions of British landscape behaviour as well as an insider's perspective of Kai Tahu behaviours. It also considers a very generalised idea of other Māori behaviours on landscapes. There is an examination of some British literature on landscape use, of changes on how flora and fauna were understood there, and the creation of pastoral and agricultural landscapes. This chapter also compares with those of Kai Tahu, the many conceptualisations of present-day English-Tauiwi descendants who continue to reside on Te Wāipounenu

Te Tuarima (Chapter five) examines landscape studies and discusses what these are. The chapter notes that though there is no universal agreement on what the word “landscape” means, it continues to be defined and further redefined as a concept. I also look at where the concept of landscape arose and how there is ongoing debate about its meaning. Landscape as text is discussed within this chapter and has to do with a particular way in which the author, the painter or the visual media producer might choose to portray it. Academic debates
embrace a multitude of definitions of how landscape may be perceived by different individuals or groups and this too is examined. Such perceptions vary according to how landscapes are presently used and might be used in the future. For Kai Tahu, how they were used by us in the past is of equal importance in the way we conceptualise them in the present. Landscape as a concept then may be and is defined in many ways, including as a text. This occurs even when landscape is displayed through the medium of art in a painterly manner. Even then, the physical geography of a landscape does not necessarily require either accuracy or change in order for it to have multiple definitions. However, the main theme of this chapter is about contestations; such as those between Tauiwi and Iwi, Iwi and Iwi, Kai Tahu and high-country farmers (or other interest groups) and our private and public intra-Iwi ones. These are always about power and with whom that rests, as much as they are about defining what landscape and connection have to do with identity.

Te Tuaono (Chapter six) examines the idea of the Kai Tahu identity as deriving from the ways we resourced food and other necessities gifted by Papatuānuku and Takaroa: our land and seascapes; the importance of kaihaukai; and, the ways in which kaihaukai has served to combine forms of trade, reciprocity and social contact between whānau and hapū, mai i te Ao Kohatu atu ki ēnei wā. All of these depended upon an intimate knowledge of land and seascapes. That form of knowing and cooperation was especially important between and across whānau and hapū so the annual harvests of such things as tī-kouka (cabbage trees or Cordyline australis) to produce kauru, the yearly cull of weka (wood hen) and whio (duck) would be successful. Not even the potato that could be used as an alternative to aruhe (fern root) and other forms of staple dietary requirements saw Kai Tahu alter their work patterns around its cultivation when it first became available to them. Rather, they chose to cultivate it near their pre-contact mahika kai (food works) sites as they continued to travel widely.

Te Tuawhitu (Chapter seven) examines the ways in which Aotearoa and Te Wāipounenui became redefined beginning with their naming, renaming and the various
former and newer uses of their landscapes. Once several Tauiwi settlers arrived, the nation’s landscapes were reconstructed, renamed, and a national history from the time of Captain Cook’s (re) discovery forward to the present became the dominant one. For almost a century, Cook's discovery was taught to the young of the nation as the one. Landscapes became imagined in terms of the incomers who seldom, if ever, took cognisance of the Iwi ones already existing. A New Zealand national hegemony and discourse largely ignored and so marginalised those of Kā tākata whenua Māori. Iwi and their landscapes became part of discourses and texts within which they as kaitiaki seldom featured. Kai Tahu (and other Iwi) quickly became spoken of as being near to extinction by well-intentioned missionaries and nineteenth-century historians and novelists. Or they were said to have been so hybridised as to be regarded as almost mythical - somewhat like the imaginings they were said to hold of their origins and those of their landscapes.

The final chapter titled Te Mutuka (The Conclusion), looks at parts of other chapters beginning where chapter seven ended with the founding of New Zealand as a Tauiwi nation. This, as stated in chapter seven, has been as mythologically retold a tale, as was the Māori one centuries earlier. Tauiwi existence in this nation came with their arrival and subsequent colonisation of Te Wāipounemu and Aotearoa. Claudia Bell (1996) has suggested that Tauiwi settlement was as big a myth in its portrayal of being a peaceful colonisation as is said of Iwi historical accounts of their arrivals here via the great fleet migration. A number of Tauiwi historians (Dacker 1990, 1993; Evison 1988, 1993; Oliver 1991; Orange 1997) have attempted historical rewrites of the settlements of Aotearoa and Te Wāipounemu in which both Māori and Tauiwi remembrances of a less than idyllic colonisation are acknowledged. Nearly all participants interviewed expressed similar views based on their tupuna knowledge as passed down. On the one hand this was an accurate portrayal, yet at the same time, participants were sure that some of the settlers from Britain had intentions of a fair and just colonisation of their tupuna and landscapes, if not an always well-intentioned civilisation of
them. This, even when the colonial masters more than occasionally considered the incoming culture they were bringing to be superior to the pre-existing Iwi one. This chapter concludes with considering Tipene O'Regan's discussion (1999) of the possibilities for Kai Tahu in the landscape during the second millennium.
KO TE TIMATA I TE KAUPAPA, KOINA ĖTAHI WHAKAARO MO LANDSCAPE

What is the substance of this Māori cultural identification with landscape and coast, with water and mountain, with species and resources? At the core of the Māori view of landscape is whakapapa, [that] which connects people to the land (T. O'Regan, 1999:12).

This chapter discusses the first of many definitions on what may constitute a landscape, its definition by Kai Tahu and those other than Kai Tahu. The chapter (like the thesis), is also about contestations over land and landscape, their definition and use, over how these are most accurately defined and about a Kai Tahu epistemological understanding of how we know what we know and why we continue to humanise rather than textualise our landscapes.

In many documents, it is striking how often Kai Tahu use the word “landscape” with its connotations of perception and feelings, although they might be describing property and transactions. One example is to be found in the Te Karaka: Special Edition 1998 of the Kai Tahu quarterly magazine. This one was produced specifically for the 1998 Hui-a-tau at Kaikōura, where the Interim Deed of Settlement was signed. It reads, "Importantly, the [Settlement] offer includes redress items that clearly intend to acknowledge and affirm our mana as a people, and our mana over the landscape and resources of Te Waipounamu" (T O'Regan cited in Te Karaka. 1998: 6). Another more recent production by Kai Tahu that uses the term “landscape” may be seen in the 1999 Maramataka (calendar). Under the heading “Whakapapa Waitaha,” it is stated that,
Archetypal images from Polynesian mythology were brought here and planted across the landscape. Not only is there a tradition of migrations, there is also a migration of traditions (Ngāi Tahu Development Corporation 1998: frontispiece).

Tau argues, “It is not simply tradition that enforces this perception,” it is also the landscape “which early Waitaha consecrated with their whakapapa, thus imposing themselves upon Te Wāipounamu” (Te M. Tau 1999: 27). Joe Waaka of Te Umu Kaha (Temuka) stated that for him, landscape is what,

... gave us identity through Whakapapa, to the mountains. We all have a mountain or a number of mountains that we relate to as identification or tauparapara, pepeha, or something similar. It is quite normal at times of Hui or Tangi or meetings, that people identify themselves by their mountains, rivers, lakes ... that was (and is) your I.D. before you made your korero. So everyone had a Tupuna super imposed into these landscapes, and that was our (Identity) kit as we travelled around the land (J. Waaka, kōrero-ā-waha 1999).

According to T. Wesley (1998: kōrero-ā-waha), landscape,

Is the land: is all the places that the old timers have lived on, battled over, died on, are buried in; hunted over and at the moment has been divested of its clothing. Its clothing is the bush, the trees, and the forest. To me the landscape is a living thing.

His wife Cecily stated that,

It is you, but not only you. It’s where you sit and commune with nature. When you’re at peace with [it], you’re at peace with yourself... it renews you (C. Wesley 1998: pers. comm.).
Rei Owens, a Kai Tahu participant from Ōtākou defined landscape as “the place that looks after you and in return you care for it and you care what happens to and on it” (Rei Owens 1998: kōrero a waha). Her husband Raymond (Ray), stated that he did not think of it in that way as a landscape. He said that there were “nice places” to go and sit on the “land”, “it’s special ... the whole area here: certainly you have better soil up there with top dressing and feeding the soil, but that’s it mainly. You’ve produced what you wanted to produce” (Ray Owens 1998: pers. comm.). Ray’s definition is of land, not landscape in the sense that Iwi know and understand it. It is land and the commercial value as a commodity that it affords through its ability to produce. He acknowledges all the same, that the area being spoken of has special places outside of its productive capacity. It appears that Kai Tahu quoted above are defining what others have termed, “place”, “space”, or “environment.” When pressed further, most Kai Tahu participants who conceived of their wāhi tūturu as landscape, expressed no real surprise in discovering that it was quite different from how non-Kai Tahu or more specifically present day descendants of Anglo–American and European Tauiwi, seemed to understand that term.

Compare the two definitions that follow, for instance, of what constitutes landscape for this Tahu husband and wife who are considered to be well versed by some and definitely Tahu tūturu (real Tahu) by most. This, even if they did not grow up in their homeplaces. Their responses were to my first question to all participants, “What does landscape mean for you?”

*It would have to be something visual to me, my whare, so it would be my marae, where I can see my maunga, where I can see the awa. Can see all those things, which are obvious marks for me. And probably the most obvious would be the urupa because that is who I am and those people that are in that urupa are me. So it is those physical things, what I can see, what I can touch, what I feel. It has to be the urupa, which can be the*  

---

9 The area to which both Rei and Raymond were alluding is part of the Akapātiki block of land at Ōtākou, which they managed on behalf of the Trustees until their retirement a few years ago. The particular piece, which Rei was talking of, is situated on the eastern side of Otago harbour, immediately behind the Ōtākou Marae complex on Tamatea Road.
urupa proper, or can be the atua on my marae. So, I think that is really important. For example, we've got this longstanding family joke about I come from Taumutu and my sister comes from Puketeraki and my other sister comes from Rapaki, and my brothers... [Tuahuriri]. But no matter what we might all say, home for us is Rapaki. That's where we know about our environment, we know about our marae, we know about those people in that urupa. I might say I'm from Puketeraki but I don't necessarily know those people in that urupa. Although I can stand there and karanga for them and waiata, it's still not home, home is Rapaki, home is where I buried those people, you know they are part of me (P. Goodall, kōrero-ā-waha, Otautahi: 1990).

For her husband, the response was:

How different it probably is from perceptions of it as ancestors or property and the differences ... Of the strength of knowing exactly who they are and where they come from. Knowledge and active participation and involvement (Goodall's emphasis). These are far more significant since I have an unofficial whakapapa and more things to go with that. And knowing there's a very strong Ōtākou/Tauteri base and Ōtākou/Ellison one. I know there's connections there, but not in a lived way. It's a different association, this connection to landscape. My response and my attachment I suspect are like Maarire's, intellectualising it rather than seeing. I consider strength and emotionalism as the principle thing... I'm interested in the questions beyond from the time of Cook if you like and of different levels of that. I'm interested in landscape as who we are in the wider community, how are we recognised by connections/respect/interest/values. And how rights and responsibilities affected the things we do. I don't necessarily agree with or understand them. As community I think it's changed for us and continues to change. Landscape from this coast to the other one, and the sea as well, all those places, it's communities of people. I think you come back and look at your feet and they're planted on the whenua, and these are sorts of symbols of ourselves, our tārakawaewae (A. Goodall kōrero-ā-waha, Christchurch: 1999).

As most participants understood their landscapes, they encompassed the whole of the earth’s surface, including the sea and were what is otherwise known to all Iwi Māori as Papatuanuku. Participants also maintained that they, unlike other Iwi, did and do not refer to themselves primarily as Tākata whenua of Te Wāipouenemu, so much as Mana whenua of a particular landscape areas there. Mana whenua still has connotations that Kai Tahu retain
mana over most of the landscapes of Te Wāipounenu, even though much of the land mass has long passed from our ownership. For participants, the status of Tākata Whenua has to do with guardianship of hapū or papakaika areas. For example, the people of Te Umu Kaha are Tākata whenua of their wāhi and kaitiaki of Āoraki. Even though we all as an Iwi might have certain connections with Āoraki, it is the prerogative of the ahi kā (those who keep the place warm) to have the rights of Mana whenua in Arowhenua, the place. As is often stated, indigenous peoples have a different understanding of place and environment from that of the West. Morphy (1996: 187) has argued that there are three quite distinct processes in Australian Aboriginal understandings of landscape. These might apply equally well to those of Kai Tahu and many other indigenous people. These are:

...the ancestral mapping of the landscape, the sedimenting of history and sentiment in the landscape, and the way in which the individual acquires a conception of the landscape (Morphy 1996: 187).

In the same context as Kai Tahu use the term “landscape”, many, though by no means all Pākehā Tauiwi, use instead the word “land:” Land with its sense of being a commodity, something inanimate and separate from them (J. Thomson 1999: pers.comm; N. M. Williams 1983: 94). This is clearly seen in Ray Owen’s comment above, despite his acknowledgement that Akapātiki contains some special areas. Alison Ellison who with her husband works a farm that abuts some areas of Akapātiki believed that if she were financially secure she would not be concerned at selling their farm:

If you’re not [financially] secure, I think you would have a connection to the land and hang on to it, but as a farm I would not hang on to it . . . farming’s been work to me, actual hard physical work, a lot of yelling and screaming . . . that’s how I see the farm (A. Ellison 1998: pers. comm.).

Papakaika or Papatipu are areas where Kai Tahu have always had permanent Kaik (kainga) and now have 18 permanent marae status and/or complexes.
In other words, the farm is not considered by Alison as anything other than the place upon which she and her husband undertook hard physical work and, without the financial security that farming provided, the land could not be considered by her as anything other than a means by which such security may be gained. Alison went on to say though, that her preference would be that someone else would continue the work of farming on his or her particular piece of land. However, she would want to have a large part of it returned to its former state by the planting of native trees upon it. All this, if she had the type of finance that would permit it. Her reason for wanting the replanting would be to make its present appearance more beautiful.

Edward Ellison, her husband, stated that landscape for him had many meanings, especially at the places where he grew up. Those meanings included, but were not limited to,

... our past. To me this (Ōtākou) landscape here where I live is immensely important because when you're small you've got images in your mind that [have] told you things. Landscape is what you've been brought up in, where you've grown and developed your mind from what you see and know (E. Ellison 1998: kōrero a waha).

Edward also spoke of having emotional ties to it and being tied to it as a result of all the stories people had told him about it during his childhood days. It was all of these things combined that for Edward gave him his spiritual link with the landscape which, he found, increased as he got older. "It's fascinating how age brings some sort of meaning to landscape" (E. Ellison 1998: kōrero a waha). When Western educated people with whom I spoke used the word "landscape" it usually, though not always, had a more limited meaning that related to the visual and aesthetic senses rather than as an ancestor or a humanised landscape. I. G. Simmons (1993: 71) on the other hand states that, "The value of landscape is apprehended aesthetically even when it ceases to be of strategic importance in survival." The kind of relationship described here is hardly surprising since the term "landscape" itself is European
in origin and one which seems to have as many definitions as it has persons defining it. The present "painterly" understanding of the term came into the European psyche and English language as a result of early urban Italian Renaissance capitalists, through their artistically controlled portrayals of rural scenery of Europe that included farmscapes. Cosgrove (1984 in Tilley 1994: 24) stated, landscape as an idea resulted from urbanisation and from this, there arose simultaneous conceptualisations of both capitalism and landscape. He went on to argue that humans exercised patrician control over all three in its artistic and linear representation of them as society gained other knowledge such as cartography, map making and the surveying of the land (Cosgrove [1984] in Tilley 1994: 24). Such limited definitions confine landscape either to mere geometrical or geographical understandings or to the aesthetic artistic ones.

These understandings and conceptualisations of "landscape" as place or art as opposed to ancestors are much more than semantic difference. These understandings reflect a deep and fundamental difference in culture and in relationships with the environments in which culture is formed. The words in the pepeha opening the introductory chapter are Kai Tahu definitions of themselves as embodied within the landscapes of Te Wāipounamu. They consider "It's who we are, we are the landscape because we are of it since it is our Tūpuna and we are them" (H. Forsythe 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). A similar sentiment in Morphy (1996: 205) states that landscape is people's identity and at the same time is part of their ancestors and ancestral identity, so that past and present are so interconnected as to be conceived of as inseparable. Teresia Teaiwa as quoted in the last of a trilogy by Epeli Hau'ofa stated that, "We sweat and cry salt water, so we know that the Ocean is in us" (Teaiwa cited in E. Hau'ofa, 1998: 393). Hau'ofa himself adds that, "this is not new; our ancestors wrote our histories on the landscape and seascape; carved and stencilled and wove our metaphors on objects of utility; and sang and danced in rituals and ceremonies for the propitiation of the awesome forces of nature and society" (Hau'ofa 1998: 406-7). We therefore have beliefs on landscape perception coming from other peoples of Oceania, such as Hau'ofa who is Tongan and Teaiwa who is ni Kiribati
from Banaba. These understandings fit well with how Iwi conceptualise both ancestral identity and time, so that in using the pepehā and naming Tūpuna we are acknowledging our connections. We are as connected with the past as the present and through these times and places, to our offspring from whom we are also inseparable, through the lines of whakapapa (genealogy) derived from their landscapes. Toren (1996: 164) states that the villagers of Sawaieke in Fiji believe that they are *i taukei* (owners) of the land, and as their birthright is “grounded in the land, they are materially of it [and] are the land’s very substance.” This juxtaposes the quote above from Hine Forsythe who stated that "we are the landscape" (H. Forsythe 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). The term *vanua* like whenua in Māori has more than the single meaning of “land” and may also mean “any part of the world, a part of Fiji, a confederation of villages to the people who occupy it” (Toren 1996: 164). Iwi understand that the word whenua means both land and placenta. When discussing how he or Fijians contextualised such plural understandings of this term while lecturing to or discussing the term with non-indigenous students in Fiji, Pio Mānoa told me,

*I always quote your understanding of whenua as being both land and placenta and how that then is inseparable from whakapapa. Hence the use of the term ‘tāngata whenua’ and how the term was made to state you, [as Iwi] are the people of the land (P. Mānoa, 1999: kōrero-ā-waha, Fiji).*

Similarly for Kai Tahu, there is no one understanding of landscape. Landscape is all the things stated above as well as those things earlier referred to. We find then that Polynesians share terms and concepts in common and Melanesians also share some of these, especially names. Thus even the name Sawaieke has a remarkably similar sound to the Māori Hawaiki, the (sometimes) Kai Tahu Kawaiki, the Samoan Savai‘i and the Hawaiian, Hawai‘i.

By the use of such trope as the recitation of our pepehā, we as Kai Tahu affirm our descent as being derived and therefore inseparable from our landscapes and seascapes. This
remains so, whether all or any of these remain in our ownership. As Kai Tahu, we attest in this way to being of the landscape when identifying ourselves to other Iwi. When identifying our landscapes among ourselves, we are much more geographically specific about those that are wāhi tūturū (homeplaces). In such instances, identification becomes localised in the naming of mountains, rivers, harbours, lakes, and of marae, hapū (sub-tribes), Tūpuna (ancestors), wharenui (carved or uncarved meeting-houses). In other words, the landscape continues to be humanised, since all the above are named after or are considered as formerly being humans who have since become known as ancestors as a consequence of dying.

Kai Tahu self-attestations include all Iwi from whom Kai Tahu are derived: Kāti Māmoe, Waitaha, and for some, Te Kāhui o Rapuwai, Kāti Hawea, Kātikura and even Kāhui-tipua, who together formed Kai Tahu Whānui.11 As an Iwi Whānui Kai Tahu are not and have never been a universally homogenous group. Rather, they have been a collection of geographically separated and distinct hapū who were able to operate independently of one another (H. Evison 1993: 13),12 but who for the past 150 years have, as a single tribal force, sought to have our land and mahika kai (food and related resources) grievances heard and redressed. All of the above attestations are most often markedly different13 from those of the descendants of the first colonial settlers in Te Wāipounamu and Aotearoa14 and the subsequent Tauiwi arrivals. These incomers and their descendants have perceived and continue to perceive of New Zealand as both their land and landscape. Keri Hulme (1989: 59) expresses a Kai Tahu and personal connection with the landscape of Te Wāipounemu:

11 Dacker (1994: 4); taku tino mōhio for the first three and others mentioned. Anderson (1983: 2) also refers to these as well as Kāti Hawea and Kātikura as does Tikao in Beattie [1939] 1990: 57-59) for some, but not all. Goodall and Griffiths (1980: 5) talk of the first three and Kātikura, while Olssen (1984: 1-2) mentions the first three and Kāhui [sic]-tipua Kāhui tipua being the correct spelling. Hulme (1989: 62) states she is from the first three and Te Kāhui o Rapuwai.

12 Evison (1993:13), states that Kai Tahu were "independently self-sufficient"

13 T. O'Regan (1987a: 21), talks of a particular way Māori experience connectedness
... one way or another I have been at Moeraki all my life [though] am seldom there in the physical sense of occupying [its] space and time yet in a sense I never leave it.

Hulme’s description fits with that of Walzer that, “We are (all of us), culture-producing creatures [who] make and inhabit meaningful worlds” (Michael Walzer in Entrikin 1991: 137). In other words we symbolically imagine and then culturally describe what constitutes our landscapes, such as the image below which is used in our pepehā. Most of the earlier quotes provide an understanding of why the naming of the Kai Tahu landscape was so significant before colonisation. And why for many, the naming became a crucial part of the Deed of Settlement agreed to in 1997. This agreement was negotiated and agreed to between certain Kai Tahu negotiators and Ministers and others representing the Crown. As a result of these negotiations there was dual naming of certain areas of the landscape, beginning from October 1998. Kai Tahu negotiators argued that “Place names are a significant symbol of [our] relationship with the landscape [while] the re-establishment of traditional place names will serve as tangible reminders of our history in Te Wai Pounamu” (Ngāi Tahu Negotiating Group 1997: 37). From that perspective, Kai Tahu believe that these renamings re-state and re-instate in them Mana whenua and Mana moana over their land and seascapes of Te Wāipounenu.

The way in which the South Island’s landscapes had been used and were perceived by Kai Tahu was very different from those of the incoming British Tauiwi settlers from 1840. This difference continues to be there for many on both sides. These Tauiwi at times thought of Kai Tahu and their landscapes as being savage and in need of civilising. Many of our landscapes though, like image one that follows, are now seen as awesome and worthy of

14 Many Kai Tahu know and therefore speak of the North Island as Aotearoa. In Te Matenga Taiaros's early notes on a trip to the North Island, he referred to it as "te heke ki Aotearoa." (cited in private family papers). See also Dacker (1994: 88) for a newspaper logo which depicts the two as distinctly Te Wāipounenu and Aotearoa.
inclusion in overseas tourist magazines. It is said that Āoraki and other areas of natural beauty are comparable with other world famous tourist attractions. The personal experiences of these images were considered by some participants to have had an almost or an actual spiritual effect on them (Matapura Ellison, 1998; T. Rereti, 1999; R. Harris, 1998 me he maha anō [others too], 1998-2000, kōrero-ā-waha).

In a kōrero-ā-waha with Edward Ellison at Ōtākou (12/6/98), when the issue of spirituality was discussed, he stated he could well understand how the lessees of the high-country could have a type of spiritual relationship to such a magnificent landscape: it was both awesome and isolated and lent itself to a feeling of spirituality. However, from his understanding of things,

\[...this\ is\ not\ the\ same\ sort\ of\ spiritual\ connection\ that\ we [Kai Tahu] have\ with\ our\ landscapes,\ theirs\ [the lessees’]\ is\ a\ sort\ of\ junior\ relationship\ with\ the\ land,\ a\ time\ line\ thing\ (E. Ellison 1998: kōrero-ā-waha).\]

Jim Williams questioned whether Ellison could make such a statement with any degree of informed knowledge and understanding of how high-country people felt about their land, since Ellison was not from that area (J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). Williams on the other hand, is of the Manuhune (high-country) and believes many who lived and farmed there, whether lessees or freehold farmers held an attachment to their land, but this attachment was not the same as that of Kai Tahu to the landscape (J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). This is because Kai Tahu epistemology sees us as part of our tupuna or landscape, not merely inheritors of it, though we have been charged with the ongoing guardianship of it.
Williams felt a person had to be of that particular landscape to understand it more fully and comment upon how the people of the area might perceive of and relate to their homeplaces (J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). In other words, Williams was arguing that in this instance and in his opinion, experiential knowledge held greater weight than the presumption expressed by Ellison. It could be argued that only those Kai Tahu who have experiential knowledge of their landscapes are able to feel for them, in the way Williams has questioned Ellison's opinion. However, it could just as easily be argued that Kai Tahu without such direct experiences can also have such an understanding of the landscape from which they are descended. Most raised on wāhi tūturu did not think that those raised away from their
homeplaces could share their type of connection. This intra-Iwi contestation of opinions came up repeatedly throughout the research interviews and therefore, within this thesis. One example is of Kai Tahu who choose not to think in these terms but still consider themselves as Tahu and are the ones to whom others refer when talking about how some of us have become “Pākehā-fied.” Such Tahu were spoken of by the two interviewees as follows:

The thing that . . . I think the biggest issue Jacko is not so much in acknowledging . . . it’s . . . the biggest issue is about acknowledging who carries this whakaaro around. . . we’re tending to acknowledge the academic rather than those on the ground. And inevitably, the people that hold on to it, those who have the knowledge passed down are getting castigated by the rest of our people because these people don’t understand it. So you get left out, pushed out to the side and it’s happening all over the place. I mean, I get to the point even at home right now where I just turn up to these things [hui or Roadshow type gatherings] thinking what I know is of no value to them and you waste your time. And they are the things that worry me more than anything else. I mean I just came back from the Bluff and there’s two young Kai Tahu expert in Te Reo people down there with the Kia Kurapa and I was quite disgusted with the put-downs they put upon all the young people there AND the old people because they couldn’t speak Māori (K. Davis, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

Yeah, yeah, I’ll go along with that (J. Reihana, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

This kōrero shows some of the sadness and frustration felt by those with experiential knowledge at how other Kai Tahu believe that the language is all there is to being tūturu. It was clearly evident this sadness was also to do with the way some of these learners have seemingly undermined the knowledge of the old people. The old people referred to were the same ones I interviewed. Thus we have Kai Tahu with degrees in Te Reo (language) who

---

15 Roadshows are iwi gatherings where TRoNT table delegates and members of Ngāi Tahu development Corporation travel Te Wāipounamu and Aotearoa informing grassroots of Kai Tahu
have nothing of the kawa\textsuperscript{16} that goes with having it or having none of the experiences of Kai Tahu homeplaces. I also interviewed some of these younger people in Otautahi and, though a few espoused knowledge of their whakapapa landscapes, it was only knowledge for a great number rather than a real experiential connection. Knowledge learned away from the place that the knowledge pertains to, contributes to certain differences that exists intra-Iwi. Many of those referred to have the ability to articulate well, but there seems in some instances to be little depth in what is being stated. Thus other contestations are about who has the knowledge and with whom it ought to most properly rest. It is also about the following: Who has the real understanding of the Kai Tahu landscapes, our home people or (only) our academically knowledgeable; who has the power to decide the correct use of our resources and of our environment; once made, how will they apply to whānau, hapū and Iwi; and in regard to the holding of all this knowledge, how do such decisions effect Kai Tahu Whānui āiānei, ā, ā muri ake. There is much to be said in favour of both groups having access to the knowledge but all who hold the responsibilities of retaining the knowledge should also have personal experience of the landscapes rather than an outside only knowledge of them. In this way a deeper attachment might be formed with our wāhi tūturu.

Attachment can take a number of forms but close and intimate human relationships are not formed at a distance or even through virtual reality experiences. Besides, the argument this thesis is making is that we (Kai Tahu) are the landscapes. Ideally then, we have an intimate knowledge and attachment to them that is different yet not too far removed from the kind we have with other whānau members. Perhaps the differences in the degrees of connection in an intra-Iwi sense, are no different from the inter-Iwi differences and contestations of urban versus rural. Within or outside Iwi, these contestations occur between

\textsuperscript{16} The correct behaviour, protocol or manner of doing things, which is governed by tikaka. Tikaka are rules that govern all things Kai Tahu within our worldview and ethos, wherever we are. Tikaka is not a merely marae-based rule, neither is kawa. Both apply to everything we do and are as Kai Tahu.
those with and those without access to the power-brokers, be these Iwi or Tauiwi. This applies even over definitions of spirituality.

The following serious concerns unfolded with the interviewees, as with many informal discussions with other Kai Tahu. These were:

(1) regardless of experiential knowledge of our landscapes, much greater value appears to have been placed on the understanding by Kai Tahu whose landscape knowledge has come through a tertiary education than with homepeoples’ knowledge;

(2) along with that emphasis, much greater credence has been given to knowledge of what and who constitutes Kai Tahu learned in this way, because such education has armed the beneficiaries of it with an ability to express the knowledge in a way which Tauiwi more readily understand and accept;

(3) little if any credence (until this research project, according to the participants), had been given to those with experiential knowledge of the landscapes whose actuality comes from a different starting point and perspective.

Many whether interviewed or not, have stated their dissatisfaction at the seeming elevation of certain place names above all others as part of the settlement process (Anon: 1998 and 1999). These placenames which are scattered throughout the south island are now to be known by dual names in English and Māori except for Āoraki and as a consequence, those so renamed have already gained greater significance than all the other places we named from first arrival. Thus others than ourselves appear to be defining by implication, what places and names apparently have significance for Kai Tahu, when the actuality is that all names and

---

17 It was surprising the number of participants who expressed sadness and even anger at how both negotiators and media misrepresented the figures. They said that though the statements were true, they were far from the whole truth, a very small number of respondents replied via the postal vote. One kaumatua told me that 85% to 90% of a few hundred rather than the thousands of voters agreeing to the Settlement was anything but an overwhelming or positive response. It is also fair to point out that neither he nor others who expressed similar sentiments with Kai Tahu’s so called “due process,” wished to be named. Some have expressed their unease or disapproval of the so-called misrepresentation in person of the negotiators (Anon. 1998, 1999).
places are of significance since they are tupuna or named for the deeds tupuna enacted upon them.

Although there were several different perspectives the most significant were:

1) gender differences in landscape perception and land use;

2) how the term landscape was understood and so defined between homeplace people and those outside their Kaik (kainga);

3) distinct differences in understanding, as to what constitutes and what was part of our landscape where these existed between home and outside participants and between Kai Tahu and non-Kai Tahu;

4) the difference in perception between those who are working for us as negotiators and the homepeople;

5) differences in thinking between Iwi corporate commercial/Iwi corporate development employees and how these might impact on the way decisions might be reached.

How are we seen by our ahi kā Kai Tahu who remain on our landscapes keeping them warm on behalf of those of us unable to do so, yet who still have understandings of our familial and familiar landscapes?

**KA RARURARU MAHA Ō ROTO, Ā WAHO I KAI TAHU**

The answers to this question are several since they are contested. Raruraru or contestations have always existed within whānau, hapū and Iwi in the Māori world and between these groupings. Knowledge and understandings of our pakiwaitara, kōrero pūrākau,
whakataukī and whakatauākī and waiata tawhito attest to this. That is one reason why there are individual Iwi and within them, many hapū. For Kai Tahu i kā wā i mua, the majority of our raruraru were intra-Iwi, occurring between hapū and sometimes within whānau. This state of affairs existed more or less until the time of raids on our people by Te Rauparaha. It was these raids to acquire mana over the whenua and her resources that saw us fight as hapū and Iwi against that external force led by Rauparaha. The next great external force that was to detrimentally affect our landscapes and her resources was the arrival of Tauiwi in large numbers, as colonisers and settlers. As a result of inter-Iwi raruraru, our Claim was born: A Claim that more or less united us as he Iwi Kai Tahu tahi for the following 150 years and the settlement of which seems to have seen us revert to hapū divisions and “hapū-centric” thinking once more. Thus even what constitutes understanding of our spiritual landscape connections continues to be contested both intra-Iwi and inter-Iwi. These inter-Iwi contestations include both other Iwi Māori and Tauiwi.

Te Maire Tau a Kai Tahu from Tuahiwi, stated in his Doctoral thesis that, “In the writer’s view, the term spiritual [ity] has [been] confused with sentimental attachment” (Te M.Tau 1997: 6-7). This view could be likened to that of high-country farmers being sentimentally attached to their landscape as opposed to spiritually connected with it (Anon. 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). Of course that very argument could and has been applied to Kai Tahu by non-Kai Tahu participants who argue that all this money that has been given to us would “be better spent elsewhere and not on these whingeing Māoris” (Anon. 1998: pers. comm.). Nonetheless, the way in which Kai Tahu perceive their landscapes as ancestors cannot be ignored any more than can the idea of high-country and other South Island farmers’ perceptions of the same landscapes as land that is merely a commodity. From this landscape

---

18 See Evison’s Te Waipounamu: The Greenstone Island 1997, especially chapters 1 to 3.

19 Though the three participants quoted here were happy to be sourced by name in other areas of the thesis, they requested that these comments and similar ones to do with re-naming, monetary repayments and nohoaka sites were not able to be directly attributed to them.
the farmers have created units capable of production that will hopefully realise for them some
degree of profit. It is therefore impossible to ignore the thoughts of some of the participants in
this research, just as it is to ignore the many other Kai Tahu who have argued against the right
of negotiators to settle.

Both groups, those supporting the Settlement process and those who do not, have stated
that some of their leaders who were empowered to negotiate the Deed of Settlement, were
often no more than merely attached to the idea of their ability to wield personal power in the
negotiation process and cared much less about the landscapes being negotiated. One group
further argue that the negotiators were mandated to negotiate but not to settle, since so few of
us actually signed and returned the voting forms that sought our permission. Participants
believe they should have some say in the use of the landscape that is their founding Tūpuna,
whether that use is by farmers, conservation or special interest groups or any other
commodity-based group. They further argued that this is not mere sentimentality (and is of no
worth) on their part in wanting such input. Such Kai Tahu considered that rather than being
spiritually connected with many of the wāhi tūturu up for discussion in that settlement
process, some negotiators were thought to be after self-elevation and did not acknowledge
either then or now, that such spirituality exists within the Iwi. Such a lack of recognition for
other forms of knowing or for differing perceptions, it was argued, was partly demonstrated
when the Iwi were being informed by hui, of the negotiation processes. By his own
admission, one of their number spoke of how after a long gruelling day, a group of them
decided at midnight upon the names that would constitute the dual namings (T. O'Regan
1997: kōrero-ā-Iwi Hui, Dunedin). Names therefore were allegedly arrived at almost by a hit-
and-miss selection, based on the group's personal selection, rather than on the collective
knowledge of how certain areas of landscape came to have particular stories associated with
them. However, Anake Goodall believes we should keep such knowledge of all tawhito
(ancient) and special names of importance and their accompanying stories to ourselves and
argued this, at the time we were asked to submit names for consideration by Crown and our negotiators (A. Goodall 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).

What was never taken into proper consideration were the wishes and knowledge of all of those homepeople who are not part of the marae system (by choice or otherwise), but who have a deep understanding of their landscapes and were therefore never consulted; or when they were, their wishes either were ignored or overruled (Ashwell 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). The stories of the places and their namings by our Tūpuna were not fully known by the whole group, but by part of it only; and, according to some of those whose stories these are, it was said the group did not truly understand the full and true significance of what some placenames and stories contain (P. Waaka, 1999; K. Davis, 1999; J. Reihana, 1999: me ērā atu tākata i kōrero-ā-waha: 1998-2000). It seemed to a number of those who heard the means by which name selection was arrived at, that it came from a perspective, which bore little resemblance to our connections with the many landscapes of Te Wāipounenu. Rather, the selection process had a great deal to do with either time constraints imposed on the Iwi by the Crown or a certain amount of “mana munching” by some of those engaged in the negotiating process on behalf of our hapū and Iwi (ētahi kōrero-ā-waha, 1997-1999; me taku mōhio). Others have stated privately that they consider some who negotiated the 78 placenames for us, were more into a type of personal one-upmanship over who held the greatest knowledge of these landscapes rather than any longstanding experiential knowledge of them (Anon. 1997 & 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). The process that had been used, we were informed by some leaders, did not demonstrate there was much of a spiritual connection held by many with the landscapes over which they were negotiating. However, it should be clearly understood that this is said only of a few negotiators, rather than the majority who worked tirelessly on our behalf. The work is still incomplete and those charged with the responsibility of keeping the Iwi informed have regular hui around the rohe to both inform and discuss issues to do with land assets and nohoaka (camping) sites. Nevertheless, the power base is confined to a few,
despite the devolution process aspired to within the tribe and the contestation over who has the power and the uses to which it is put continue. Those on the homescapes argue that they ought to have an equal say in matters to do with their homeplaces since they have more intimate knowledge of them.

Under the heading “Powers of Place,” Tilley states “qualities of locales and landscapes give cause to a feeling of belonging and rootedness and a familiarity, born not out of knowledge but of concern that provides ontological security” (Tilley 1994: 26). This last contention seems to express the thoughts put forward by Williams about the understanding expressed by E. Ellison, of the “junior” relationship he believes Tauwi have to Te Wāipounenu landscapes. However, the argument by Williams is that Ellison’s assumption is purely philosophical since it was made without being based upon fully informed knowledge.

The power to access and manipulate control over particular landscapes such as the high-country, without ownership of it, has been a major point of contention in the raruraru between Kai Tahu and high-country lessees. This has also happened with certain members of groups or the general public who have similar interests in recreational sites of Te Wāipounenu. Here we see political power and ownership/lease rights versus traditional connections and material use. All are connected with the power of place to which Tilley alludes. Having entrusted the power to negotiate on the many aspects of the Deed of Settlement, especially about places and their re-naming, there have been similar rumblings over where or with whom the power ought to rest.

These power contestations have occurred between Tauwi and Kai Tahu and among Kai Tahu as earlier mentioned. Raruraru between Kai Tahu and Tauwi to which I now refer, are those between Tauwi engaged by us in the negotiation or post-negotiation management of our landscapes and our grassroots selves. The landscapes include nohoaka sites and lands of significance that have been restored to Kai Tahu, some of which may have a greater resale
value than others. Resale—when the entire Claim has been fought over the enormous loss of land, sea and the mana over both! These Tauwi employees as well as the Rakatahi Kai Tahu employed within the Corporate arm of the Iwi in many instances, (A. Goodall 1999: kōrero-ā-waha), have often failed to have any understanding about what initiated the Claim in 1849. They also lack understanding about the struggles we have fought through the courts since 1849, or why we as an Iwi persisted with this through legal means rather than with the gun.

We used the law as a means by which to seek redress for our inability to develop alongside Tauwi because we were made landless and manene (like strangers) in our own landscape. We maintain this happened as a direct result of the huge loss of our land and seafood resources from our management and use, into those of Tauwi. The main argument we used to support our contention was that the Crown for over 150 years, had failed in its duty to protect our rights and therefore us as Iwi. In so doing, they negated these rights to develop alongside our Tauwi neighbours: Rights that were guaranteed to all New Zealand citizens under the Treaty guaranteed under Article the Second. Crown failure to protect crosses into present day failure by the Crown to educate our fellow Tauwi.

When a landscape such as a nohoaka site is given over for exclusive use by Kai Tahu, by the definition and understanding of our hired legal minds it has to be of “sacred” or special significance for them, rather than the understanding that all landscapes have special significance for us. Thus, suggestions that areas be put up for sale or re-negotiation in favour of other sites more profit “worthy” or “sacred” to Kai Tahu, are made. Definitions of “sacred” are theirs, not ours and the worth of such landscapes are measured by them, not us. Outsiders whom we employ are now attempting to define the most significant sites we have, not us. All sites are significant and selling or trading off is not negotiable. Our (meaning the ordinary people’s) wishes are often ignored as the educated, learned opinions, are considered of greater worth than those of the homepeople are.
When this type of thinking occurs by those employed to extract maximum cultural benefits for us, landscapes valued by us are often seen by our employees as valueless, by Tauiwi reckoning (J. Waaka, 1999; K. Davis, 1999; me he maha kaikōrero i kōrero-ā-waha; taku mōhio). Such reckoning is directly related to the alleged importance now placed or that will be placed on those 78 placenames that were part of the Settlement agreement (J. and P. Waaka, T. Jardine, H. Ashwell, T. (G). TeAu, M. Reihana and others; 1998-9: kā kōrero-ā-waha). The perceived need to rid us of supposedly less “famous” land tracts in favour of more famous or sacred sites defined by Tauiwi or certain negotiators, reduces areas of cultural value for us, into areas of a commodity, of value in Tauiwi terms. Yet another contestation that seems to have resulted from power acquisition in the corporate and development area, that is intra-Iwi and Tauiwi-Kai Tahu based, caused (I am assured), by the dreaded “mana-munching” (K. Davis and J. Reihana 1999: ētahi kōrerorero-a-waha).

Meanwhile, participant Anake Goodall (1999: kōrero-ā-waha), then part of the negotiation team for Nohoaka sites, contended this accusation of “mana munching” was neither a valid or accurate argument. He explained that he and others with whom he worked throughout the Claim process and beyond, have taken direction from and tried to inform and consult Mana whenua of the marae maha o Kai Tahu. Aspects of this argument are also challenged, but not on whether the consultation took place. These raruraru are about whether or not it was full consultation. That contestation is: that it is not only on marae that Kai Tahu interact and experience their Tahu-ness and connectedness with their landscapes; on the contrary, those on the marae are in a minority (R. Harris 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). I should add here that Harris is and was not alone in expressing that belief. Sadly, there exists within Kai Tahu, a present day fixation with marae only-based importance as a measure of one's Tahu-ness. I was therefore, not too surprised at hearing it expressed that there seems to be an over-importance attached to marae-based action, while much less importance is given to daily and lifetime experiential and intimate knowing of place. There continue to be large numbers of
non-marae participating Kai Tahu, still resident or active in their many home and landscapes. Many of these people (some now deceased), were actively engaged in following the Claim process and hearings around our rohe, unlike large numbers of those who hopped on board after its conclusion, or who did not follow physically follow it to each place the Tribunal sat. It is these people who feel so disempowered and sold out by the many of incoming "new guard." Thus there continues to be multiple understandings on how we should operate as an Iwi, which fits with how we have defined the term landscape, "multiply."

It is clear that there is no single Kai Tahu perception of what landscape is and how that defines our identity as Iwi. This continues to be so, whether from personal or self-definition of Kai identity, what Iwi leaders say we are collectively or how we are defined by outsiders including other iwi or the Crown. Nor is there a single use of the Iwi pepehā (which is one way to self-identify) when stating an individual's degree of Tahu-ness and identity. This appears to be so even if or when there is a clear understanding amongst the majority as to the meaning of the term "landscape." At one level, there is a collective as well as a more localised definition of us within the landscape. The understanding of the term appears for most, to encompass the idea of land as well as sea, between which few make any distinction when defining their homeplace. Participants all generally agree that landscape, as they understand the term, equates to and is Papatuānuku, but includes as well, Takaroa me Rakirara.

Landscape perception then is not able to be separated from the flora that clothe Papatuānuku and dwell with Takaroa and the fauna who, like us, are still conceptualised as their offspring. Landscape perception is also about belonging even when it is not necessarily about what constitutes being Kai Tahu as defined by the Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu Act of 1996. It was this Act that gave Kai Tahu a legal identity as an Iwi. Landscape perception is most importantly about Mana whenua, Mana moana and kaitiakitaka of these landscapes, even without ownership of them. Landscape perception, in the way in which this research
intends, is seldom about an aesthetically pleasing vista, although it has elements of that within
the way it is understood and spoken of. Even when that is done though, it is usually done from
a Māori perspective using metaphor Māori and epistemology Kai Tahu, rather than being
conceptualised in artistically descriptive terms.

Tilley has provided a very full description of what landscape meant to hunter-gatherer
subsistence cultivators. It is as follows:

... the natural landscape may be held to have provided a symbolic resource of utmost significance rather than
simply providing a backdrop for human action, [while] the natural landscape is a cognized form redolent with
placenames [and other things which] humanize and enculture [it], linking topographical features, trees, rocks,
rivers, birds and animals with patterns of human intentionality (Tilley 1994: 24).

Humans have culturally created places that they have endowed with human qualities so
that their landscapes over the centuries, became culturally produced (Tilley 1994: 24). Tilley
notes that the present understanding and interpretation of the word landscape “is highly
ideological” in that through such a narrow focus as a painterly one, all landscape images have
been “created and read” and are either “verbal or non-verbal texts” (Tilley 1994: 24).
Contestations have always existed among and between people about land and its best use as
well as over ownership and rights to resources. All vary according to the laws under which
the ownership and use rights are understood and defined. Small wonder then that other
contestations between the two culture groups within and outside the Iwi body politic that have
occurred, have been about Kai Tahu having a recognised role in the Tōpuni (conservation
areas) management and the nohoaka (camp) sites.

These contestations arose because of a perceived loss of power by the dominant culture
group, by the Crown and leasehold farmers at the time of the Claim hearings. Contestations
arising since are from some Tauiwi engaged by the Kai Tahu corporate group but have
seemingly overstepped the role the majority believe they should have. In the case of the high-
country and the raruraru between Kai Tahu and lessees, the problem existed because the perceived power over the most desirable land use (rather than the land itself) might have been removed from the lessees to rest with Kai Tahu. The power over the renting or leasing of the land had formerly rested with the Crown for almost 150 years and that is all that would have changed had the whole of the high-country leased lands been restored to Kai Tahu. It has been stated elsewhere that,

...most land use is determined by the highest net returns (of money, individual or community satisfaction) that can be gained from the area (Hughes 1969 in Smith 1984: 15-16) and the community believes that at present it gets most benefit or satisfaction from leasing this land to a farmer (Smith 1984: 16).

When some of the lessees were asked whether they would consider moving to another area to farm because of soil erosion, many said they would do so, since they were always paid compensation (Smith 1984: 35). This implies it is not a particular landscape or piece of land to which they were attached, but rather to the ability to earn a living from any piece of that high-country landscape. Such an attachment by these farmers is markedly different from that of Kai Tahu who do not need to live there to remain connected with it in a special way. After all, our founding ancestors are the high-country. This type of landscape understanding as a thing of monetary worth experienced by high-country farmers has already been alluded to in our raruraru with our Tauiwi employees. There it was stated, that if a landscape was not of particular significance (such as areas of the high-country), then another piece would be more equitably desirable—but to whom? (taku mōhio—personal knowledge). The main concern by the lessees was that the bulk of the high-country area could have been used as part of the Kai Tahu settlement. In the internal raruraru, it has been more a case of “mana munching” about who believed they had the most accurate information of the places being dually named there and elsewhere, than anything else. This so-called understanding resulted from supposed marama hōhonu (deep knowledge) and understanding of kōrero pūrākau or pakiwaitara...
(historical knowledge or stories) associated with the traditional names (Anon. 1998: kōrero-ā-waha).

The other aspect of the internal argument was about who should have had the power to negotiate the re-namings and more importantly, to settle on them. That contestation was also over a supposedly superior knowledge of the landscapes and the histories associated with their original naming. Many who were not power wielding simply gave little if any credence to that supposed knowledge since most of the “experts” had never lived in the places. Those who did live there felt their requests and the reasons behind them were ignored as being chosen because of sentimental attachment rather than being historically important as defined by the “experts.” As a consequence, the landscapes, along with the experiential knowledge of them were seemingly relegated to lesser importance. Some less experientially knowledgable (termed by some as “Johnny-come-latelies”) perceived the situation only as they understood it believing it was a truly informed one. Kelly Davis and Jacko Reihana in a kōrero with one another during an interview stated that:

The reality is that the very kōrero we're having now, the very kōrero we're having now, was had. And happened in the Kemp's purchase area predominantly and in many other places too, but was not recorded. And you're talking about names ... there's that [sic] many names and I don't for the life of me understands why, when we went. When they [negotiators] did this name thing that they didn't look. There's a map, there's a book, there's the kōrero that goes with it. Why the hell didn't we use it? Why didn't we use it in terms of the...[settlement]. 'cause it would have highlighted to all the other area. Even Murihiku that didn't have that recording though there were some recordings down there. It would have induced people to say, 'Hell look, you know, look at this lot here...we've got as many[names].’ And that would have covered the landscape. What we're literally saying is the kōrōwai of Papatūānuku for Ngāi Tahu has not been put there (K. Davis 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).

And:

Well exactly. And they should have done the whole lot (names) instead of just those wee few (J. Reihana, 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).
I mean I could show you the maps. I could show you the kōrero that goes with them ‘cause I’ve got the whole damned lot. And it was given to them, it was given to the claimants, it was given to them up here at Arowhenua, but it never ever...but that’s as far as it got. It got translated. It was in Te Reo! It got translated and then it got locked away. And the maps are there. And if you’d put that map up there, you can bet that Murihiku would have come in, [have] loaded it up [with their names] with everyone else and the whole of Papatuanuku in terms of Ngāi Tahu would have been covered. And then if you wanted to get the whole of Te Wāipounenu you get Te Tau Ihu to do the same damned thing (K. Davis 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).

Another participant put it this way:

I did complain about a number of nohoanga sites, their location, the areas where we were ... they [negotiators] weren’t very selective, in that they didn’t consult with the Tākata whenua about what they were going to do. They took a point on the map and said, ‘This is it.’ We went to one in the Mackenzie Country. It was on the eastern side of a shingle road were the lake was and Pākehā huts on the other side and every time the wind blew, (a nor’ wester), it blew the dust on to the area where the nohoanga site was. We had to walk through the dust to get to the lake, toilets ... I complained to all those who were involved. We all met at the lakeside and we decided that this wasn’t good enough and this site was no use to us. So it [the site] was transferred to the other side of the road and we re-settled nearer to the lake. I mean, a lot of this rubbish could have been solved if the negotiators had contacted us beforehand. We wouldn’t have needed to go over this again. I think we should be looking at ways of stopping this ‘you take it or leave it’ attitude to the home people (J. Waaka, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

It has been expressed that such choice of names or selection of places by some negotiators, clearly demonstrates how little they actually know of the landscapes and special places over which they assumed the power to negotiate. The raruraru or contestations are at the heart of kā mea māramatāka o Kai Tahu and are what make the heart of Kai Tahu beat. They are also the heart of this thesis.
KAUPAPA HOU I RUKA I PAPATUĀNUKU

The landscapes of Te Wāipounemau were to become so vastly reworked as to be almost totally new and unrecognisable to Kai Tahu. How such vast changes occurred was due, in no small amount, to the enormous and new agricultural practices that were introduced. These required a vastly altered use of the Kai Tahu landscapes that involved amongst other things, the removal of Kai Tahu from most of our physical or geographical landscapes. Alongside it came the removal of our rights of access to our mahika kai and other resources that were upon those landscapes. The landscape alterations also involved removing large sections of bush, the draining of large swamps and lakes and the re-routing of streams. As a result, areas that had formerly been known to hold certain food even though still able to be accessed, no longer provided such resources, because of the colonists' activities. These processes brought about enormous environmental changes as a result of the incoming settlers' altered use of the land. The idea of boundary marking was also altered from rivers, streams or other landscape markers to the fencing off of large tracts of land, which were then stocked with sheep and cattle. At the same time there was a replacement of existing forms of kai with newly introduced ones such as grains, sheep and cattle. So it was that former Kai Tahu landscapes were so completely recreated that they were all but unrecognisable. As a consequence of this knowledge loss, many Kai Tahu have not in any way been socialised during childhood upon these landscapes or been able to live upon them even as adults. There are a number who know of or have heard about their homeplaces, but who have no experiential knowledge of them and want none either of the places or our Claim to have Mana whenua restored to us in relation to many of these landscapes. This was clearly expressed in one interview where it was stated that:
One of the staff members, who [m] I shan’t name … at one of their meetings I asked him, ‘How many of you lot have read the Tribunal support of Ngāi Tahu Claim?’ So of course no one puts his or her hands up. Not too surprising. OK, ‘How many of you read the Deed of Settlement then?’ Same response as the last question as well. No, no one had. Oh! ‘How many of you have read the history of the Ngāi Tahu [Legal Identity] Act and the Ngāi Tahu Claim Settlement Act?’ Nobody… um. ‘Has anyone actually read the summary document that went out with the vote on the Ngāi Tahu Settlement?’ Not one person has read it. So you have got a whole organisation that is absolutely without consciousness of who we are and where we have come from. They turn up out of nowhere and they’ve got to do stuff in a context which they don’t understand, without any guidance, without any experience, even age, on their team and the response this person [meaning himself] got was, ‘Stop living in the past.’ So, there is an example. Part of the danger in that approach … well! If you took that approach and extrapolated further you would be dead in no time flat. And that, at the moment, is the thinking of that whole, very fundamentally important part of the organisation, [meaning NTDC], the whole heart which is the bit that is dealing ‘back to ourselves’ mainly. And, that its understanding of these relevant issues is … ONE BIG ROUND ZERO. This I personally don’t condemn. The bit that I condemn though is no acknowledgement that that stuff has any value per se, and the lack of willingness to learn things. People like me certainly knew nothing of the Claim early on when we started, but we made sure we learned as much as possible from either written records or those who were knowledgeable about that history of our landscapes (A. Goodall Otautahi: 1999).

Many of the so-called well educated amongst Kai Tahu were part of the negotiation process, or the team that led that process post-settlement as employees of Kai Tahu Development Corporation. A number in that group fit the category described above by Anake Goodall. Consequently, the only form of knowing that they have of the landscapes and of our Kai Tahu ancestors’ homeplaces is mostly book acquired knowledge. This they have acquired in tertiary institutions, through the medium of print, from television, or most recently, the Internet. This is not a condemnation of any of these forms of knowledge. But once having gained it, to have never bothered to avail themselves of the experiential knowledge accumulated by their whānauka or Kai Tahu who are in possession of intimate and lived form of knowing is unforgivable. When that form of knowledge is not sought, then criticisms are
bound to arise and have. They have done so, because the type of decisions that have had to be made on behalf of the Iwi needed to include all knowledge of Kai Tahu landscapes, their meanings and the reason for the pursuit of the Claim, from the people who are of them and who fought it. This form of knowing was essential if the negotiators and those who informed them were and are to act wisely on behalf of the Iwi during the negotiation processes and prior gathering of evidence. As one kaumatua from Awarua stated:

There exists a so-called knowledge of Kai Tahu landscapes and their histories. Harry Evison has never been there! [to the Tititi islands]. He’s never ever been there. All he was writing was second hand knowledge and he was getting that from people who have never ever been there either. You know they went to the wrong people, all the time, they kept going to the wrong people. Ngāi Tahu have claimed all the Muttonbird Islands when they never ever owned the Muttonbird Islands. Core blimey; you only have to look at the island. The names that are there are or were either Waitaha or Kāti Māmoe, every one. And now they are saying all these things were Ngāi Tahu. Ngāi Tahu were a long, long, long way away. Ngāi Tahu’s only presence on there was through the Kāti Māmoe women. They married into them, but Ngāi Tahus always have been greater orators, if you can put it that way. More forthright in talking, whereas Kāti Māmoe have sat back (H. Ashwell Awarua 1999: korero-ā-waha).

Although we are now considered to have a single Iwi identity that continues to acknowledge tātai (strands) which go to make up Kai Tahu, rights such as those to the Muttonbird Islands, are not tribal as of right. They are derived only through whakapapa as are the working of whānau manu (birding areas). The Crown granting of such rights through the return of Crown-owned islands cuts across traditional rights inherited through whakapapa, creating further externally induced raruraru. That is not the way to have a lost piece of land returned. To attempt to establish a new and external right in place of a whakapapa right, as it uses a Tauiwi perceived land right in place of a traditional whānau one.

The possible return of high-country leased land to Kai Tahu as part settlement of the 150-year old Claim, past, present and possibly future occupation of that landscape and the most environmentally sound use of it, became a further area of contestation. This contestation,
unlike the one above, was between Kai Tahu and high-country lessees. Both issues were based almost exclusively around a shift in the power dynamics. That was out of the hands of Kai Tahu in whose care the landscapes were originally intended to be and into the power of the Crown. (Anon. 1998: kōrero-ā-waha; taku mōhio). This possible loss of power and land was no less traumatic for high-country farmers than had been the removal from pastoral usage of sections of their farms, to control land and soil erosion earlier (Smith 1984: 16 and throughout his thesis). However, at this particular time, the high-country lessee farmers chose cultural appropriation through the borrowing of Māori trope to claim bonds to the land through their lineage, not ownership. These lessee farmers used a similar argument to the one that Kai Tahu had put before the Waitangi Tribunal (M. Dominy 1990: 12-14; taku mōhio). Over the duration of the hearings, it became clear that they wished to maintain existing rights to and power over that landscape (taku mōhio; J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). As an issue of landscape perception, the high-country argument is explored more fully in chapter five.

More recently in the nation’s consciousness regarding the climbing of Aoraki, a statement was made by some Kai Tahu about the need to respect their Tupuna and the tapu nature for many of them of his head, especially about the discarding of rubbish there. This became a new area of cross-cultural contestation which escalated further when Sir Edmund Hillary stated that such feelings were a modern-day expression by Kai Tahu since they had never to his knowledge made such a fuss in former times. He stated in a documentary, that the very first time he climbed a mountain, Te Tapuae o Uenuku, the locals had told him to be very wary of their mauka (mountain) and had, on his return, expressed relief that unlike other lone climbers, he had completed the task and returned unscathed (Hillary in “Hillary: A View from the Top” nd. September 1997: TV 1). The locals he was referring to were Kai Tahu and their version of the events is similar only in that they were concerned, but that this concern was applied to all who traversed their mauka and failed to respect his ihi and the tohu of their elemental Tupuna. The most telling aspect of Hillary’s statement is “to his knowledge” which
though it may have become extensive about mountain climbing, had not in any way apparently increased on a cultural “other’s” perception of how to act sensitively and sensibly when in the presence of their Tupuna. This perception of Āoraki has always been part of the belief system of Tatane Wesley and was part of other Kai Tahu belief systems mai i kā wā i mua, atu ki aianei (from old times to the present). T. Wesley 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). The idea that Āoraki, besides being Tatane’s sacred mountain, is also his revered Tupuna was not a newly contrived belief (T. Wesley 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). It would be unthinkable to transgress by touching or fouling the head of a revered Tupuna during that person’s lifetime, so also is it said that, “to Ngāi Tahu, standing on the very top of Āoraki denigrates its tapu status” (Ngāi Tahu Negotiating Group 1997: 35). However, I recall from a kōrero-ā-Iwi that even this statement is contested as a belief. The descendants of those Tūpuna along with the majority of present day Kai Tahu, hold fast to their belief of the importance of Āoraki and their other Tūpuna of Te Tiritiri o te Moana (the Southern Alps), regardless of the Waitangi Tribunal findings on this matter. Those of the East Coast did not sell their Tūpuna or mountains and only Āoraki is mentioned on the West Coast deed of sale (K. Davis 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). Thinking on not selling mountains still holds true, even in far off lands that were the home for the ancestors of present-day descendants of the Scottish settlers to Te Wāipounamu.

Just as unthinkable for Kai Tahu is the idea that their Tūpuna would have ever knowingly sold the high-country in which Āoraki and many other significant ancestors and wāhi tapu (sacred sites) are located. Even so, Tūpuna on Te Tai Poutini signed away their side of Āoraki (K. Davis 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). A recent news bulletin stated, that the present Laird of the Clan MacLeod could not sell the Black Mountains which are part of his family lands in Scotland (BBC World News: Washington DC, 10 April, 2000: taku mōhio). An unnamed woman in that news item said that, “no-one can buy or sell mountains,” while another stated that the mountains should instead be gifted to the nation.
Table 1. Summary Table of 'contested landscapes'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTESTATIONS</th>
<th>RARURARU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-iwi (including Iwi Māori and Tauiwi)</td>
<td>Intra-iwi. (including whānau, hapū and Iwi Whānau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty Tribes versus Urban Iwi.</td>
<td>Marae versus marae AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahu ki te Raki versus Tahu ki te Toku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such contestations are part of belief systems other than those of Kai Tahu. For Kai Tahu, the “hole in the middle”, the mountainous high-country interior of the South Island, the Southern Alps, will always be an unresolved area of contestation. That raruraru, despite the final acceptance of the Deed of Settlement, will always be with us (taku mōhio). The maps that follow, show the differences between what Kai Tahu state we sold and what the Crown believes it fairly purchased.
Many have felt that little respect has been shown by some other cultures in the treatment of Aoraki or other places of special significance to Iwi. When climbing Aoraki or other mauka, the majority of climbers and other tourism adventurers have never asked for the opinions or feelings of Kai Tahu in this regard. Jacko Reihana though believed, that many mountaineers showed great respect for Aoraki as a mountain (J. Reihana 1999: kōrero-a-waha), though not, to my understanding of his remarks, as our revered Tupuna or consulted with Kai Tahu beforehand.

Some of those who are the closest guardians of Aoraki at Te Umu Kaha (Temuka) view such inconsiderate actions as both ignorant and galling. Rather, they were sensible about how they acted when climbing him as with any other mountain of equal height and challenge. Kai Tahu disapproval and other cultural insensitivities about this lack of respect for an alternative understanding have only been acknowledged and reported publicly since our negotiations with the Crown were agreed to in principle. These negotiations and settlement have since been enacted in law through parliament. Formerly, such approvals were deemed unnecessary since the landscape was no longer considered as being under the kaitiakitaka (guardianship) of Kai Tahu. Many Tauiwi mistakenly believe that we no longer maintain an unbroken kaitiaki role for Aoraki and other areas of significance that are no longer in our ownership. Of course we state that we never owned them but were their guardians and that they were beyond the ownership of any group or individual. Tauiwi and others also believe that the idea of takata tiaki is new and that it applies only in its presently understood terms as presented in the press and therefore, as the nation. This understanding is that the role of takata tiaki pertains exclusively to customary fishing and any other form of tiakitaka (caretaking) that the Crown wishes to grant to Iwi. Such assumptions are quite wrong.

Even after the Kai Tahu Tribunal hearings entered the public arena, little reference was made to our thoughts on these insensitivities. If consultation had occurred from the start and had been recorded at any time since Tauiwi opened Aoraki and the surrounding areas to
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tourism, there may have been greater weight attached to the Kai Tahu argument before the Waitangi Tribunal (T. O'Regan 1997: kōrero-a-Iwi hui, Dunedin).

The argument is that we had not sold the high-country in the Kemp’s Deed of Purchase, but only the lands agreed to from the coast to the foothills (WAI# 27, DoC.: W 1: 165; Evison 1993: 328). Instead of Aoraki being given over to Kai Tahu for a day for us to supposedly accept then gift back to the nation, when that part of the settlement process is enacted, he may have been seen by all, Tribunal members, the Crown, lawyers for both sides and the nation as a whole, as never having been separated from Kai Tahu. This is especially worth considering with him being perceived of by them as sacred with his uppermost regions being thought of as the head of any living person or Tupuna, and therefore tapu. These issues will also be discussed later in the thesis. Present arguments are occurring within the media about the return to Kai Tahu of some of these high-country areas. The correspondence in local and national newspapers about Kai Tahu and other Iwi issues are no less scathing and often come as a result of Waitangi Tribunal recommendations. See, for example this quote from Paul Waaka of Arowhenua:

This guy who writes to the Newspaper, E. W. Austin [is] a bit of loose cannon. Any slip up, or any minor issues that happen on the T.V. or the paper... every area has one ... he jumps on the band wagon, he is very critical of our cause (P. Waaka, 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).

---

20 WAI# 27 (p. 166), states that the Kemp Deed of sale was not legally valid and that being the case, neither was the sale. See also Evison 1993: 284 f.n. 8, p. 307.

21 One of the greatest raruraru Iwi wide, (excluding a few of those on Te Runanga O Ngāi Tahu) is the gifting back of Aoraki to Kai Tahu for one day by the Crown as a gesture of good will. In turn, Kai Tahu are expected to gift it back to the nation as a further gesture of good will. All this gifting will then be seen as Kai Tahu having accepted the settlement and acknowledging the sale of Aoraki actually occurred. On the East Coast, this was never the case and that sale continues to be contested.
There is ongoing debate in New Zealand about how government should forget the past and treat all New Zealanders the same way. Other types of Iwi bashing about Te Waipounemu are invariably to do with the non-belief by certain sections of the public who disregard the honourable intentions of Kai Tahu over lands returned in the settlement. This is especially so on how we as an Iwi, will continue to grant public access to all the areas where this already occurs. Since August 1999 groups of nohoaka sites (camping places) have been declared for our exclusive use to camp on as Kai Tahu, for a certain time each year. Thus the Crown acknowledges that as an Iwi we have always retained our mana over the landscapes of Te Waipounemu and this acknowledgement effectively means we have the status of Mana whenua in our rohe pōtae (tribal area); and as an Iwi we have a say in how the land and seascapes of Kai Tahu are managed. As Kai Tahu, we retain the right of Mana whenua as we continue to maintain a spiritual connection with our wāhi tūturu. This spiritual connection is quite different from how others retain a connection with Te Waipounemu as their true home, regardless of their ancestral origins. However it is only different, not idiotic or sentimental as has been suggested.

Even with such held beliefs we are being dictated to by certain lawyers and others in our employ, not to make active all the nohoaka sites at once, but to bring in this concept gradually so as not to upset Tauiwi. The grassroots on the other hand are saying that “our taoka should be protected and cared for and if we must pretend these new taoka do not yet exist, then why have they been part of the deal?” (H. Duff 16/06/1999: Kai Tahu Roadshow, Otepoti). R. Harris spoke similarly about the possible placing of a Mataitai over the Ōtākou harbour to protect not only our seascape there but also our taoka, in the form of tuaki (cockles) (D. Matahaere 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). However, those in the so-called seats of power again insist that such action may upset rednecks and they therefore felt that this should be avoided at all costs (J. Innes mā 1999: kōrero-a-Iwi hui, Otepoti). Such actions or more accurately, a lack of action help keep the status of our Mana whenua and Mana moana in a position approved of by
Tauiwi, not Kai Tahu. This is outsider-defined “caring” instead of the pre-existing Kai Tahu one as kaitiaki of these taoka as formerly expressed. Our role then as now is essential in these two important areas of Mana. It is very different from the way that we envisaged the Deed of Settlement had intended. More worrying for many, is that this is precisely what our negotiators may have settled for. Thus many Kai Tahu ask, “Kei hea te taha wairua o Kai Tahu? Kua ngaro, kaore he taha pēnā i a tātou rānei?” And the conclusion reached if these are the sad facts is, “Kaore ātahi mana tou tātou?” (Have we no Mana?)

WESTERN VIEWS OF LANDSCAPE.

An opportunity presented itself to me to discuss the concept of landscape and its use with a young farming couple in East Anglia, when researching during early 1998 in Britain. This was done to see if there were differences in understanding between them and participants from Te Wāipounenu and Aotearoa. The male spouse discussed landscape as a concept with colleagues reporting some farmers did not connect it with their farms or farming practices. Most apparently considered landscape had to do with works of art in galleries or private collections, even if their farms were depicted in painted landscapes (N. Stacey 1998: pers. comm.). The thinking of these East Anglian farmers was quite similar to that in responses of one Otago area of research (Anon. 1998: pers comm.). In other words, landscape was conceptualised only in a painterly way. However, as earlier stated, Kai Tahu usually understand landscape as being Papatuānuku, that being the whole of the earth’s surface, which for them incorporates the entire land and sea areas of Te Wāipounenu to which they have access, use, or developmental rights.

According to Barbara Bender, landscapes may be all or any of the following:
Close-grained, worked-upon, lived-in places, or they may be distant and half-fantasised. In Western societies they involve only the surface of the land: in other parts of the world, or in pre-modern Europe, what lies above the surface, or below, may be as or more important, [where humans] are the point from which the 'seeing' occurs. (Bender 1993: 1).

Tilley states that landscape has ontological importance because it is more than merely a pleasing aesthetic scene, it is also something, “lived in and through, mediated, worked on and altered, replete with cultural meanings and symbolism” (Tilley 1994: 26). Bender agrees with Tilley’s argument while contending that her description quoted above is a wholly Western perspective as well as an ego-centred concept of scenery and views, and that cultural “others” do not always (if ever), place such emphasis on the visual (Bender 1993: 1). The word landscape was apparently “coined [by] European aesthetes, antiquarians and landed gentry--all men” and connoted a class-conscious perception of relating to both the land and to people other than themselves (Bender 1993: 2). Similar statements have been made by Tilley (1994); Cosgrove (1984); Cosgrove and Daniels (1988). Landscapes were considered by some in both England and Te Wāipounenu as commodities similar to paintings, affordable only to the “upper classes,” “wealthy” or “arty” types. Those of Oceania with whom I discussed the concept saw it much as did most of the Kai Tahu participants and continued, in some instances, to humanise those parts with which they were most intimately connected. However, this was not always so, as in a korero-a-waha with Teresia Teaiwa, she stated that she was amazed at how many of the histories of Viti Levu were no longer known by the home people there. So even though the people of the place retain the bulk of their landscapes and language, she believed that because they have retained their language and landscapes, unlike Iwi Māori, Kanaka of Hawai‘i and her own people of Banaba, indigenous Fijians have become complacent in their knowledge (Teaiwa, kōrero-ā-waha Viti Levu 1999). She believes they
fail to value those kōrero that speak of the deeds of their ancestors who are embodied in their landscapes (T. Teaiwa 1999: kōrero-ā-waha.). Te Wāipounemū definitions of the farm as a landscape in localised areas evoked the following remarks: “anywhere on it I can see land, hills, sea, the moana” (S. Harris 1998): “it is the ancestors, the Tūpuna as they are in my piece and all around the whole rohe” (T. Wesley 1998): “it’s everything we can see, the land and the sea” (R. Harris: 1998: nō kā waha ō ēnei kaikōrero). Similar definitions were given by both Tauiwi and Kai Tahu of their landscapes.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL VIEWS ON LANDSCAPE

How do anthropologists and other disciplines such as geography, literature and writers on art define the idea of landscape? According to Bender (1996: 323), anthropology thought of landscape with “landform-something already in place or ‘land use,’ whereby something is done to the land.” Hirsch quoting Dresch states that one way in which landscape was used in anthropology was through the weaving of terrain that the field worker could see into classic monographs. Another was as a production of the indigenous people which fieldworkers learn to “recognise and understand through fieldwork” (Hirsch 1996: 1, 2). After providing an explanation of how the term and its understanding over time became conceptualised in England and Europe, Carter contended that imperialist history “reduces space (landscape) to a stage” (Carter 1987: 3).

During an informal discussion, the head of Anthropology at Otago University stated to me that landscape was not a usual anthropological term: Instead anthropology like social geography used “space,” “place” or “environment” (taku mōhio). However, this began as an interdisciplinary thesis and though it is now anthropology alone in which I an enrolled, the

---

22 In a footnote, Bender provides a more accurate description of the term landscape and its original meaning, and how it was re-created in the seventeenth and eighteenth century Europe, including the British Isles.
thesis continues to come from more than a single cultural perspective and definition. Anthropologically, landscape was formerly perceived in a passive, neutral way, though in more recent times, anthropology has begun to take cognisance of how humans perceive their world: how they materially engage with it; how intimately they and their landscapes are bound together; and how humans “are creative of and created by the landscape” (Bender 1996: 323). This approach clarifies that separation of nature from culture is a Western view. What apparently challenged this long held idea was the conceptualisation of the landscape held by the Aborigine people of Australia. For Aborigines (and many other first nations' people), landscape “is at one and the same time a topographic map, a cosmological exegesis, a ‘clanscape’, and a ritual and political landscape” (Bender 1996: 323). Kai Tahu and other Iwi view their landscapes similarly, if not identically with these descriptions. Kai Tahu and other Iwi have places and names in common with each other and with other Polynesian peoples, as well as shared epistemologies that are at once recognisable by most Polynesian groups. However, there are also many differences in understanding. To cite one, Kanaka o Hawai’i (indigenous Hawai’ians) were traditionally affiliated to an Ali’i (chief) (L. Kame’eleihiwa 1998: kōrero-a-waha) unlike Iwi who were and still are, connected with the whenua (land). Even so, Hawai’ians valued and followed the Ali’i who best took care of the land (Kame’eleihiwa 1986: 33-35). The difference was that Kanaka could choose to leave the land they worked if they decided to affiliate with another Ali’i, so. their main connection then was to a person in regard to how she or he as Ali’i cared for the landscape and themselves through mālama ‘aina (Kame’eleihiwa 1986: 33-35, 43-47). The Kanaka Māoli concept in Hawai’i of maka’aainana (kin affiliation) equates with, but is somewhat different from the concept of whānaukataka (family-ness) of Iwi Māori (Kame’eleihiwa 1998: kōrero-a-waha).

It is in such an indigenous epistemological context that I use the term “landscape” and that is the way in which it is understood and used by Kai Tahu. It concerns their Claim and aspects of its settlement, that are not regarded in the artistic understanding of landscape. This
is also more than what has been termed variously by anthropologists and others earlier referred to “space” or “place” or “environment.” Kai Tahu and other Iwi use the term landscape interchangeably with land, but it is usually particular land that has a history involving Tūpuna from Hawaiki Nui, Aotearoa and Te Wāipounamu, and often has to do with feats these ancestors achieved upon the landscape. For Kai Tahu, it also encompasses the sea. Gerard O’Regan (17/5/99), in a kōrero-ā-waha stated, “You [the writer] should call the sea a seascape” to which I replied that this was the way in which I referred to it within the thesis. Moreover, it was also the way I felt Kai Tahu and especially our Tūpuna had. O’Regan went on to suggest that a possible reason why our Tūpuna had not used the term land was that large land tracts were not visible to them as so much was bush-clad (G. O’Regan 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). He added that seascape was part of the overall concept of landscape. Upon it were contained special areas of importance that provided a place from which to view the wider landscapes of Te Wāipounamu, while the sea itself was as an integral and inseparable as part of the total landscape of Kai Tahu.

Landscape as a study has been connected to many analyses of Western perceptions in art and literature. Hoskins, in regard to the making of the landscape in England, has spoken of landscapes as palimpsests that in a British context clearly showed “a history of occupation and land-use [that developed] in the shape of a hedge or the angle of a road” (Bender 1996: 323) so that it was “like a painting by Brueghel or a major symphony” (Hoskins 1985: 3). According to Bender, archaeologists have been able to map “the increasing constraint of movement and vision within the Neolithic and later Bronze Age landscapes and monuments of southern Britain” (Bender 1996: 323). Kai Tahu boundaries were not clearly defined by the use of a fence, but were on the other hand, similar to those mentioned by Hirsch in his “Introduction” in The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space. The Kai Tahu boundaries were invisible to all without inside knowledge and were to do with
mahika kai resources correctly accessed only by right of whakapapa. Such boundaries and use rights were known and accepted without a need for enclosure. Conversely, the English ideas on boundary markers such as the hedge and road angles alluded to above, are what Williams’ *The Country and the City* explored. Here, the idea of structures of feeling in English literature sees Williams analyse the ways that people engaged with their landscapes, and were connected with them through social and historic relationships, as stated also in Bender (1996: 323). Bender commented that, although “Jane Austen, William Cobbett and Gilbert White were all living in the same area,” each conceptualised the same landscape in a vastly different way (cited in Bender 1996: 323). Edward Said in his 1993 work *Culture and Imperialism* went even further than Williams with his wider, contextual and analytical exploration of colonial exploitation of landscapes; namely the creation in the colonies of parks that were based on those created in England.

Such anthropological and other studies have focused almost exclusively on landscape as divorced from land use and mostly from a Western perspective of what that means. Cosgrove and Daniels in *The Iconography of Landscape* (1998) examined the idea of a Western iconography of landscape during the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. This moved from painterly perceptions to landscape as a class-defined form of perception from which came the active creation of landscaped parks and gardens in Britain, America and later in their colonies. Cosgrove and Daniels (1988) discuss a Western gaze assisting in colonisation, using the iconography of maps. Many others including Bender (1993), Pratt (1992), Said (1993) and Tilley (1994) have also discussed the so-called imperial eye. The “iconography of maps” talks of an imperial gaze that differs from the indigenous ones in the following ways; how explorers visualised the landscapes; how the coloniser’s ideas of land ownership and use differed from those of the colonised; of the many unequal encounters between coloniser and colonised; and finally, how the Western gaze ultimately transmuted into the tourist gaze and
the politics of heritage. Bender notes that anthropologists have quite recently begun to examine in more detail non-Western conceptualisations and "ways of being in the landscape" citing herself (1993) and Hirsch and O'Hanlon (1995), in which she also states that landscape is now being gendered (Bender 1996: 323). Landscape is not a particular focus or preoccupation of anthropology solely, though since Hirsch and O'Hanlon's work of edited essays, it now seems to have a place within what was formerly the study of the systems and structures of cultural "others." Landscape as a study operates in an interdisciplinary way as it encompasses politics, history, sociology, cultural geography and anthropology, examining social relations, and cultural perceptions and contestations. "It is also an area that forces the abandonment of conventional disciplinary boundaries and creates the potential for innovative cross-fertilization" (Bender 1996: 324).

**SUMMARY OF LANDSCAPE PERCEPTIONS**

Regardless of who is defining their particular landscape, Orians and Heerwagen (1992: 570) argue that it is generally accepted that most landscape features will maintain a sense of permanence, "at least from the perspective of a human lifetime." Schultis stresses the importance of the idea of preferred landscapes, which are chosen because survival is guaranteed through the meeting of human needs (Schultis 1991: 14). Some landscapes alter slowly while at the same time they maintain their environmental conditions in which predictors remain relatively constant (Orians and Heerwagen 1992: 570). This, according to Orians and Heerwagen (1992: 570), indicates that a people’s habitat has a reasonably long-term and therefore, feasible future.

However this was not the case for much of the Kai Tahu landscape from shortly after the arrival of the pastoralist settlers. Within just two decades, the bulk of Te Waipounenu become understood as a subject of study and research, within social anthropology.
was already in Tauiwi ownership. Kai Tahu in the mid-nineteenth century, according to their understanding of what constituted the areas of the land to be sold, were agreeable signatories to its sale (kōrero-a-Iwi mai ra anō). There is however, little likelihood that they could have envisaged the huge changes to be wrought upon their landscapes (Evison 1993: 50; B. Mikaere 1988: 19, 88 and 125; WAI # 27 T1: 166 and 334). From written and Iwi oral accounts, it seems that they could not have fully realised the rapidity with which these would occur. The way in which the Tauiwi style of farming, whether pastoral or arable, would impact upon their landscapes could not be foreseen, any more than was the lack of ability by Kai Tahu to continue their particular method of food gathering and its associated works known as mahika kai (the food works) (Evison 1993: 329; B. Dacker 1990: 8-13; Dacker 1994: 6-8). Such practices were (and are still) part of the cultural perception of what constitutes the definition of the landscapes of Te Wāipounenui. Kai Tahu believed the landscapes, the vegetation that clothed it and the animals inhabiting it were directly connected to them through whakapapa from their earth mother and from the sea father Takaroa. Tauiwi on the other hand, saw the same landscapes as being in need of taming, working and civilising into farmscapes. These differences of perception demonstrate the difficulty for one culture to adequately comprehend what is understood within the landscape definitions and many other conceptualisations of a cultural “other.”

While considering the past, the thesis also examines how different understandings of relationships with the landscape continue in present day New Zealand, and continue to be a source of contestation between many, whether between Iwi and Iwi, Iwi and Tauiwi, or Tauiwi and Tauiwi. The descendants of the indigenes of Te Wāipounenui (and Aotearoa) have again over the last three decades and as they did last century, begun to vocalise much more forcefully and publicly about their loss of land and their special landscapes. At the same

---

24 This brief translation of the meaning of “mahika ka” is taken from "Māori customary and traditional Instream water values," Crengle, and T O'Regan (eds.) 1997: 9, from a paper obtained at a hui and learned over a lifetime of hearing about and discussing The Claim.
time they have continued to seek both recognition of and redress for these losses. Consequently, there have arisen a number of contestations over who should define the landscapes, particularly in terms of hapū connections to present-day landscapes and how the landscapes of Kai Tahu are defined. Discussions have occurred amongst themselves, especially at wānaka and hui. Such definitions have also been discussed by Tauiwi at government level and by ordinary New Zealanders, through the media, especially the printed media. These are discussed regarding the purposes for which Te Wāipounenu landscapes are presently being used, or the uses to which they may be put at some future date. In relation to intended uses, such contestations are not only cross-cultural. There are almost daily contestations over rural landscapes between Department of Conservation (DoC) and farmers, foresters and trampers, or between “greenies” and mining companies, or in urban landscapes, such as those developers and the Historic Places Trust likes. They are almost exclusively over the most appropriate use for a particular landscape and its best utilisation.

Where anything different begins to encroach on an existing landscape, contestations over its use or abuse constantly take place; for instance, when there is an encroachment on an inner-city green belt area there may be contestation between industry and “greenies;” or when pollution of some sort affecting rural or recreational areas occurs, there may be contestation between conservationists and farmers; or when Telecom towers are deemed by one side as essential and by the other as a health risk, or merely as an unsightly blot upon the landscape, there will invariably be contestation between the opposing sides. There are virtually a hundred other possible combinations of encroachment on modern day so-called sacred sites, without ever considering the number of old wahi tapu Iwi ones that are under constant threat. The encroachment or so called destruction of “sacred site” or “trees” such as the pine formerly atop Maunga Kiekie (One Tree Hill of Auckland), cause some form of contestation or sit-in type protests by those often labelled unfairly as “lunatic fringe groups.” However, the contestations that will be examined and discussed most fully in this research are about
differences of definition: if they actually exist between Kai Tahu and Kai Tahu; between urban and rural Kai Tahu; between Kai Tahu men and women; between all of these; and, within and across cultures. Although they may also be about landscape use and management, they are definitely about identity, about belonging, about spiritual sustenance, and about differences of perception of landscape between two cultural groups, Kai Tahu and non-Kai Tahu.
THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

Humans could understand their own creations more profoundly than nature. (Norton, 1989: 29).

Ngā mea i hanga ai te takata, ma te takata ano e whakaaro atu. (in Evison 1988: frontispiece)²⁵

Many theorists argue that landscape is a cultural or symbolic construct. The role that culture plays in landscape interpretation as discussed by Norton is appropriate as a theoretical parameter, into which this thesis might be best placed. The thesis, which was initially undertaken in two disciplines, has more than a singular disciplinary theoretical basis if it has one at all. As such, this research could be considered interdisciplinary since it draws its research from several. Just as landscape is said to be a “cultural” construct, there are also disciplines where what constitutes a culture has always been seen as valid and in which qualitative theory is undertaken as a research project. As part of a cultural definition, the elements that combine to make up a cultural landscape are often articulated. The disciplines in which the above are analysed in considerable depth have over time come to include cultural or social geography, history, art history, sociology and anthropology. It is within the many works produced on the concepts of culture, identity and landscape from these disciplines, that I have based my research. Thus I begin with William Norton’s 1989 text because his cultural geography sources provided the type of in-depth bibliographical work necessary to access other disciplinary as well as cross-disciplinary academic works on landscape. The theoretical definitions upon which Norton based his text were for me, insightful, informative and, most
importantly, inter-disciplinary. This chapter also discusses perception studies for they add to the understanding of how humankind conceptualises landscape cognitively, ecologically and culturally.

Norton’s quote above stated that Giambattista Vico rejected Cartesian rationalism because of its assumption that humankind could acquire total knowledge of itself, and so the world, through mathematics alone (Norton 1989: 29; I. G. Simmons 1993: 81). Norton (1989), Schama (1995) and Sack (1980) asserted that humankind is both author and actor of its own history and that Marx was one of the few who added to this as an idea, by contending that the human need to satisfy basic material requirements preempted the creation of culture (Norton 1989: 30). It is further argued that the physical environment was the cause of both culture and the cultural landscape (Norton 1989: 32; Sauer 1925: 46), and that the somewhat disjointed history of landscape as a cultural concept began with the Greeks and continued with the French philosophers, Bodin and Montesquieu, in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries respectively. Cushen (1997: 39) provides a table that notes key periods in the development of landscape studies, to which I refer and more fully explore later in the thesis. Sauer (1925: 46) believed a cultural landscape was fashioned from a natural one by a culture group and provided details of the evolution of both the natural and cultural landscapes. He later stated that humankind through culture, transformed the natural landscape into a cultural landscape (that was his object of study), but not necessarily the culture of a group per se (Sauer 1925: 19). These are perceived to be inseparable constructs, even though nature and landscape are seen as the environment of a culture, rather than an environment in which a cultural group happens to reside (Sauer [1925] 1963: 19-53). Sauer discussed how a new alien culture is the major causative and contributor in the creation of a new cultural landscape “superimposed on remnants of an older one” (Sauer [1925] 1963: 343). M. Williams (1983: 6) noted that, “once Sauer left the rarified babble of methodology [to concentrate] on an actual

---

25 This whakataukī equates with, “What man has created man must resolve” (cited in Evison 1988: Frontispiece).
case study of man and landscape,” his main area of concern was to do with how humans came historically to construct landscape. From then onwards Sauer’s use of a formal structure of morphology was set aside for a more “intuitive feel for behaviour and object through time” (M. Williams 1983: 6). But was this really so? In his 1941 work, Sauer gave a further definition from that in his earlier 1925 (1963) work, of what he had then considered a cultural landscape contained. It included,

...the geographic version of the economy of the group, as providing itself with food, shelter, furnishing, tools and transport. The specific geographic expressions are the fields, pastures, woods and mines, the productive land on one hand, and the roads and structures on the other, the homes, workshops, and storehouses (Sauer 1941: 7).

Here Sauer seems to have expressed his ideas in a totally Euro-centric manner, which is surprisingly since his stated goal was to see the landscape through the eyes of the user (Sauer 1941: 15). However, this expression ignores any contribution made to or the role played by many of the world’s indigenous people in the creation of present-day cultural landscapes and contemporary landscapes. Contemporary landscapes are created from the ways in which two (or more) cultural groups respond to new landscapes. Incoming settlers reacted to and acted upon the new landscapes that they altered and renamed. In turn, these newly created landscapes required the indigenous people whom had lived and died on them, to conceptualise them in a way that was as new and altered as the very landscapes they had known previously. For Kai Tahu this adaptation varied.
CULTURE AND LANDSCAPE CHANGES

Though some Kai Tahu entered into both the national and trans-Tasman world of trade, for others the idea of trading was never part of their lifeway and trading in land, where this did occur pre-Treaty, was never conceived of as permanent. Rather, the land would be used as long as was required by Tāuiwi who when finished with it, would pass it back into the hands of whānau, hapū or Iwi. In Kai Tahu terms, land could not be bought and sold since it was not owned. Rather it was thought of as part of the overall landscape in which their Tūpuna resided alongside them and under the care or guardianship of the Kai Tahu. This role was held in conjunction with appropriate management of the resources of Papatuanuku. Such practices continue to be the ideal but are not always possible for Kai Tahu to achieve, especially in our homeplaces. Sentiments and practices like these have also been sought in the newly created nohoaka sites. According to some of the participants, we will be able to recreate former practices whereas others do not believe this will be possible because most sites are well away from our papatipu kaik. That makes it harder for us to police because the sites are often too far distant to be managed as intended, especially where a food source might exist there or the environment might be fragile and in need of closer caregiving. This was not so in the pre-contact world of Kai Tahu. Sadly, many sites will be unable to be used in the traditional manner. Therefore it is considered by many participants that tertiary or outside knowing is only knowing to a certain extent.

Much of this form of knowing is about past landscapes and the deeds of the Tūpuna from written records (sometimes based on oral sources), but little of how Kai Tahu interacted and continue to interact with the contemporary land and seascapes. Most of the stories learned in tertiary institutions upon which such knowledge of Kai Tahu landscapes is based have been
written about us by outsiders as Harold Ashwell has said. Many of the participants I have interviewed on the other hand, lived their stories and come from a Māori or Kai Tahu form of epistemology. They have then passed on such knowledge from generation to generation as opposed to academically obtaining this type of knowledge, valuable though that is. It is precisely this insider form of knowing that Sauer seemed to be aspiring to in his early works, but which he seemed to lose sight of in his later 1941 work. The initial factor in his equation began with a culture, one that was “other” than a Western one. The theory was that “other” cultures understood their landscapes by humanising the natural landscapes around them. He argued they did this to explain their places in them. As a result, these humanised landscapes over time became cultural or culturally constructed landscapes (Sauer 1941: 19).

Meinig (1986: 208) developed a model of a cultural landscape that went beyond that created by Sauer. For Meinig, a cultural landscape was one of economic activity, material culture and settlement patterns, where the outcome emphasised the idea that such a landscape resulted from how those living upon it perceived it. The non-material side of culture such as differing perceptions and attitudes to landscape and its uses added to the importance of the role played in the culture contact process.

Grossman (1977: 126-144) also contributed to the discussion of landscape when he identified its origins and made pertinent and useful comparisons with anthropological perspectives rather than those normally associated with cultural geography. In his interpretation of that article, Norton expressed Grossman’s intent as having, “fundamental foci” that acknowledged the differences between what are actual and culturally or symbolically constructed landscapes. Through these landscapes an “establishment of the determinants of [and an interconnectedness between] perception, decision making and behaviour” was created (Norton 1989: 42).

---

26 In some instances I have interviewed non-Kai Tahu spouses/partners of our own who have spent most of their adult lives living on our landscapes with our people, because they often have more experiential knowledge of the landscapes than some of our own who have not lived in our homeplaces.
A similar thesis had emanated two decades earlier from Thomas and others (1956: xxxvi), that also argued all human groups have first evaluated potential sites of habitation, so that they are then able to organise themselves and their ability to survive within them. Following on from these basic needs, humans went to use the techniques at their disposal to establish a place of habitation and simultaneously incorporated within these sites the group’s acceptable and desirable landscape values alongside normative behavioural expectations (Thomas et al 1956: xxxvi). Orians and Heerwagen (1992) similarly hypothesised, stating a savanna landscape is the most preferred as a result of the initial survival of skills humankind acquired through trial and error in central Africa (Orians and Heerwagen 1992: 570-571). Practices of land use have evolved to ensure such survival, particularly when identification and care of the landscape’s resources are to do with “human values and [necessary types of] behaviour” to secure this (Norton 1989: 42). These later two are more to do with land use than landscape perception as such. However, land and its uses cannot be separated from the idea of landscape, whether that be conceptualised geographically, topographically or culturally, since each is so connected with the other. Meinig viewed landscape as encompassing: nature, habitat, artefact, system, problem, wealth, ideology, history, place and aesthetic (Meinig 1979: 33-47).

VIDALIAN, MARXIAN AND OTHER THEORIES OF LANDSCAPES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Norton (1989), in his comparative discussion on Vidal and Marx as theorists, stated that Vidal de la Blanche the eminent French geographer, forcibly refuted the idea of environmental determinism, replacing it instead with an alternative concept known as possibilism. One understanding of the “possibilism” concept, is that Vidal believed natural and
cultural landscapes were one and the same where the relationship between humankind and nature became so enmeshed that the ability to distinguish whether natural world influenced people or was influenced by them, was not possible (Norton 1989: 35). In some aspects, this argument about whether humans influenced or were influenced by nature or by culture is not so far removed from the argument which Sauer ([1925] 1963: 19-53 esp. p. 42) made. Vidal placed his emphasis on genre de vie-- a direct mirror composite of culture where the meaning or perception a given group has of its particular environment, varies according to the group's genre de vie. A further aspect of Vidal’s thesis is that which is concerned with recognising quite distinctive areas of human occupation, namely regions or pays where particular human and land relations evolved. His emphasis on this regional aspect “was particularly meaningful in a rural context” (Norton 1989: 35) and was based on the understanding of the land and the rural landscapes of the French peasants. These peasants were said to have assumed their identity from both their particular lifestyle and the particular locality in which that lifestyle was situated. 27 But what of Marx?

Marx considered that nature was linked inextricably with human activity as opposed to a culturally constructed perception of the landscape. Marxist thought, nonetheless, is open to a variety of interpretations ranging from humanism to structuralism,

... from an active view of people as the makers of their own history, to a passive conception of human development as the determined product of relatively autonomous structures (Norton 1989: 4).

Cosgrove (1983: 7) went with the idea that advanced and utilised a symbolic interpretation of culture, which allowed “for a synthesis of some traditional aims of cultural geography or anthropology [combined] with historical materials.” What would theoretically result from

27 Entrikin (1991: 156 fn. 33) states, that Vidal contended the evolution of French peasants' identity resulted from (i) a particular lifestyle within; (ii) a particular locality; these two being the fundamental ingredients of pays.
such a synthesis is the symbolic contribution of humankind as creators of landscape and the means by which such created landscapes maintain symbolic production. Norton concludes from Cosgrove’s idea that such a synthesis is not unusual in order to draw parallels between Marxist ideas and those of Vidal in relation to landscape, as both are concerned with social and historical processes (Norton 1989: 50).

Duncan alludes to a development in sociological theory called “symbolic interactionism,” that is based on the social construction of individual selves (Duncan 1978: 269). The thesis purports an idea where humans, through the process of being socialised, do not simply go on to become mere expressions of the society of which they are a part. On the contrary, by means of communication, individuals tend to maintain a common life where interactions with others are what come to constitute social life as each passes through a continuum of personal and/or fleeting contacts.

Norton (1989: 55), citing Duncan, states that in symbolic interactionism, “both social and spatial organisations are negotiated [through] communication.” He goes on to argue that both these organisations are dynamic in that they are always responding to individual choices (Norton 1989: 55). In many aspects the ideas which have been posited by Duncan and the added comments on them by Norton are similarly expressed in Jackson and Smith (1984: 205):

*Culture in the sense of a system of shared meanings, is dynamic and negotiable [and its] emergent qualities often have a spatial character, not merely because proximity can encourage communication and the sharing of life worlds, but from an interactionist perspective, social groups may actively create a sense of place, investing the material environment with symbolic qualities such that the very fabric of landscape is permeated by, and caught up in, the actual social world.*

From this quote and the preceding discussion, symbolic interactionism might offer through its particular interpretation, a way of resolving theoretical issues in relation to possible problems
of bias, of societies or individuals. It may further provide clearer conceptualisation of culture as “other” than some earlier theoretical perspectives do. Despite a supposed objectivity by theorists, many continued to bring with them either their learned or an alleged inborn “superiority,” so much a part of early and not so early ethnographical accounts of the cultural “others.” This was true in the ways in which many ethnographers perceived the cultural “other” (amongst other things), as well as the ways in which they saw the landscapes of these “others,” and rationalised their places within them.

According to Norton (1989: 56), a key distinction between the approach of the symbolic interactionists and more general sociological views is the rejection of behaviour as being caused by society (Norton 1989: 56). Instead, behaviour is seen to result from individuals as members of a group. Therefore, approaches such as those alluded to might well be seen as a correcting of “both the Durkheimian overemphasis on society and the humanistic overemphasis on individuals” (Norton 1989: 56). These may still be judged as somewhat deterministic.

CULTURAL GEOGRAPHY AS A BASIS OF THEORY

The theoretical discussions at this point are based largely on cultural geography and, without excluding the concept of culture altogether, they have nonetheless relegated it to second place. Only two approaches so far have directly added to an understanding of culture, which is an integral part in the symbolic construction of landscape: the Marxist approach that focuses on groups rather than individuals; and symbolic interactionism (with its various other labels). The focus of the latter, however, is more to do with changing culture and society. There are, nonetheless, two anthropological developments of relevance that are worth mentioning at this point. One is concerned with the “symbolic” focus, the second relates to the concept known as “minding.” The “minding” concept came from the 1930s
historian/anthropologist, L. A. (Lynn) White whose hypothesis is labelled by Norton (1989: 17) as technological determinism. In his study of Polynesian societies, Sahlins also gave consideration to the relationship between technology and social stratification within which the division of labour and gender equation were linked directly to the available technology (Sahlins 1958; Gadgil and Guha 1992). Alongside this was an understanding of access to and resource use rights over landscapes, where many resources such as trees and animals were perceived of and treated as kin. A similar if not identical view of hunter-gatherers and their landscape perceptions is mirrored in Gadgil and Guha (1993: 20). Kai Tahu along with other indigenous peoples especially indigenous Australians would fit within such parameters; that of hunter-gatherers who it has been alternatively argued, have managed their resources according to the ways in which they understood their environments as opposed to simply foraging and living from them (J. Williams 1999 kōrero-ā-waha). Kai Tahu and other Iwi also conceived of (and for many of us continue to accept that) the flora and fauna of our landscapes as kin in as much as they share common primeval parents. In this way, the landscapes and certain places upon them are humanised by those who conceive of themselves as being related to as well as having a relationship with the flora and fauna of their landscapes.

Norton, in his discussion of White’s four point concept states that in 1959 White extended his ideas of evolution which posited that “minding” is the basis for understanding culture and is a reaction of a living organism to a thing as an event, through interaction or relation (Norton 1989: 18). However, only type IV “minding” includes “symbolling” (bestowing meaning on things and events while having the capability to understand the meaning bestowed), was applied to humankind. Davies (1988: 33) states that symbols, rather

---

28 Polynesians could be classed as hunter-gatherers but not by and large as shifting cultivators. Kai Tahu would fit Gadgil and Guha’s definitions (1993: 20).

29 Norton (1989: 18) provides the following explanatory notes on the four distinct areas of minding. Type I is characteristic of inanimate objects involving attraction, repulsion and indifference; concepts determined by the
than being arbitrary, possess a particular appropriateness that emanates from both their physical features and their historical significance. Thus, what symbolic landscapes are said to stand for is portrayed through actual geographical features, often as “physical manifestations of an idea,” determined by a cultural group (Davies 1988: 33). A classic example of this would be the physical landmass in the South Island Southern Alps that is widely known as Mount Cook. As Āoraki, the mountain is conceptualised from a Kai Tahu perspective as their revered Tupuna, while many of the peaks of Te Tiritiri o te Moana are similarly perceived as his brothers and others of his crew. All were on his waka during their ill-fated journey to visit Papatuānuku.

White’s view of culture was deterministic, as culture was seen as the determinant of human behaviour. Behaviour was in turn connected with human perceptions of landscape and how to act upon or interact most appropriately with it. In order to understand culture therefore, an objective analytical hypothesis was required as opposed to participant observation. The views of White in both his 1959 and 1975 texts and those of Clifford Geertz in 1973, though not closely related, do however have at least areas of commonality. Whereas symbolic determinists such as White are at times regarded as proponents of culture as a determinant, symbolic reactionists and Geertz argue more against culture as an independent variable. Cosgrove and Daniels (1988: 4) contend that in Geertz’s dual method of “Thick Description” he sets down the meaning of particular social actions for the actor and is reasonably explicit about knowledge obtained in this manner. It also shows much about the society in which it occurred and about its social life (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 4). There seem to be few if any areas of commonality between White and Geertz. Norton nonetheless inherent properties of the objects and their topological relations. Type II minding involves reactions characterised by the conditioned reflex of Pavlovian theory with the relation being between organisms and stimulus and not dependent upon their intrinsic properties. Type III minding involves relations that result from the conscious intent of the organism playing the major role. Type IV minding implies symbolising, defined as the free and arbitrary bestowing of meaning on things and events and the ability to grasp such meaning. Only humans have the capability of the fourth type and it is from this symbolising ability that culture becomes possible.
considers that the point from which White begins is not so far removed from that of Geertz. Culture when seen as dependent upon symbolling, exists within,

\[ \ldots \textit{social interaction processes, [and despite the many variables within each hypothesis], general similarities [exist] regarding the relevance of symbolling and the dynamic quality of culture} \] (Norton 1989: 58).

A tendency to concentrate more on people as agents of change, within purely economic constraints as opposed to environmental ones, has been the major area of focus for some time. As a result, the relationship between humans and landscapes has come to be viewed largely in terms of economic contestations, rather than being considered in relation to their interdependence and complementarity. A view that holds there is interaction between landscape and socio-economic space sees the distinction between static and dynamic landscapes, overemphasis of cultural determinism and under-emphasis of landscape (Norton 1989: 59).

Haynes (1980: 2) states that people seldom respond in a direct manner to the landscape environment so much as to their mental image of it. Norton (1989: 59), quoting Haynes, contends that the understanding Haynes has of landscape perceptions and those found in Cosgrove and Daniels' "Introduction" (1988: 1), most clearly argue the symbolism attached to landscape definitions. Each examination into landscape as a concept ultimately alters the meanings it has, as more layers of cultural representation are deposited upon it, until it becomes a cultural image, "a pictorial way of representing, structuring or symbolling surroundings" (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 1). Schama (1995: 6-7) also talks of landscape having layers of cultural representations which add to the cultural landscape. Human activities upon their cultural landscapes are said to be quite markedly influenced by geographical images and mental maps of what symbolically constitutes a landscape environment (Haynes
Cosgrove wrote that landscape as a concept and an image has a role of real value in relation to cultural geography for all the following reasons:

Unlike place it reminds us of our position in nature. Unlike environment or space it reminds us that only through human consciousness and reason is [nature's] scheme known to us, and only through technology can we as humans participate in it. (Cosgrove 1989: 122).

Within the symbolism of the Kai Tahu ancestral landscape, understandings occur in a relationship to boundaries, access to and use of resources, and other resource rights and political divisions based on hapū, all of which are both recognised and recognisable through whakapapa. This is similar to, though not identical with, Yolngu of Australia who have what is termed “the totemic geography” (Morphy 1996: 192). Morphy (1996: 196) states that in the Yolngu Aborigines' cultural landscape, “Not only does landscape change but ancestral presence intervenes to influence human action.” He goes on to discuss how people learn about the past deeds of ancestors by movement over their landscapes (Morphy 1996: 196). Each individual goes on to acquire understandings of that landscape that, over time, dictates the ways in which interaction with the landscape occurs. In this way introduced flora and fauna may be assimilated into the understanding of the Aboriginal Dreamings when apparently contradictory elements arrive as a result of change in landscape uses. Kai Tahu also adopted and adapted incoming aspects of the culture of the British colonisers, while maintaining most of their own landscape understandings and namings. Davis et al (1990a: 5) and others have written that placenames or the naming of areas of landscape in Te Wāipounenu and Aotearoa are “survey pegs [or] oral maps” of Kai Tahu (and other Iwi).

Thus Tūpuna are part of the landscape in a very literal sense as opposed to being part of a stage backdrop. Certain elements within the cosmologies of indigenous peoples, though differing in how they are described, nonetheless serve the same purpose. Cosmologies tie us to particular landscapes through ancestors and genealogy, whether human or cosmological
and, as stated by Highwater, the spiritual relationship we maintain between ourselves and nature form the basis of indigenous peoples' sense of place (Highwater 1981: 68-9). Such beliefs are fused into the culture of indigenous people through language styles, forms of art and myths all of which through a differing belief system, ties tribal people to their tribal land (Highwater 1981: 69). Hau'ofa offered a similar statement that was quoted in the previous chapter (Hau'ofa 1998: 407). In Murton (1987: 99) we read that a landscape “is often inhabited by spirits of the ancestors [while] a constant and intimate knowledge of place, enveloped by a mythical view of the land, ties society to place.” Highwater adds that, “the landscape itself is sacred it therefore embodies a divinity that it shares with everything that is part of nature [so therefore all things are interconnected, rather than the way in which it is] for Western man ... an escape from nature” (Highwater 1981: 124).

The Yolngu landscapes are said to be full of the memories from their ancestral beings who are in the land and who like Te Tiritiri o te Moana for Kai Tahu, become a reference point for their descendants (Morphy 1996: 187 - 188). These ancestral actions and deeds like those of Kai Tahu Tūpuna become timeless (Morphy 1996: 188; see also O'Regan 1987a). The villagers of Sawaike in the Fiji Islands are said to give a literal representation “in terms of places and landmarks, [both of which] function as reference points,” when passing the time between individuals (Toren: 1996: 163). She adds that, for the villagers, the individual is virtually connected with “his/her natal place” and is a manifestation of that piece of landscape always placed in time, whether time now, time past, or time future (Toren 1996: 163, 164). Kai Tahu have time concepts, which are also three-dimensional and similarities of thought with those of Sawaike in regard to the making of the landscape and their place in it:

*Our identity with the landscape whether we owned it or not didn’t change my way of thinking, because there are some things that money or ownership can not buy. That is your Tupuna that are super imposed on the landscape itself over 20 or 30 generations or more. It would take more than money to erase that from the memories of any...*
Tahu as far as I know. Even the changes of the names by the Pākehā add to the Pākehā way of life by calling them, [the mountains, lakes and rivers] after people who had never set foot on our land. That didn’t worry me because we still knew the names of our lakes, rivers and mountain. Even the springs hold special meanings. Those are still there in our minds and our knowledge and these are the windows of our past and future. So we can look back and think of our Tupuna. These are things that money can’t buy (J. Waaka, Te Umukaha kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

At the same time, Kai Tahu see no separation between land and sea. This is also a part of the belief system of the people of Sawaieke and other peoples of Oceania. Hay (1990: 23) reminds us that,

Through cosmology, patterns of land use, tribal affiliation, rituals, architecture, extended family identity and ways of thinking and perceiving, indigenous peoples tend to develop a deep sense of place, which is rooted in the . . . land, sea and spirits of a particular area. Tribal peoples consciously develop and maintain a cultural attachment to place, regarding this as part of their lives.

It was Ley who stated, “if we lose the land we lose ourselves” and “a man is his place” (Ley 1977: 508). Relph too had said that, “people are their place and a place is its people” (Relph 1976: 34). Despite such contentions, these are far from universally accepted beliefs. Cosgrove notes that landscape also shows us that geography surrounds us with its beauty or lack of it, and that we may experience through its visual consumption all or any of the following: joy, sadness, right, wrong, as well as profit and loss (Cosgrove 1989: 122). As part of this visualisation process, humans locate themselves within a given landscape according to their mental image of it, rather than its actual topographical features (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 2). If such arguments are accepted they shed much light on the way colonisers interacted with, reacted to, and then acted upon the landscapes of Te Wāipounenui in the nineteenth century, as had the various Iwi who arrived here in prior centuries.
By drawing on theories from many disciplines including geography, history and anthropology, Norton (1989: 59) states that it is neither cultural determinism alone nor landscape in a geographical sense as separate entities that provide a definitive comprehension of what constitutes a culture's landscape. Norton (1989: 59, 75) drew upon Haynes (1980), Cosgrove (1989) and Cosgrove and Daniels (1988) to explain humans' actions and reactions upon their landscapes. Norton uses their insights and arguments to succinctly explain the many theoretical understandings of: why we view our landscapes as we do; how we then use these ideas to our best advantage; and how that assists us in the way we choose to conceptualise landscape. Norton suggests that for those who find a range of theoretical approaches problematic, his text will remove the problem by suggesting that a uniform framework will assist, along with a willingness to undertake interdisciplinary research (Norton 1989: 5-6). It is also, as suggested throughout his text, the most pertinent combination of theories in which to locate this thesis. However, there is a further theoretical issue that must be examined before concluding this chapter. As a concept it has been hinted at, but has not been looked at in any depth. What then of theories on perception?

**PERCEPTION AS THEORY: DIFFERING LANDSCAPE PERCEPTIONS**

Before it is possible to understand and identify perceptions of landscape, it is first necessary to understand the way in which perception processes work in conjunction with how and where place and experience fit within this understanding.

According to Aitken et al:

...the underlying rationale for environment perception and behavioural research lies in the assertion that understanding the geography of space and place requires knowledge of the way in which people experience,
perceive, organise and ascribe meaning to information about the environment as well as how people act upon this information (Aitken, Cutter, Foote and Sell 1989: 218).

The idea of perception studies according to Emel (1994), arose as a perceived need and as a result of several other forms of study that include: environmental hazard studies; historical geography; and urban geography and cultural geography. What each of these studies has emphasised is how humans view their environments and then react accordingly to them.

The theory of environmental perception came out of the need to explain the processes involved in humans’ interaction with their landscapes. Environmental perception as theory has value in that it enables the researcher to more fully comprehend “knowledge of the way in which people experience, perceive, organise and ascribe meaning to information about the environment [and] how [they] act upon [it]” (Aitken et al 1989: 219). Perception studies have nonetheless, been viewed with a certain amount of distrust in that it is not necessarily a simple theoretical matter in identifying personal feelings of others and being then able to accurately represent these without distortion. Even so, it has gained some significance as a theory within human geography (Cushen 1997: 20). Research which involves perception studies examines the importance which culture plays in relation to how people individually and collectively construct their landscapes while the context “within which an individual perceives the environment provides the resources of information and interpretation” (Cushen 1997: 22). As Riley has stated it is “the tie between the culture of a people and their landscape [that] is the key to understanding collective human activity” (Riley 1992: 16). Ingold (1992: 39) has also argued that culture is the primary mediator between humans and their relationship with the environment.

According to Philp (1995: 15), human perceptions are reflective and perhaps selective in “the information they retain” since we often seek the type of knowledge that will reinforce those things that we have chosen to retain as part of our overall belief system. This is
particularly the case in regard to our perceptions of our homeplaces or cultural landscapes because any number of people are able to view the exact same landscape, yet perceive of it differently, so a single definition of it is often impossible. Ingold (1992: 45) states then that, "the only activity in perception, [is] mental activity" which clearly spells out what perception is; namely, a people-driven human activity (Philp 1995: 15). Is it possible to conceive of landscapes separately from people's experience of them? If so, then landscape ought to be able to be defined and understood as a geographical location where all who see it describe in similar, if not totally identical terms. However, this seems not to be possible. Neither does such a simplistic view take cognisance of how people, whether collectively or individually, feel about, relate to and react upon their homeplace landscapes.

The study upon which this body of research is based attests to the fact that despite Kai Tahu using their tribal pepehā in similar and occasionally identical terms, they do not have a unified or single definition (or even similar definitions in some instances), of what constitutes the Kai Tahu landscape. This of course, seems to have a lot to do with where and how they were socialised and whether they have grown up with experiential knowledge of their homeplace landscapes. Neither are they totally universal in how they define themselves within the landscape. There are many similarities of thought in relation to what the term means and it is certainly quite different from an aesthetic definition as understood by most Tauiwi. Certain participants described those of us who felt the term "landscape" was an acceptable term to use (when describing ourselves as connected with particular areas of Te Wāipounamu) were unable to grasp the idea that it was a deliberate act of ours (and now an argument of mine), that we as Kai Tahu had taken an English term and redefined it to have meaning for us, (even though that understanding was perhaps quite different from the original intended meaning). However, landscape is a term which the majority of the participants chose to use as opposed to land, place or environment, even though it includes all of those within
their meaning of it.\textsuperscript{30} It is seldom if ever, possible to separate the idea of place from an individual's experience of it, as has been expressed by Low and Altman (1992: 10) who state that the "social relations that a place signifies may be equal or more important to the attachment process than the place \textit{qua} place" whereas Riley (1992 28-29) made mention of imagined landscapes and ideas that humans have of a place which are based not on fact, but rather on a perception of the place. This is what is said to have occurred in regard to those Kai Tahu who have "waxed lyrical" about their landscapes (and deeds of their Tūpuna), although they have never set foot upon their wāhi tāturu. Their knowledge is often limited to what they may have picked up while studying a tertiary paper on Iwi Māori, which contains a small section on Kai Tahu and their Claim. That is not to denigrate what historians and anthropologists have written about us as an Iwi, but sometimes a little knowledge can be mistaken for more that the person really has when as an outsider, she or he has much less than may be apparent to the learner. This is particularly so when the learned person is in the position of passing on knowledge through a tertiary institution as an instructor or lecturer.\textsuperscript{31} Meanwhile, such idealisations of their past and present identity fit with Riley’s argument that the fantasy aspects of landscape perception are often based on guesswork and belief rather than on experience or actively lived upon knowledge of the landscape.

There is then a question that begs answering: is it possible for a person to have a so-called intimate idea of a landscape without ever having had experience of it? For instance a Kai Tahu person may recite her/his pepeha with great feeling without ever having set foot on her/his homeplace may believe s/he feels such attachments. Is this possible? Experiential

\textsuperscript{30} All of the following have been suggested as alternatives to landscape by young Kai Tahu interviewees (and older participants too). Kitenga (Megan Ellison: kōrero-ā-waha 1999); Te Ao Turoa (M. Ngawhika, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999) Turakawaewae (I. Cranwell, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999), Wāhi Tuturu (Anon 1998); Papatuanuku and Whenua (K. Davis, kōrero-ā-waha 1999). Many, though not all, who have suggested these alternatives have been less comfortable with the term landscape because they have thought of that term as a Pākehā only concept.

\textsuperscript{31} A classic example exists at Otago Polytechnic in the "Te Ao Māori" course. Here a lecturer from the north is giving instruction on Kai Tahu customs and knowledge, which is not correct. In fact what he is doing is talking about what is "tika" in his homeplace and stating that this is how all Iwi act. Hence when some of our own were
knowledge has a large role to play in the way in which landscape perception is developed in
an individual. Therefore, it follows that there will be degrees of difference between those with
a tangible perspective of homescapes and those without it. This will continue to be so, despite
the huge advances that technology permits in virtual experiences.

The way in which my participants view such outcomes, is that the images presented by
those without experience of the landscapes are other people’s visions. They do not denigrate
these visions, but are upset their experiences and opinions seemed to count for nothing. There
seems to be a belief that kaumātua of knowledge and standing within the various communities
were not considered sufficiently well educated or knowledgable in the Western-educated
sense to be reference points for sources of theory and epistemology of places and things Kai
Tahu for their whānau and hapū. This fits with one of the conclusions drawn by Cushen in his
research where he states:

The creation of place and landscape by the electronic media, for a range of reasons and presented as places of
historical or cultural importance, is having a profound effect on how individuals view their surroundings. We
seem to be substituting breadth of knowledge for depth of understanding of the environment (Cushen 1997:
26).

A conclusion of this kind is precisely what the homeplace participants have expressed, if in
less elegant or academic terms. Their expressions of understanding when talking of them are
based squarely on long associations with and experiences of both their landscapes and their
seascapes. None of the answers within the interview process from the homeplace people
seemed to have been rehearsed, “off pat” or “measured,” unlike many of those responses from
some of the people I interviewed who were involved in a different way with the landscapes of
Kai Tahu; namely those involved with the landscapes mostly (or even exclusively) through
welcomed into his class they were told they had to act in a certain way by the students and it was incorrect for
this area.
the political and negotiation processes of the Iwi. These involvements are viewed by home people as new relationships that have yet to be either proven or long established.

Riley (1992: 29) has proposed the idea that despite the innate strength which personal experience and knowledge have, new relationships have occurred which seem to have withered our dependence on place and newer relationships have occurred as a result of this withering. It seems that less importance is now attached to personal experiences of place because information technology such as the Internet reduces the need for actual experiences of places. People’s perceptions and interactive appreciation of landscapes can be undertaken via the medium of television, which is much more readily accessed both from an availability and affordability perspective than is the Internet. This is how many now experience landscapes both at home and afar, including many “high flying” Kai Tahu (taku mohio). On a positive note, technologically produced representations of landscapes are also produced for Poua (grandfathers, elders) and Tāua (grandmothers, elders) who are no longer able to walk their childhood landscapes, so that the reliving of such experiences can now be made possible through the medium of video recorded images of homeplaces (W. Russell and R. Harris 1999 kōrero-ā-waha; H. Holmes 1998, 1999 me ērā atu wā: kōrero-ā-waha).

Tertiary gained perspectives have largely been presented as the accepted Kai Tahu views of landscape in relation to the Claim Settlement and acknowledged thus by the higher educated or “degree-ed” Kai Tahu and Crown negotiators (kā kōrero-ā-waha). It may follow then, that the way in which Epeli Hau’ofa has presented his interpretation of a Polynesian view of the whole of the Pacific, along with an Island-wide total landscape perspective, is or might be, equally acceptable within academia or by those so educated. These representations made by homepeople and Hau’ofa are not wrong, merely different. But the acceptability of homepeoples’ versions of themselves as the landscape are often ignored as are the perceptions of landscapes which are held by many of those who live in and with the homeplaces. As a result of these views being ignored, there is a perceived, if not a real concern that the
alternative views of the educated may, over time, become “the acceptable” understandings. Acceptable that is, to those either living away from their homeplaces by deliberate choice or to those who have not yet been or may never be able to have a personal connection with or experience of these places.

Accepted in part as was the case, by Hau’ofa’s Oceanic colleagues of his version of how the Pacific might be perceived. Some of his colleagues have accepted his version, in the sense that his argument had the effect of being a great esteem-raising booster for aspiring young Pacific people in the tertiary institution where he taught. Some have reservations, especially Griffen (1993: 59-65) and Ratuva (1993: 96). For example, Hau’ofa’s argument is based in the first instance on an away from home acquired experience of his wāhi tūturu of Tonga, since he was raised in Papua New Guinea (J. Bennett 1999: pers. comm.; Hau'ofa 1999: kōrero-ā-waha Viti Levu). It was not then, until he was a tertiary educated adult in the work of educating other Pacific Islanders at the University of the South Pacific that he chose to write thus about a lived perceptual experience of his homeplace landscapes and those of Oceania in general. Hau'ofa told me that he has formed a firm attachment with a section of the Viti Levu landscape. Here, he has purchased ten acres in the bush, which he has begun planting out in indigenous trees, which he has established for his children and mokopuna yet unborn (Hau'ofa 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). Hau'ofa makes the point that the peoples of Oceania as attested to through their myths, cosmologies, legends and oral histories, perceived of their landscapes as the whole of the Pacific region, not merely the tiny atolls and islands upon which they lived (Hau'ofa 1993: 7). On the contrary, that landscape rightly included the entire “surrounding ocean as far as they could traverse and exploit it” (Hau'ofa 1993: 7). He goes on to argue that Pacific peoples viewed their world as a sea of islands, an enormously vast landscape the majority of which was ocean.

In contrast, the early European explorers and their later colonising counterparts viewed these landscapes as tiny islands in an enormous expanse of sea. Such perceptions continue to
assist in maintaining the idea that Pacific Islands are tiny pieces of land in a vast expanse of ocean, rather than the reverse. Hau'ofa then cites a further example from Tonga to validate his argument where those from the mainland have referred to those from the offshore islands as "people from the sea [with] the underlying assumption that the sea is home to some people" in the same way that land is to others (Hau'ofa 1993: 8). "An identity that is grounded in something as vast as the sea, should exercise our minds and rekindle in us the spirit that sent our ancestors to explore the oceanic unknown and make it their home" (Hau'ofa 1998: 393).

In so saying, Hau'ofa states that he is not attempting to suggest we are or should become culturally homogenous as that would not be desirable, nor would it be possible (Hau'ofa 1998: 393).

However, "the regional identity [he is] concerned with is something additional to other identities we have or will develop in the future---something that should serve to enrich our other selves" (Hau'ofa 1998: 393). This adds to his earlier made contention that the sea is part of the enormous landscape of Oceania. Although some applaud the conceptualisation of Oceania as put forward by Hau'ofa and agree that the opposing conceptualisation of it as the Pacific islands by Taniwi has had a belittling effect on many of Oceania’s citizens, they also inform the reader of other relevant facts such as poverty, unemployment and the idea that all who have chosen to keep homeplace landscapes warm on behalf of others (who have chosen or been forced to leave), are seen as "bludgers." They are seen as takers (usually by outsiders) because they accept or sometimes expect monetary and other forms of assistance from the relatives who have left and are now on (an assumed) more affluent wage overseas compared with those on whose behalf Hau'ofa stated he was presenting a new or re-awakened paradigm. (Hau'ofa 1993: 8 and throughout; Ratuva 1993: 96).

What is not understood or not counted as part of the equation is the reciprocity which exists, even if it is not immediately visible. Also, it is not spelled out in the articles and critiques that there exists for many raised away from homeplaces, poverty of a different kind. That form of poverty shows that many raised away from the ancestral homeplaces have no
real understanding of what homeplace landscapes mean to those who remain part of them. Even though the home people may be seen variously as unsophisticated, uneducated and less worldly, in their knowledge of the genealogical landscapes from which they are descended, home people are all of the things which they are seen by their own “outsiders” as not being and of not knowing (D. Gege 2000: kōrero-ā-waha, Berkeley, CA). Though these home people do not theorise over their actions or knowledge, in a Western academic sense, this does not in any way mean they are incapable of undertaking discussions of a similar depth and breadth. Gegeo (2000: kōrero-ā-waha) stated, home people merely do it in their own fashion, using their own terminology and starting from an epistemological and theoretical basis which differs from that of the “outsider,” indigenous or Western. Judgements are made about the role of home people of Oceania. At the same time further judgements are made about the differences in landscape perception between indigenous home people and indigenous rāwahi, as well as between indigenous people and cultural “others.”

Some of Hau’ofa’s views confirm what has been discussed in the previous and later chapter and by T. O’Regan in his 1987a article and in a later chapter. Polynesians and the other peoples of Oceania have many landscape names and other cosmological or ideological belief systems in common, but they also have differences. Though there is a similar theme or thread that runs through these belief systems, these are in no way universal or uniform. The perceptions of landscape though similar are not identical. There is, however, one exception in the belief of Oceanic people. They have never it seems, separated the land from sea in understanding what makes up their landscape. The places close to the akau (shore) are considered to be the same as if they are land, such as lagoons in Tuamotu, Marovo (Solomon Islands) and Takaroa (Tahiti). (Rapaport 1996: 39-40). They ultimately have more areas of perception in this regard in common, than they have differences and the differences are not as opposing as are those which exist between Kai Tahu (and other Iwi) and their Tauiwi counterparts of Te Wāipounamu and Aotearoa.
Australian Aboriginal peoples are associated with Pacific peoples and they too have an interesting understanding of landscape perception based on Country and Dreamtime. Like Kai Tahu, some Aboriginal clans have rock drawing sites that equate to Kai Tahu wāhi tapu or sacred sites. However, the paintings of the Yolngu are clan owned and are part of the “corpus of ritual knowledge” (Morphy 1983: 117). These paintings are associated with both Yolngu clanscapes and clan designs and may contain specific topographical information. They are seen as maps by those who have ownership of both paintings and the knowledge, which they impart, even when the guardians are no longer owners of the landscapes being depicted (Morphy 1983: 118). Yolngu paintings may represent a single landscape or only a solitary feature on it; they may also be representing both ancestral deeds and topographical maps from particular or a number of intersecting Countries or Dreamings (Morphy 1983: 124-5). As a result, the people of that clan group are able, “to learn about the mythological significance of their land even when separated from it by considerable distances, and to keep in touch with the land when they are away from it” (Morphy 1983: 124). Morphy, in his conclusion, states that land rights and rights to paintings of this clanscape and other aspects of the Yolngu world are so interwoven with the world of the Ancestors as to be inseparable, while the paintings are deemed to be the Tauiwi equivalent of an Ownership Deed with the added dimension of a Yolngu religious obligation (Morphy 1983: 131). Therefore, when the Yolngu gave over some of their paintings into the hands of the incoming Europeans, it was done in order to demonstrate their rights of ownership which went alongside their religious obligations to protect the “landscapes” created for and gifted to them by their Ancestors and in accordance with the Ancestral laws (Morphy 1983: 131). They have continued to contest these rights in the courts to ensure their cultural survival and enable themselves to properly fulfil their religious obligations to their landscape and their Tūpuna (Morphy 1983: 131). Such expressions on Aboriginal landscape perceptions have been expressed to me by Iaean Cranwell who stated that there is a further similarity of landscape understanding with
Canadian Mana whenua who have a "trapline" equivalent which is resource, access and whakapapa based (I. Cranwell 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).

Massey and Jess (1995: 2) suggest that once landscapes are contested over or people leave their homeplaces the issue of "meaning and imagining" is raised,

... when people lay claim to territory, when they grieve for home, when they construct and re-construct the meaning of place, they are 'imagining geography'- producing images and creating identities which then form the bases both of the future character of those pieces of space and of the behaviour of people towards them, be that acquisitive or defensive. By starting with migration, we are therefore immediately into questions of place, and the relations between cultures and places (Massey and Jess 1995: 2-3).

Though the authors use the term "place" it could just as easily be exchanged for that of landscape. For the Yolngu, as for many other indigenous peoples there was little choice in regard to emigration or a definite wish to move away from their clanscapes. On the contrary, they were shifted away from them and other places of their Tūpuna by the incoming colonisers who were the ones that had chosen to immigrate to the landscapes of Aboriginal Australians.

"European notions of property [that] are fundamentally or exclusively economic, may have invited anthropologists, lawyers and judges to find that [one] but not both defined Aboriginal relationships [to their land and clanscapes] or find both [are] present but one [is] subordinate to the other" (N. M. Williams 1983: 94). So it seems it is possible to be connected to a clanscape, but not what others have defined as an "economically viable" property right. Williams further quotes a 1971 statement by Judge Blackburn of Australia, in which he contended "it seems easier, on the evidence to say that the clan belongs to the land than the land belongs to the clan" (N. M. Williams 1983: 94). That is precisely the argument Kai Tahu presented before the Waitangi Tribunal concerning their relationship with their landscapes of Te Wāipounenu. Mana whenua and Mana moana did and do not necessarily equate with
ownership, but are to do with whakapapa rights and identity as well as obligations to and over
the landscape. For many, there is also no separation of the physical from the religious (or
cosmological) worlds. As Kai Tahu we trace our whakapapa back to Tūpuna from Hawaiiki
Nui, such as Te Kāhui Tipua and Kahukura, both of who are said to be non-human (taku
mōhio). Tipene O'Regan has stated publicly on many occasions that though Pākehā, through
Darwin, believe they may be descended from the apes, Iwi Māori and Kai Tahu in particular,
believe they are descended from atua (or the Gods) and as such must never neglect their
duties of care and protection to Papatūānuku and their landscapes upon her (taku mōhio).

SUMMARY OF THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

This chapter began by arguing there has been a rejection of Cartesian rationalism and
went on to contend that humans write and act out their own histories. Marx however,
considered the requirement of satisfying material needs, was what saw humankind create
culture. Neither humankind nor culture stands alone as a totally separate and separated entity
from the environments each inhabits. It is Marx and Sauer who have been credited with
theorising that the physical environment was a major influence in cultures and the resultant
influx by other cultural groups, pre-existing landscapes are re-worked, renamed and so
recreated according to the responses of each incoming group. Such recreations require first
the indigenous population, then other groups, to re-conceptualise what had been an already
existing landscape. Often the changes have been so great as to have created a landscape which
went on to become unrecognisable to the previous occupants of it. This was what occurred for
Kai Tahu after the arrival of the settlers mostly from Britain but also from Europe.

When the idea of new land use arrived with the settlers, so too did the creation of
boundaries that were marked by fencing off large sections of land. Such boundary marking
was markedly different from the one which had existed earlier and which was understood by knowing the landscape and the markers, which occurred naturally upon it. The new land use, which also arrived with the settlers, meant slashing and burning of huge tracts of formerly bushed or forested land, stocking it with sheep and cattle. This also meant the loss of former foods and replacing them with new ones. Such included introduced grains, vegetables and fish into streams, lakes and waterways and the re-routing or draining of the last. Such new land use concepts then removed virtually all traces of pre-existing ones as well as access to these and the resources, which they had supplied.

Over time the descendants of the original owners and those of the settlers have moved away from their homeplace landscapes except for a few who have continued to either work their forebears’ land or maintained their whānau homes. Those living away from such places generally have little experiential knowledge or understanding of them. As time passed, contestations began to arise between Kai Tahu and Tauiwi over land use and landscape management, so that how one was connected with and related to these homescapes took on a whole new importance. Although Kai Tahu began their Claim in 1847 and persisted with it right through the next 150 years, it was never more publicly discussed and contested than from 1987 onward through the Waitangi Tribunal. As a result of those public hearings, through the press and other media, land and landscape and the wisest use of it along with ownership, became huge areas of contestation in Te Wāipounamu. This was particularly so between Kai Tahu and high-country farmers, but more especially those on Crown leaseholds. The last arose because there was the suggestion that the high-country be returned into Kai Tahu ownership, as a possible form of redress and a way by the Crown to redeem their past sins against Kai Tahu. At the same time it would restore to the Iwi a culturally important area of land upon which their major founding ancestors are believed by them to reside, and, which is referred to by them as “the hole in the middle.” This hole is one which we continue to
contest, since it contains those special landscapes we maintain were never sold since it houses our founding ancestor Āoraki.

The discussion moved on to look at how present day Kai Tahu have their own internal contestations over the acceptance of the Deed of Settlement, because of the alleged insensitivities and supposed lack of insider knowledge of the landscapes which have been returned. But even more it is over those places which have been renamed, how this seems to have (though probably was not intended) elevated these places in importance and most importantly, how these renamings were arrived at by the negotiators. Contestations like these have little to do with the ownership of the landscapes over which they have arisen and much to do with the political and internal dynamics of the Iwi. The internal dynamics are to do with who has the greater knowledge of the landscapes of Kai Tahu and why academic knowledge appears to have taken precedence over lived and experiential knowledge. It is thought correctly or otherwise, that the renamings were chosen, based almost solely on supposed experts having a more widely read knowledge of the places and their histories, rather than those who have maintained their wakawaka, whānau use and access rights to specialty foods and special landscapes, by remaining on their wāhi tūturu. On the other hand, the “educated” Kai Tahu have been seen by the home people as having a somewhat romantic, definitely limited and an almost exclusively outside perception of the places and their histories. This is said to be so as the knowledge upon which most of their negotiation arguments were based, had its focus centred around Kai Tahu stories told about them and not by them.

The chapter examined various theoretical paradigms into which the thesis might best be placed but does not confine its theories to a single discipline. It briefly contrasted Vidal with Marx, discussed modern cultural geographical theorists including Cosgrove, Daniels, White, Grossman, Norton and others from art history, history and anthropology. This chapter finally examined a possible explanation for why perceptions of landscape vary between cultures, and more especially between those with the power and those without it. That has
been done by examining perception studies and how these have their relevance to this research. Finally, it compared different indigenous beliefs on land use and landscape perception. For Oceania in particular, there is a clear similarity of thought whereby land and sea are seen as inseparable and the sea is conceived of in the same way as land and as part of the overall landscape. Despite the recent presentation of this argument by an indigenous academic, such concepts are extremely old in the worldview of Polynesian peoples and others of Oceania. These understandings continue to be part of the contemporary belief systems of Oceanic peoples, Polynesian, Melanesian and Micronesian. In this chapter and the thesis research, I have deliberately chosen to include Australian Aboriginal Clans as part of the indigenes who are researched, since their landscapes and Dreamings are situated geographically in the Pacific and they too are our Pacific neighbours, even if not Island or strictly “sea” people. The chapter then compared the perceptions of these various indigenous peoples with Western/European ones (that were more fully discussed in Te Tuatahi) and concludes that despite the lack of uniformity existing amongst the various indigenous, especially those of Oceania, the differences in perceptions and ideology are not nearly so marked as are those which exist between indigenous and Western perceptions of landscape.
Qualitative research is set to produce theories that are grounded in empirical data from which they are generated. Comparison between groups and other elements, allows the researcher to test and validate the collected facts, and to develop categories (Sarantakos 1995: 13).

This chapter discusses method and how my research was undertaken in regard to how Kai Tahu understand the term landscape. The area under discussion covers the whole of the Kai Tahu tribal area and the majority of the formal interviews have been drawn from people who are largely, though not exclusively, still resident in various Kai Tahu landscape areas. The research has as its basis an understanding that there is for Kai Tahu, such a thing as landscape and that it is the preferred term rather than more usual ones that are used within social anthropology such as “a sense of place” or “the Kai Tahu environment.” Each time the term landscape was used with Kai Tahu participants, it needed little if any explanation. The exceptions to this use of the term were from those whom I defined by age as young and their suggestions and reasons for them are already noted in a footnote in Te Tuatahi (chapter one). As Cushen (1997: 26) has argued, the research he undertook, “is not so much about a landscape as the form it takes in the minds of people,” or their understanding of how they know what they know. In this research, the people and minds referred to are largely, though not exclusively, those of Kai Tahu.
WHY "LANDSCAPE" AS THE TOPIC?

The interest I have in how landscape is variously conceptualised arose as a result of research for a 1997 fourth-year anthropology paper. It was intended at first to compare and contrast broadly the differing landscape perceptions of Iwi Māori and the descendants of the first Tāuiwi settlers by undertaking a comparative study of how the rural was portrayed visually through sketches, paintings, photography, film and television. What came to be of greater interest were the texts that often accompanied the pictorial accounts. A further fourth-year paper in Māori Studies had a component in which a pre-selected number of mid and late nineteenth century novels on the land wars in Aotearoa were discussed and analysed by the group.

The analytical aspect required that we first understood what the writers and novelists were attempting to impart to their readers and to critique and evaluate the attempts they made. These included early works by Barker ([1870] 1984), Boldrewood (1899), Carrick (1892), Featon (1873), Maning (1863), Reeves (1898) and Stoney (1873). Within the texts, we considered if any of the following were used to persuade the reader: an artistic portrayal of the vastness of the landscapes that were on a par with other rugged areas elsewhere in the world; a tourist Mecca in which the adventurous would revel; or, was there a deeper ideological meaning attached to their stories of the struggles over land that existed between Iwi and Tāuiwi? All of these representations were portrayed and the ideological beliefs were evident in each text even in those not quoted in this thesis. The novelists almost unanimously supported the idea of Māori as a disappearing race, which added to my interest in the differing perceptions of Tākata or Mana whenua and their landscapes. It seemed to me that the novelists were merely expressing the thoughts and feelings of most of the population of the times. Those to whom I refer in the thesis seemed to be reflecting through the novel, generally held opinions of Māori and their landscapes, and how the latter should be redefined and
owned by Tauiwi. Descriptions within these novels demonstrated how early settler society most desired the landscape should look, along with its preferred utilisation by Tauiwi rather than Iwi. As a consequence, the emphasis of the discussion during the research projects came to be based around both areas in perceptions of Iwi and landscape.

The focus of the 1997 research became time- and place-specific, concentrating particularly on Kai Tahu and a Tauiwi group from the South Island’s high-country, the leasehold farmers. Their leases and the possible use of these Crown leased land tracts as compensation for Kai Tahu saw both lessees and their expert academic witness Michèlle Dominy, an American anthropologist, present counter arguments to those of Kai Tahu at Waitangi Tribunal hearings between 1987 and 1989. The arguments between the two groups concerned who should be the more appropriate guardians for these now rather fragile ecosystems. Part of the Tauiwi argument considered the most appropriate way in which to utilise the landscape; namely that it remain unchanged from its present use and that all who farmed the leasehold land should continue to do so uninterrupted by problems which had arisen between the Crown and Kai Tahu. Included in the lessees’ perceptions of landscape were the high-country farmers’ spiritual connections to it.

A BALANCED FRAMEWORK: SOURCES CONSULTED

To present an academic argument as well as a Kai Tahu perspective, ideas on landscape were consulted from many sources as well as from differing perspectives. These included Māori, Tauiwi and Pākehā. Māori and Kai Tahu specific sources included place-names that have resulted from Tūpuna rokonui (famous ancestors), taunahataka (bespeaking the landscape), as well as waiata (chants and songs), pakiwaitara (stories as histories), whakataukī
(proverbial sayings) and whakatauākī (proverbial sayings directly attributable to a person). Since a Masterate on the place-names of Kai Tahu was being undertaken by another Kai Tahu at the University of Otago in Information Science, this thesis does not go into in-depth research on place-names. Sources used included: Tauiwi and Māori oral and written historical accounts including academic texts; records of land courts and various Commissions of Enquiry, the Waitangi Tribunal archival material and other published sources; and, various theses on Kai Tahu, on landscape, or theses by Kai Tahu which are invariably (though not exclusively) to do with Kai Tahu understandings of themselves. These include their environmental practices or management of the resources of Te Waipounemu, an understanding of Kai Tahu Identity, places-names and Tūpuna of note and presentations of Kai Tahu histories as understood through kōrero pūrākau, waiata and the likes. The sources included within the various theses are Kai Tahu world and epistemological views of themselves and their identity through whakapapa with their landscapes, through those things mentioned above like famous ancestors, naming and claiming the landscapes and songs of all kinds, such as waiata Māori nō neherā (ancient past) and those of more recent times. I also examined documentary evidence and any explanatory notes which may have accompanied these. A so-called mythological grid in which Kai Tahu hapū locate themselves (or are located by others) permits them as an Iwi to constantly renew their ancestral inheritance each time they hui and recite their pepehā.

A wide range of anthropological and related theories and theorists was studied at libraries including those at the University of Otago, Milton Keynes Open University Library in Britain, the British Library in London and Berkeley and Stanford University Libraries in California. These texts gave explanations for the subsequent exploitation of new territories by incoming colonisers as well as the thinking of the many colonials in nineteenth century England, Europe and North America. Research that was undertaken in these libraries was combined with personal interviews, both formal and informal, in Te Waipounemu, Fiji,
Britain and in the United States of America. This was done to access a much wider number of oral as well as written sources and to be able to make comparisons from an Island or Pacific viewpoint and gain a Continental perspective from indigenous Americans' writings or interviews that had been undertaken by others. In East Anglia there are also people who have a special connection with what I have called landscape, but what they term simply "the land" or "the soil." Some there had written small private histories about their rural landscapes. The themes were almost exclusively concerned with land ownership, management and farming within certain long established families and how, over time, present day owners had acquired their land. In fact the farm on which I was based for part of the time in 1998 had an extremely old map of the original area worked by the ancestors of one of the present owner, Nigel Stacey. Since the time in the East Anglia area was near the village of Hanslope in Northamptonshire, I was as a result, provided with access to an area that is stated to have special landscape attachments. Jane Thomson had worked for some years in England editing academic and other books there and during that time the editing she did, demonstrated the obvious land attachment for which the East Anglian people are apparently well known (Thomson 1999: pers.comm.). The couple who owned the farm there had a personal library which housed a substantial number of books on both the local and a wider British history of land management, tenure and landscape perceptions. A further excellent source of knowledge came from the substantial number of British and locally made television documentaries I was able to view while in England in both 1998 and 2000, on the archaeological and historical peopling of Britain, the evolution of land use and perception changes of these. The programmes enabled me to view the various incoming colonisations upon the original tribes of Britain and the early colonisations by the English of the Welsh, Scottish and Irish. These documentaries ranged from the domestication of people and their domestication of animals, to land management, ownership and the early beginnings of English property rights; from the making of the English garden and park creation as landscape, to landscape as an artistic
concept; from the changes over the centuries of how flora and fauna were perceived in England to Roman Britain; from the making of the English house, to landscape gardening. All contributed to both my personal knowledge bases and to the research project.

TE PĒHEA I WHAI ATU AU I KĀ KAIKŌRERO

The process of selecting participants was fairly broad in the matter of how and whom I chose, or more usually, had chosen for me to interview. I have taken the view that, I sought participants or had participants chosen for me, who were not normally given such an opportunity to voice their views. Although many were interviewed formally and informally, I have been challenged by many who were not interviewed, over whether I am sure that all who might be interviewed, were. The answer I gave a recently as July 25th 2000 was, “no,” that I had not interviewed all who could have been, since I would still be doing so and would never have actually begun to write. I also added that I did not choose only those participants whom I thought or knew held views similar to my own, but had to the best of my ability--given so many participants were chosen for me--attempted to formally speak to a cross-section of people whose views were anything but uniform. Rather, they were quite the reverse and in any day competing viewpoints were glaringly obvious. My participants nonetheless have an enormous interest in both the subject matter and their landscapes, whether from experiential and lived or outside and learned perspectives. The participants who have been included were also willing to be part of this particular interview process and did not attempt to sway me towards interviewing others whom they thought were “more worthy” participants. In the selection of participants I was guided almost exclusively by the various Administration officers at many of the eighteen Papatipu marae where research was conducted, or who were at least the principal points of contact through whom the interviews were arranged. They in turn had been guided by their kaumātua or persons in whom they placed great store and mana.
In Otautahi, I approached Paul White, the then Chief Executive of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Development Corporation, since it was under his leadership that I sought permission to take out of the workplace the mostly, (though not only) young Kai Tahu employees who were interested to come to where I was interviewing. Thus my participants were self-selected as were one or two others who asked specifically to be interviewed. I directly chose only the original ten participants for what was the initial Masterate while the rest were chosen for me or volunteered.

KĀ WĀHI I KĀ KŌRERO

The interviews were almost always conducted in places chosen by either the Administrators or the participants. In our doing of “native method,” it meant that where ever possible, I was required to do my best to fit around the wishes of the participants, rather than they be forced to fit around mine. This happened in all instances, except that I was obviously constrained to various time limits. In this matter the participants largely fitted around the timetable I needed to follow in as much as I suggested times I could visit the area while they suggested venues and usually the amount of time I spent with them. There were no “set in concrete” questions as such, though all were asked what the term “landscape” meant for them as a Kai Tahu person (or the spouse of one). I also asked if any considered that this understanding had anything to do with, or was driven by, our Claim and the Settlement that resulted.

The way information was given at the beginning of each interview usually meant starting with their local pepehā or introducing themselves in Māori. For others an introduction through whakapapa was the preferred method of introduction. For another group, it was requested that I state who they were and may or may not have included the place where their particular landscapes were. Food was part of every interview except where these occurred at a
workplace as was the case for some of the interviews done in Otautahi. I was given koha of special kai such as tītī tahu and other delicacies where available and grilled cheese on toast or cheese and crackers where this was more appropriate. I even cooked at one place.

Depending on which of the various introductions was chosen, an appropriate response was sometimes required as an acknowledgement to the whakapapa that was being presented. There was usually a subtle way of letting me know when the response was expected, which they invariably stated would not have occurred if the interviewer had no idea of Tahu-taka. This was always done by me when the method of introduction was pepehā or whakapapa and a small or long mihi was given because the participants should as often as possible have such courtesy returned. This form of introduction and response or the lack of it, went on to determine how the rest of the interview proceeded and in which reo (language).

More often, ka reo e rua (two languages) were used. Gossip (a harmless kind of reporting what each of them knew about who did what and when) usually preceded all interviews as this forms an integral part of the process of exchange between participant and interviewer (me). By chatting rather than using interviewer directed or pre-selected question and answer method, it was possible to allow the interviewees to cover aspects about their particular landscape perception, which I may or may not have thought of discussing with them. It also permitted them as participants to cover other related subjects that were important to them and as it proved, to the research itself. I also discussed the “interview as chat” idea with other indigenous PhD students or academics from Oceania. I explained why that type of method had been chosen by me for this research and discovered that though they may have called in by another name, most had undertaken research in a fairly similar manner (as have many Western academics).

For many, the ideas behind their research topics had come about as a direct result of these kinds of discussions which they had remembered occurring between them and their kūpuna (elders) or senior family members (Teaiwa 1999: Viti Levu, kōrero-a-waha). Many
were strongly guided, as was I, towards their subject matter, if not directly told what their area
of research would best be. We often discussed how we had undertaken the interview process
as "insiders" and the differences that might have made when eliciting responses from our own
(P. Mānoa 1999: Viti Levu, kōrero-a-waha). The Oceanic peoples of the Pacific with whom I
spent time, saw a form of storytelling that was based on shared commonalities though these were
never assumed as universal even within whānau, hapū or Iwi and their Oceanian counterparts.
These included such things as our experiences as researchers working with our own; working
on similar subject matters with their delights and difficulties; or discussions as fellow
Oceanians who held certain shared understandings of landscape perceptions and how we best
expressed these for us. We storied about our individual, our hapū or our tribal understandings
of the idea of landscape and how I might best and most clearly explain such differences
within the rules and regulations which a Doctoral dissertation demanded. These discussions
on the "how," varied from a need to deconstruct then reconstruct the idea of landscape based
on Weberian theory as Western scholars probably understand it, to arguing it was merely
epistemological difference that ought to suffice. It was generally agreed that we had to be
accepted as researchers among our own, even though we were already well known (in most
cases) to our Iwi whānau in another context. Haole/Pālagi/Pākehā students and academics
working in these Pacific institutions (including New Zealand), also discussed the topic with
me or in group conversations. They talked of how I am attempting, or how their indigenous
first nations' American or Pacific island students being supervised by them are attempting to
present our particular form of knowledge that begins from our way of knowing. These
scholars were generous with their time, support and opinions of those with whom I should
speak and I found and continued to find time to spend with these students and scholars, so that
ideas could be shared and exchanged for the benefit of all our areas of research. It was a most
rewarding, fulfilling and useful way to spend many hours, storying with Pacific Island
academics of all ages from early twenties to near retirement or even long ago retired.
Presenting a paper on my research in Hawai'i further facilitated contact with Kai Tahu ki waho now living there: one a Brigham Young University lecturer; another, a visiting guest at Mānoa (from Murihiku) now living and working at Auckland University; a man whose whakapapa goes back to Waikouaiti, who had visited New Zealand, but not the landscape of his whakapapa. He knew his pepehā, which he proudly recited with an Hawai'ian American accent, but also with much pride. For many Kai Tahu who live away from their homeplaces for whatever reasons, it seemed that landscape attachments have in some instances become stronger because of this. At least that is how they theorised this need to belong or feeling of belonging in a special way. It was a privilege to story (talk) with and to tell them of homeplaces and the landscapes as the thesis and I portrayed them.

Landscape as discussed in interviews was not confined to the land, but included the sea and the management of the resources which were to be gathered from both. It was also about appropriate use of the land, rivers and mountains and the sea. The time of each interview varied, some being as little as 45 minutes, others taking up most of a morning or afternoon or even a whole day. Invariably these were interspersed with sidetracks for Iwi taketake and catch-up as well as showing me some of the places by physically walking to them. This was done so that I would more fully understand the kōrero and have a deeper appreciation of the special meaning these places held for those who are so intimately of them. Time required by each participant was always made, even when it meant that we needed to phone ahead to say I was delayed by up to as much as an entire day, which often happened. I would simply explain to the next participant that in order to fully appreciate what “Mea” was wishing to share with me, it was often essential to walk over her or his particular landscapes including the sea shore, in order to have places at sea and elsewhere pointed out to me. I declined out of necessity, extending one trip to Murihiku in order to visit Rakiura and regret that still, since it would have delayed all the others by three to four days, but would have given me longer with Teoti

---

32 I have deliberately used “story” since that is the word used by the elders when talking with me.
Te Au who died while I was away overseas. So with that one exception, whatever assisted the interview process and my understanding of their stories was done, including allowing time to grieve over the loss of a loved one or simply the personal grief some felt at what we have lost and how others felt we were still lost in our understanding of Papatuānuku and her needs. I add that nothing further would have been added to his and my kōrero, but I would have had more precious time with him that I may never now have. I found many of the deeply emotional times very hard on me personally since I had to then proceed to the next interview fresh and with a supposedly clear mind for each new participant. I do hope I was able to always give of my best in every instance while knowing that such times of emotion were also necessary in order to understand the feelings and sense of deep loss or of a great pride each felt in being who they are.

KĀ KAUPAPA I ROTO I TĒNEI RAKAHAU

This research then, is concerned with an in depth study of what might at first glance be considered a broad topic, especially in its use of a term more usually thought of as “space,” “place” or “environment.” For Kai Tahu though, of all those terms mentioned above, most agreed that “landscape” or a kupu Māori described this research. The use of qualitative method allowed for participants to have their own forms of expression. Some were mai i te reo, others were completely in English and the majority were as stated, a combination of both. At the same time, recurring attitudinal and descriptive patterns suggested there were important features contained within the subject matter able to be used as empirical data, especially to do with differences of perception. This was not only to do with landscape, but also covered a range of matters, all of which had to do with identity, both of the personal and hapū type, and from this, the sense of belonging. It was also to do with knowledge and who knows or owns this. That for them was one of mana and Rakatirata. As such, it is not unlike
present academic and commercial thinking on intellectual property rights, for though there are
general stories which are known by many, there are particular ones that belong with certain
people and certain places in the landscapes of Kai Tahu. So the “what” of stories as well as
the “where” and “with whom” these are deposited is jealously guarded in some instances. So
too are the “where” as well as “the rights” to accurately tell them lest these stories become
mis-told or endangered. Consequently people were a little reticent in certain instances. This
has happened as result of many stories being collected prior to and during our Waitangi
Tribunal hearings and having become lost as whānau stories and taoka by their reckoning. As
a result, forms of knowing have since become (from their perception) redefined to suit a cause
that they, as kaitiaki of them, never intended or would have deemed a proper use of such
stories. To avoid creating any misunderstandings of my wanting access and rights to such
stories, it was essential that I formulate some general topic headings we were all comfortable
working around.

The main topics we covered included: (a) the importance of the definitions of
landscape; (b) those issues which are to do with imagery and imagination as opposed to
imagery and experiential knowledge (e.g. the way in which knowledge of Kai Tahu and their
landscapes was acquired); (c) land tenure in regard to leased lands; (d) the re-namings; (e)
Tōpuni sites (Conjoint Conservation areas) and how these were both arrived at and will be
managed; (f) co-management of our landscapes where we no longer have title; (g) what might
be the future of our newly returned landscapes; (h) who are the key Kai Tahu stakeholders--
the corporates or the grassroots; and (i) how will nohoaka sites be managed and who will have
first rights to the use of these?
THE TASK

The task for me as a researcher was to comprehensively understand, that while in that role, I was examining the cultural and physical aspects and processes which together demonstrate how we as Kai Tahu, whānau, hapū and individually, conceptualise our landscapes. In order to attempt such a daunting task, I had to first present my credentials as a Kai Tahu by pepehā. I also had to re-present myself in all other ways in which I am known to them already before proceeding further. This I did by personally approaching people whose knowledge and opinions I could trust, to direct me to those whānauka who would be the ones with whom it was most essential I request an interview. Thus I was largely told who in each area would be both worth consideration in relation to this project and whose knowledge and judgments were to be trusted. Even though most of the participants had known me most of my life, or I had known them most of theirs, I was still required to present myself in a new way and present my researcher credentials. Now I was the seen as researcher who had come to interview them, even when it was by storying with them as I had done a million times before. It was exciting and a marvellous learning and sharing of knowledge of how we know the things we know in a different way from others. The combined wealth of knowledge that my participants passed on or shared with me came from Te Wāipounenu, Aotearoa, around the Pacific, England and Continental America. The constant questioning by these whānau as well as significant others from Te Moanaui a Kiwa (the Pacific), forced me to more critically examine my epistemological understanding of my research topic. Thus I was constantly examining and re-examining how I discussed the research project and clarifying for myself what it was I was attempting to convey within the thesis. Kai Tahu are so truly spread around the Māori and the Tauiwi worlds that I was able to meet and story with them in their new
homeplaces while discussing the landscapes that were associated with their whakapapa places.

ÖKU HIAHIA MO KĀ KÖRERO-Ā-WAH

To the degree that my preference was to interview Kai Tahu who have not already been direct participants in research prior to this project, I have spoken with our people from all over the Tahu takiwā. They have included participants in both the formal and informal sense and have come from the following: the present eighteen Papatipu Rūnaka as well as Kai Tahu employed by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (here on in referred to as TRONT); Kai Tahu who live in urban areas of Te Wāipounenu; and also those referred to above from other parts of the globe. It has also been possible to either speak with or formally interview urban and rural Kai Tahu who are living away from their wāhi tūturu or Kaik though still in the South Island; and finally to Kai Tahu living in Aotearoa and rāwāhi further afield, including London and Perth and the Pacific and mainland America. All but a few, originate solely from wāhi tūturu Kai Tahu, since their Tūpuna were brought under that name during the time of the Treaty signing and the time that Walter Mantell was seeking to purchase land from the mid to late nineteenth century.

NŌ HEA KĀ WĀHI TŪTURU O KĀ TĀKATA I KÖRERO-Ā-WAH?

The Kai Tahu and other people with whom I spoke or whom I interviewed formally and places they call home are widely dispersed across te rohe pōtæe o Kai Tahu and further. These include five places with which I have hapū connections:33 Firstly, the place where I was born

---

33 A hapū is understood in anthropological terms to be a sub-tribe, which may at many levels, operate on its own terms, rather than from an Iwi (tribal) base.
and raised, Ōtākou on the Otago Peninsula some 25 kilometres north east of Otepoti (Dunedin), one of the places where Te Tiriti was signed and the home of Taiaroa, my Tupuna; the second, Puketeraki (formerly old Waikouaiti, presently known as Karitāne) which is close to where I presently live at Okahau (Warrington) and from which one of my Tupuna, Maaki Parata, originates. The latter area is approximately thirty kilometres due north of Otepoti on the eastern Otago coast. The third place is Taumutu situated on the edge of Te Waihora (Lake Ellesmere) south of (Banks Peninsula), from where my Tupuna Taiaroa originally came and to where his son returned as a Māori MP to build Te Awhitu house and farm the area around the house, while retaining his Ōtākou land. The fourth, though there is no longer a Kaik there now, is to Ruapuke Island just off Awarua (the Bluff), where my great grandmother Koriana Te Horo’s Tūpuna originated and another of the areas where Te Tiriti o Waitangi was signed; and also to Rakiura where Hananui is the mauka atahua. All areas from which Papatipu places stem are fairly ancient settlements, though some are much more so than others. Puketeraki and Ōtākou still have two of the most important marae in Otago and were moreover, two of the oldest Tauiwi settlements in the province as large whaling stations in the 1830s. They are now farming and fishing communities. Ōtākou also sees most of Otepoti’s tourist traffic pass through it on the way to visit the albatross and penguin colonies and their beautiful environments. Karitāne has long been a holiday resort for Dunedin people with its sheltered beach and spectacular scenery. Both areas have attracted many Tauiwi artists and photographers. To me, however, it is the very different Kai Tahu perception of landscape that has absorbed my interest. The Hukanui (also spelt Hokonui and Hokanui) is another Papatipu Rūnaka where I have contemporary relatives, but no direct whakapapa connection. Their whare Te Ika Rama (O te Ikerama) and their marae complex are now situated south of Gore where many of those of the place are active in Iwi matters. They, along with other Rūnaka of Te Tai o Arai-te-Uru have Treaty interests with and input into State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and other similar bodies. Still within the Otago rohe is Te Rūnaka o Moeraki where
two settlements at one time have been situated, the second having been occupied (and some say created) as a result of the sacking of the Kaiapoi Pa of Kai Tuhaitara when there was a need by refugees from there to be housed, sheltered, fed and given solace by their more southern whānauka already settled there. This type of manaaki (caring) was provided by most Rūnaka south of the Waitaki, but only Moeraki seems to have had two settlements at that time. Others like Ōtākou had several small Kaik and had a total population at the time of first contact as high as two thousand (taku mōhio; T. Wesley 1998: kōrero-a-waha; Hui Mātauraka, Ōtākou).

Arowhenua and Waihao are in reasonably close proximity to one another north of Moeraki, with Waihao being situated at Morven approximately half way between Oamaru and Timaru near the coast. The original Pa site is now part of a farm, but there is a whare and marae complex there. Te Hapa o Niu Tireni is te ikoa whare at Arowhenua, an important whare as attested to in its name, situated at the southern end of the present township of Temuka. This place is properly known as Te Umu Kaha and is an important place for Kai Tahu since it is close to Waiateruāti where there was a substantial Kaik, occupied during the planting and harvesting of tī kōuka and the manufacture from it of the kauru. Some say Waiateruāti was declared tapu and thus had to be vacated after the drowning off its coast of Tuhawaiki, a well-known chief and trans-Tasman trader at the time of contact.

Tuahiwi is stated by people from there and others in print including Evison (1986; 1996; Tau, 1992, 1998, 1999; Tau, Goodall et al 1990), to be the centre from which Kai Tahu spread on their third and final migration from Aotearoa. Between Tuahiwi at Kaiapoi and Taumutu near Southbridge lie three Papatipu Rūnaka which are situated on Banks Peninsula. They are Rapaki at Lyttleton, Ōnuku slightly further south of Akaroa and Wairewa which lies slightly north of Taumutu and west of the peninsula proper on the Halswell side of the peninsula. Wairewa is in close physical and easily viewable proximity to the Kaitorete Spit which borders Taumutu as well. Kāti Kurī of Mangamaunu and Takahanga were the first
places in Te Wāipounemu to be colonised by both Kāti Māmoe, then later Kai Tahu whose uri continue to live at the Kaikōura area. Mangamaunu has yet to regain its former Papatipu status and continues to put its take before the TRoNT table for Papatipu recognition. Te Tai Poutini the West Coast where the Papatipa are Kāti Waewae at Hokitika and Makaawhio at Bruce Bay), was the home of Kāti Wairangi before Tahu people ever ventured across the passes to that coast and established their mana over that whenua.

THE WHERE AND WHAT OF THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR LANDSCAPES

In my initial research which I began as a Master of Arts candidate I formally interviewed six mixed marriage Tauiwi and Kai Tahu couples who were in the work of farming from the takiwā (areas) of Ōtākou and Puketeraki, one Kai Tahu couple and one Kai Tahu male, whose Kai Tahu partner withdrew from the process of formal interview, but was happy to chat informally about the project and retains an interest in it. The reason for choosing farmers in the first instance had been because they were still on the land in the two original research places and because they would theoretically be more readily available to be interviewed than would fishers. It was also thought that the work of farming might find both Tauiwi and Kai Tahu people who felt strong landscape connections, because of the work in which they were engaged on a daily basis. However, many of those spoken to informally were fishing people who are still resident in the two areas, or Kai Tahu now living away from their homeplaces in urban or other rural areas. Happily, I have now been able to formally interview greater numbers who have retained their homes in these areas, and are or have been in the work of fishing or in work that is neither fishing nor farming, though may be loosely connected with one or the other. Outside of the above occupations other forms of employment have been taken while the participant/s have chosen to remain “at home,” such as my brother Bill Russell who has had much to contribute without ever being consciously aware of how
much he has given (W. Russell 1999: kā kōrero-ā-wā). He now has his own carrying business, since ceasing to fish for a living, part of which involves the moving of cattle and sheep around our landscapes. Another brother Toni, who works on the land in the employ of a Tauiwi farmer in Central Otago and has deeply spiritual connections with landscapes and Tūpuna. Insights such as they both have are a great source of inspiration to me personally and to those whānau who have similar interests and share their experiences or refuse to acknowledge the existence of a taha wairua. I have also spoken about this research project with literally dozens of Kai Tahu not unlike my immediate whānau, when they have been at hui I have attended, either at home or in an area away from my home marae. Others live in the urban areas and are employed in Māori tertiary education, Māori health, work for the Iwi in the Development or Commercial arms of our Corporation or as Marae Administrators. Some in this, the largest grouping are retired people who have worked in occupations from manual workers to office employees, but who are now or have always been home people. Likewise they have come from a geographical range considered by some to be the four farthermost areas of Kai Tahu, the boundaries of which are for us, marked by special landscape areas and rivers, rather than those defined by former or present members of the Crown. (see Map 6.1, p. 222)

Opportunities have also arisen to interview Kai Tahu from further afield and these have been taken. A second and third formal round of interviews were also undertaken as needed within the wāhi tūturu of the participants. Others were interviewed where they now live, even when that was close to or far from their actual hapū areas. For example, one was interviewed at a regional hui at Ōtākou, but whose whakapapa links are Makāwhio on Te Tai Poutini and another from Koukourarata on Horomaka (Banks Peninsula). Yet a third whose whakapapa is from Waikawa on the south-eastern coast, was spoken to by phone in Auckland after initial talks at hui in Te Wāipounenui. This has been the process all the way through, I interviewed participants wherever they were and they told me at the start where their whakapapa connections were.
I make no pretence at objectivity in my research into differing perceptions of how landscape was and is conceptualised and defined by Kai Tahu. I myself am Kai Tahu and have direct and indirect relationship connections both with those being interviewed and some of the geographical areas around which the research is based. Like many other Kai Tahu, I consider myself to be derived from the particular landscapes being researched and those of Te Wāipounenu which are situated within the rohe pōtāe (the greater land mass) of Kai Tahu Whānui. I also have a personal concern with environmental issues from a Kai Tahu perspective and from that of any New Zealander concerned with how humankind mistreats the earth, nationally and globally. I have a commitment to environmental protection of Papatūānuku as well as the belief that humankind must firmly commit itself to sustainable management of its limited resources and to the cessation of chemical usage in pastoral and agricultural activities.

**METHOD: INTERVIEWS AND STORY EXCHANGES**

The method used for these interviews was participant observation, which gave an insider's perspective as well as two (sometimes more) cultural perspectives. This began with a first meeting in which the topic was discussed and was followed up with one to one, couple or group interviewing (the last being the least used). It was in these situations that participants defined what the term "landscape" meant for them. At each interview's completion, where necessary, the participants were given some further questions or thoughts to consider, based on the interview just finished. This was done in order to prepare them for the next interview. Many did not require a second interview as they were very clear in their thinking. These participants said they had given the topic much consideration prior to the interview. It was mostly the older participants who wanted more than one visit and often had several, some of which were more about being together than participating in an interview. Such meetings
revealed stories and memories which were for me priceless and some not for inclusion in this research, even when they were relevant to it.

The questions I asked on return visits were based on matters which arose during our initial interview meetings, but which were not able to be dealt with at the time they were raised. That was usually because of insufficient time on the particular day rather than as a result of a problem of any sort. Participants also contacted me whenever they had something they wished to add or delete from a previous session and also when they wanted clarification on any matter to do with the project, which had not been fully understood by them.

Those involved directly in the research project did not wish and were not asked to simply make available their individual and collective knowledge and opinions to me, so I could then fit it into some theoretical parameter that was based on an academic discourse. Rather, the interviews were based more on the idea of “Interviews as Chat” as expressed by Russell Bishop in his *Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga* (Bishop 1996: 30-32). It was often possible to “co-construct a mutual understanding by means of shared thoughts” and understandings (Bishop 1996: 31). Interviewing in this way facilitated co-operative construction of storying, based on collaboration. It also allowed for an initial statement to be revisited and redefined in order for participants to be comfortable with any quotes which might be later attributed to them. Though the route taken to reach this point was usually, though not always, very circuitous, such means were essential in order to construct each story to the satisfaction of the narrator. Some stories were not for direct quotation in the final data, but added nonetheless to the overall narrative being constructed and at such times, the machine was turned off to respect the wishes of the story-teller. Occasionally some tapes were blank when I listened to them at home, despite recording when tested at the time of the interview. I discussed this with Te Maire Tau who asked if I was intending to re-interview, to which I replied that I would not. As I saw it, such tohu indicated things should stand as they were and with this we were in wholehearted agreement. However, it transpired that such
stories were often identical with those of other interviewees and where these have been attributed to a named person, it has been possible to state that similar opinions were expressed by others. In this way, the right of confidentiality has been respected, as has the respect of a Tiipuna perhaps, who have decided in favour of a particular version or story that was for the sharing, but between the participant and me only. I have neither desire nor intention to question such wisdom.

**PROBLEMS, ETHICS AND GENERAL DISCUSSION**

When in the process of conducting formal interviews whether the chat type or question and answer type, I consider I acted at all times in a professional manner. I was able to maintain such a manner by making no attempts to lead or influence participant opinions when they were at variance with my or others’ ideas on landscape. To have behaved otherwise, would have broken the Code of Ethics of the Social Anthropologists of Aotearoa/New Zealand. When my opinion was asked for, I stated that the point of the interview was to ascertain the participants’ views, not those of the researcher. I was required, as are all students, to gain approval for the research and the right to interview, from the University of Otago Ethics Committee and I followed the Code of Ethics of the Association of Social Anthropologists of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Having secured the academic permissions and ethical requirements, I then went about gaining the participants’ permission, which in many instances was a much more daunting task than what academia asks of its researchers.

Permission was given freely for the interviews from all concerned, in fact as earlier stated, some requested that they be part of the process. As participants, they were willing to consider the questions and the issues I had put before them for comment. The result was that these did not end up merely questions of interest to me. At times of frustration or conflict, permission to continue was temporarily withdrawn or I withdrew from the interview process.
In all but one instance, permission was re-instated by the participant, rather than at the behest of the researcher or Administrator. The major ethical difficulty was a possible disharmony that arose and might continue to arise between spouses or whānau members, over differing beliefs of what constituted landscape, how that was then defined and as a consequence of such difference, how land should be used as this applied to farming practices or how sea and other traditional resources would be put to best use and by whom. It was my intention to hear all views about landscape and its uses, but not to deliberately create friction between couples or within whānau. Differences of opinion, especially on how best to use the landscapes or whether they were worth farming, occurred in part maybe because all the farms involved in some of the research areas happened to be Kai Tahu owned. Two of the participant male spouses have farmed or are farming these landscapes and are Tauiwi. One stated, “I’m only a caretaker [who is] improving it” (S. Harris 1998: pers. comm.). That too was an area of contention. He felt he was improving the land’s quality from the perspective of farming, while another perspective was that the quality of the landscapes of the area was being eroded because of the work practices that farming make necessary. Yet another opinion contended that the Tahu farmers of the area were lazy as they under utilised their blocks of land.

A second reason for ethical dilemmas seemed to arise with one of the two Kai Tahu couples I interviewed, where the husband and wife had markedly different understandings of their Kai Tahu-ness in relation to landscape definition and use. For example, one half of the couple believed that identifying as Kai Tahu and all that stood for created an inner conflict in relation to how the farm landscape is treated, as opposed to how it should ideally be treated. For the other half of the couple, it was viewed as totally unrelated, a separate aspect altogether, somewhat like the East Anglian farmers referred to elsewhere. The former and the East Anglian farmer saw the two issues of landscape perception and land use for farming as having no relationship to each other. This was not the case for one Tauiwi farmer who stated that he classed the farm as his wife’s cousin’s land, as Māori land upon which he worked in a
"way that doesn’t upset the Tūpuna” (S. Harris. 1998: pers. comm.). In other words, landscape is landscape and must be viewed in all its various aspects, so that it is a total view of it. Yet when I asked him to describe what he perceived as landscape, it was the farm he spoke about and mainly of the views seen from it or on it. He described the many differing moods of it as a result of seasonal or weather changes, which altered its appearance and how that in turn altered his descriptions of it. Thus the one block of land could evoke many descriptions and understandings of it, whether as a place that had once been occupied by Tūpuna or presently as a farm. Here we see examples of inner conflict that often boiled over into an ethical nightmare when the conflict arose in discussions between couples or within a whānau.

From the many informal conversations had with various of our people, it seems that definitions of landscape have a more holistic description. That they were humanised landscapes we were discussing, rather than pieces of land the useable qualities of which were seen by some who farmed or otherwise worked the landscapes, was made clear time and again. Yet there is still room for an holistic view of a worked landscape as one organic grower made very clear (Anon. 1999). The landscapes for most participants, whether farmers or not, were multi-dimensional or holistically conceptualised.

**DILEMMAS AND SURMOUNTING THEM**

One ethical dilemma arose because some participants seemed to denigrate all the beliefs that many others of us hold dear. Some participants or others who were not part of the formal interview process expressed their beliefs about others in the group by speaking of Kai Tahu who saw and spoke of the landscape in human terms as “hicks from the sticks” (Anon. 1998, 1999). I found it very difficult to contend with this “want to be seen as Kai Tahu,” but not one with the “hick” view. I disliked having such opinions thrust at me in the manner they
were, as there was little, if any, opportunity afforded by these people for any real interaction between with me. Rather, this type of delivery was more like a sermon in which I was the listener and needed to remember that these opinions also counted and were real to them. Such Kai Tahu had a definite place in the research, as to have ignored them would have been to pre-determine what landscape meant for me and to seek only those who thought similarly. However, the seemingly superior attitude was a very disconcerting as well as a personal and ethical dilemma that I experienced. The only way to overcome the problem was to interview all who presented themselves to me and to add their thoughts to the body of research, since their opinions and understandings had validity. It was the attitude which was most difficult to deal with, rather than the opinions and I was constantly having to remind myself of the difference between a participant's manner and what their story could contribute to the research and so separate the two.

Conversations with the so-called “well-heeled” Kai Tahu seldom saw acknowledgement of a tie any deeper than the recitation of their pepehā. Most, though certainly not all, never acknowledged a taha wairua aspect in regard to landscape, identity or whakapapa connections except as that was understood to be a way of locating the self within the way pepehā is recited. Rather, the majority in this group when making any such acknowledgement did so at a purely head level. In other words, they believed it may have formerly existed within the Kai Tahu belief systems, but they saw no evidence of a present need for it in contemporary Tahu beliefs. When I said to such people that many other participants believed in a spiritual aspect, the response was often a derogatory one which suggested it was hardly surprising since they continued to live in the past and not in the real world.
KO TĒHEA, KO PĒHEA, KO WAI KĀ TĀTAI TAHU

All who were interviewed from across the socio-economic sphere and from all ages and educational levels, however, described themselves as connected with the Kai Tahu landscapes through the use of pepehā or something similar. In other words, regardless of distance by miles or by generations removed from their homeplaces, all I spoke with directly considered themselves of those landscapes of Te Waipounenu in general. Was this a Kai Tahu methodology that has continued to exist in order to examine the who, what and which of us and our strands of connection? And have these remained within our epistemology? Or was it nothing more than how we did and do things in order to find out how we arrived as part of our landscapes or to get some hoped-for money? One potential participant who grew up overseas came with this attitude, that I should pay for his story so I declined to interview him.

There was obviously a need to contextualise landscape that may have arisen because of the enormously varied ways in which people understood and engaged with their worlds. This may differ depending upon their gender, ethnicity, social and economic situation, or age. Perhaps some or all of these were contributing factors for the withdrawal by formerly willing participants as well as the differences alluded to above. Perhaps it was a mistrust of someone else representing their understanding of landscape, or a feeling that readers other than the interviewer might be unable to fully appreciate the ways in which they conceptualise their world or because of the way in which it might ultimately be presented. They may have further feared that this thesis might somehow alter what was their original meaning by my having to re-word it and place in a particular context, totally different from the context of telling.
Regardless of their reasons, one of the females, as earlier stated, withdrew from the formal interview process completely, due to a mistrust of how academic works might convey any of her intended meanings. As a result she was not taped when spoken to. She did send a clear message that this was not a personal gripe with me so much as a general mistrust of tertiary institutions such as the one in which I am a student. We also talked about landscape and how that is defined in various ways, especially its wide use as a concept within Kai Tahu. She has therefore continued to be a source of information, but not one to whom I may attribute any direct quotes.

The other couple, though willing to talk about the concept of landscape and their understanding of it and farming in general terms, in the end would not allow anything they stated in regard to their views of landscape or their taha Kai Tahu to be quoted or used for the purposes of this research. They said that there should be nothing written in the research that would in any way be attributable to them. For me personally that was a very sad and disappointing, given that they are well-known and knowledgeable kaumatua from their area. As a result, only one of the originally intended participants from Karitāne has been directly quoted within the thesis, although the others' contributions and those of other non-participant people from the area have still provided many insights to the overall body of knowledge upon which I have drawn for my research. Such pearls as these came from general and private conversations, while their views are not so different in certain belief aspects from other Kai Tahu of that generation. Therefore they have been taken on board in a general sense, along with the views of others spoken to about the thesis topic who were not direct participants.

The wider whānau have been very willing to talk with me and with other participants about the research. General informants of this type were never directly quoted without permission, though they were considered, nonetheless, to have contributed to the overall body of knowledge. I drew upon these informants in a similar manner to that of the many other Kai Tahu. With many I have engaged in various ways during my lifetime and their combined
knowledge is alluded to in the research. This is so even when it has not been directly quoted. Such persons have included my late father and his siblings, all now deceased except for one unable to speak since a stroke over eight years ago. They have also included the parents of many of the participants and others long since dead, but with whom I had both private and general conversations over my lifetime and with whom I have even had fierce disagreements from time to time. Aunt Magda Wallscott, (the great grand daughter of Karetai, a Tiriti signatory from Ōtākou) was a person whose knowledge and strength I and others drew upon until her death on February 17th 1999. Whānau and friends celebrated her 100th birthday on Christmas Day 1998 at Ōtākou. Another of the people with whom I have ongoing contact regarding this research, and her own is Lyn Waymouth who lives in Auckland. This contact was possible at Kai Tahu language and other hui we attended, as well as in my home where Lyn has stayed at various times. She has a strong connection with her landscape at Tautuk (Tautuku) as her whānau is still living there and Lyn visits them regularly. Her Tahu-ness seems to be strengthened in spite of her separation from her homeplace or perhaps because of it. Kuini Te Tau [née Ellison] of Karitāne, even though she had lived just outside of Masterton for over 70 years, maintained a similar attachment to her homeplace and its landscapes until her death in 1998 aged 97. Aunty Kuini stated that she had spent many of her happiest years over at the Kaik (Ōtākou) in the company of my father’s mother Ettie Russell [née Taiaroa]. Aunty Kuini like Aunty Flo Reiri of Moeraki and Kaikōura, followed and attended many of the Tribunal hearings in Te Wāipounamu. These last two like Aunt Magda, were a great source of knowledge to those of us who cared to consult them in this way for all of our lives. Whenever it was possible, many of us visited them on trips north, even though it often meant making a substantial diversion from the usual route. Aunty Flo is still living up north with her daughter and was the only one of the many over 80-year olds able to attend the interim agreement at the 1997 hui-a-Tau, the passing into law of the Kai Tahu Settlement in
Parliament in 1998 and the apology by the Prime Minister on behalf of the Crown at the 1998 hui-a-Tau at Ōnuku marae (near Akaroa).

Aunty Leah Wineera (née Taiaroa) who was given in marriage to Te Rauparaha’s grandson over 70 years ago to cement peace between the two Iwi, lived more of her life in Porirua than her wāhi tūturu of Taumutu and Ōtākou (tuku mōhio). Aunty Leah nonetheless maintained a close and strong connection with both places until her death at the age of 97 in 1996. Some of her children who have lived in Te Wāipounemenu feel an affinity with its landscapes, but none has the type of connection with the Ōtākou landscapes that their mother had, though they may have a strong connection with Taumutu in an experiential way (tuku mōhio). Their strongest land and landscape connections are more with Ngāti Toa areas and Takapuwāhia, Porirua in particular, for some. However, for most of the surviving of Aunty Leah’s fourteen offspring, attachment to their taha Iwi varied as did the degree to which each of them was involved with their homeplaces and marae (H. Wineera 1997: kōrero-a-waha i Ōtākou). Haana (Wineera) also stated that it was similar in regard to how each defined identity and land.

As with the other Tāua cited above, Aunty Leah was a wealth of knowledge on the two Kai Tahu places with which she was connected. She held land and shares in both the Akapatiki farm at Ōtākou and owned the majority of shares at Te Awhitu house and farm at Taumutu. These knowledgable Tāua maintained throughout their lives, strong connections with their landscapes of home. Many Tāua and Poua still living, continue to be the source of great knowledge for much of what I have been able to base my own landscape understandings and beliefs upon. This has been so for other Kai Tahu as participants in general conversations of their beliefs. This knowledge continues to be available to them, even though large tracts of their former lands and landscape are not.

Many of that generation and those in their 60s and 70s tell of how their Tupuna sold lands after 1847 to finance the Claim which also precipitated the building of some of the
wharenui on Papatipu marae. These included Tatane Wesley from Te Kaahu of Ōtākou and Waihao) a formal participant; Mahana Walsh (a relative) née Te Tau, (who is a Parata of Karitāne); George Te Au, a relative on the Retara (Russell) whakapapa from Te Rakitauneke at Waihōpai, (also known as Teoti Te Au) Murihiku; Tuhirangi (Ted) Parata (deceased), a relative of Karitāne; and from the younger age group, Rānui Parata a relative of Karitāne; Gerard O'Regan of Moeraki, Awarua and Te Tai Poutini; Hine Forsythe of Arowhenua and Ōtākou; and many others not specifically spoken to in relation to this project. They are also counted as those who have contributed nonetheless, to the overall corpus of knowledge I have gained. These people were also part of the more general korerorero at hui around the rohe where gems were often unexpectedly forthcoming and, as stated, have been quoted either directly or indirectly, with permission.

One of E. Ellison's uncles who has lived away from Ōtākou for many years felt no affinity with that landscape now. In fact he did not express any interest in hearing about any of the Kai Tahu matters being spoken of and was somewhat disdainful of others' interest in “these Māori things.” Even so, when he at one time returned to Ōtākou he came to the opening of the Albatross colony at Pukekura which took place in 1990 and, as one would expect, for Aunt Magda's taki aue (funeral) (E. Ellison korero-a-waha: 1998).

GENDER DIFFERENCES?

The Tauiwi female participants showed a marked preference for more environmental protection of the landscapes on which they lived and landscapes in general, in a way similar to their Tahu counterparts. The women had wanted to retain any existing trees, or even to plant new ones on what they saw were denuded farmscapes. Their preference was usually (though not always) for native species. Some of the males on the other hand, continued to feel a need to remove some or all of the trees that still remained, even when it was not essential to do so. Those interviewed and the number of geographical areas included in the second set of
interviews have made it more feasible to see that a definite gender difference towards land use, landscape beautification, treatment and perception existed. When I suggested to one participant that perhaps women were more closely in tune with the land, he agreed that this may be so, as their bio-rhythms are cyclical. But there were also men who could be very much in tune with the land and were farming people or people with a strong gardening interest.

Since the research was upgraded it has become possible to interview greater numbers of Kai Tahu and others connected with them through marriage or a long association, from all over the rohe. It also became possible to reasonably argue that there are distinct gender differences in regard to landscape and environment perceptions and management, and there was certainly a marked difference between the genders in the research participant group. One of the main questions asked of all participants was how they saw or viewed their homeplace landscapes and if anything about these could be improved?

The female participants suggested there was both an ecological need and an aesthetic desire to re-clothe the denuded landscapes (theirs and others’) by replanting as many trees preferably natives, flaxes and other shrub-type plants as possible on these landscapes. This was so whether they were large land tracts such as farms or smaller areas such as a wakawaka, a section, the marae. On the other hand, though most of the males agreed with that as a good idea they seldom ever thought of it as a necessary one, and only ventured an opinion on it anyway if they were asked as part of a direct question. With a few exceptions, the males who were farming did not agree with this suggestion, unless the trees were to be planted around the farm house for a windbreak. Thus it seemed that the trees needed to fulfil some useful purpose other than merely holding the land in erosion prevention or as beautification of the garden. When I suggested that maybe flax or other types of plantings might also benefit the landscape on which farms and other forms of living were made, especially in wet or boggy areas, most of the men saw little value in this suggestion, since
unlike trees these could not be harvested later for use as firewood. There continued to be potential for contestations between couples and or whānau, so an ethical dilemma arose once more.

As stated, there were some exceptions amongst the males in regard to tree planting and these came from those who continued to live in their homeplace and (sometimes) to work the whānau properties. Those male participants living away from home had little interest in caring for their homeplace/s landscapes, yet interestingly several maintained beautifully landscaped personal properties. Others were keen to landscape their marae areas, but saw no reason to do likewise to the wider homeplace landscapes, many of which were very bare of any type of bush cover. One male participant from north of the Waitaki suggested that women only thought of covering a bare landscape because they liked flower gardening, rather than because they were ecologically and environmentally concerned with our landscapes (Anon: 1999). When this suggestion was made to the women, most rejected it outright, though one thought it may have been a contributing factor for her personally in considering landscape as a concept; she offered no comment in regard to how other women might feel (D. Matahaere 1999: kōrero-a-waha).

One potential issue that did appear to be based on gender in regard to landscape management in the research areas, caused both good hearted and serious differences of opinion. These were merely a reflection of other matters to do with best practice land management and the wisest use of it. Therefore the most sensible and acceptable solution to avoid open conflict, as suggested by me and agreed to by some, was to do the formal interview of each spouse separately where possible, necessary or appropriate. It has not always been desirable to interview both spouses since one has little or no interest in things Tahu, other than being wed to one or having helped as one spouse put it, “in the production of more Tahu offspring” (Anon: pers. comm. 1999). On the other hand, those non-Tahu spouses whom I did choose to interview because of their interest in both the project and Kai Tahu
matters overall were extremely keen to participate. They had always been very supportive of Te Kereeme and the injustices caused by Crown actions upon Kai Tahu (and other Iwi) taken so long ago. It did not always follow, but more usually the spouses who had an interest in the landscapes of Kai Tahu had chosen to live upon them with their spouse or partner and to learn the history behind the Claim which had resulted directly from the displacement of Kai Tahu from their landscapes. Many of these partners and spouses had willingly extended their interest in and support of Kai Tahu, to attend Tribunal hearings or to participate in all types of hui and/or be available in so many other ways for their Tahu partners and offspring. For that reason their opinions were valued and of value in the same way as is their ongoing support. It did not of course necessarily follow that they agreed with the opinions of their Tahu partners, in fact this was seldom the case, but they did respect the right of one another to express opinions contrary to their own. As it transpired, separate interviewing was deemed the wisest and was often requested even long before I suggested it. That allowed each participant to be more comfortable about the process, even though it added so much more time to the undertaking and completion of the interviewing part of the project.

What I had hoped was that the spouse who had been interviewed would not subsequently initiate discussion that might later give rise to a disagreement of opinion between spouses. The least that I as the researcher wished, and continue to hope for, was and is that I would not be involved in any potential conflict whether as a direct or indirect cause. At the same time though, it was desirable for me as earlier stated, to hear the different opinions in order to ascertain if a case could be argued for gender differences in the understanding of landscape and its uses or if these were more cultural in essence. The differences, such as exist, may not necessarily be a substantial part of this research process, but may on the other hand prove worthy of a deeper and ongoing investigation in a later project.
It is not the literal past that rules us save in a biological sense (In Bluebeard’s Castle cited in Wood 1986: 201).

Ehara i te Tākata kotahi anō i oho ai i neherā
[There is likely to be more than one version of any story] (Goodall & Griffths 1980: 3 [mai i te Reo] J. Williams. 1996: 13 for the English wording).

As the research undertaken has shown, Kai Tahu have to some degree defined landscape in relation to Tauiwi challenges and processes. English or Tauiwi views of landscape certainly have some importance, but more as a reference point from which to depart and as a means to locate differences in context between them and us. It also enables this research to show how Kai Tahu have taken hold of the term while we have turned its original intended meaning around to suit us. In doing so we have created a means to describe ourselves not only as the people of the land, but as the very landscape itself. We ourselves have been similarly contextualised and defined to fit within a particular group type, according to how we produced food and the means of production we used. We read that in the more productive climates of the world, hunter-gatherers existed in tribal groupings as opposed to nomadic bands confining their resource use to relatively small territories no greater than a few hundred square kilometres. Kai Tahu though often described as nomadic since we wandered all over our landscape, always had permanent kaik, where we stayed when not working mahika kai sites. So where did we fit here, as gatherers or nomadic bands? Neither is totally
correct if gatherers had a small territory, since ours was an entire island. Nomadic we were, if that means that we wandered our landscapes, but we always had permanent Kaik (kainga) where we stayed when not away gathering kai. So how different were we from those who arrived to colonise us?

At the time of British colonisation in Te Waipounenu, the incoming Tauiwi settlers had over time experienced various colonisations. They had developed a fairly sophisticated technological state compared to the indigenous with whom they established contact. Our colonisers began the permanent settlement among and colonisation of a cultural “other,” known now as Kai Tahu. The British had advanced technologically from being tribal gatherers themselves to industrial capitalists. Conversely, Kai Tahu Whānui were, for the majority, only slightly removed from that “hunter-gatherer” stage which the settlers had left behind them many centuries earlier. A number of Kai Tahu though, had contact with Tākata Bola since the mid to late eighteenth century and, by the mid 1830s, were trading in flax and potatoes with visiting ships (Anderson 1998: 71) They were also crossing the Tasman to trade in flax, even though they were neither as technologically nor as materially advanced as the incoming British settlers. Despite numbers of them having travelled quite extensively offshore with sealing and whaling ships to Hawai‘i and Tahiti (Iwi kōrero) as well as to Sydney (Anderson 1998: 67), such journeys were the exception of the few rather than the rule for the majority. Kai Tahu even in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were not cultivators of landscape in the way that the ancestors of today's British were in the fifteenth century. This chapter then, will look at landscape perception and ideology by incoming colonisers as a means of placing Kai Tahu landscape definitions into a context. It will give general descriptions of British landscape behaviour as well as a more immersed insider perspective of Kai Tahu behaviours, together with a very generalised idea of other Māori behaviours on their landscapes.
As each new set of conquerors arrived in either Britain or Te Wāipounemu, they brought with them ideas of best landscape use. This was based on prior knowledge and experience of well-known and usually successfully worked homescapes. The ideals and views of good arable land practice invariably involved (to a greater or lesser degree), the denuding of the landscape using slash and or burn method of land clearance. The area that could be cleared in this manner depended on the technology available to the incoming group. British understandings of flora and fauna brought about the creation of pastoral and agricultural landscapes. How the first Māori colonisers and their successors viewed the landscapes of Te Wāipounemu is pivotal to how they used or misused them.

**EARLIER TIMES**

So what of our ancestors as colonisers of Te Wāipounemu? If one takes on board the kōrero of Rangimarie Rose Pere, Iwi were always part of the continent of Hawaiki Nui and that it was the loss of it which the gods brought about because those ancestors mistreated Papatuānuku. From that time forward, we and our more recent ancestors, other Polynesians and peoples of Oceania have gravitated to Aotearoa me Te Wāipounemu in search for Hawaiki Tautau, the heart of Hawaiki Nui. We have all therefore had to rediscover our landscapes and have hopefully learned from the mistakes of the wā tawhito (ancient past). Waitaha and the other Iwi of our pre-Kai Tahu ancestral line when they first encountered the new landscapes of Te Wāipounemu, also had practices which were detrimental to both flora and fauna, or that had no place in this very much colder climate. However, our histories tell us that these early colonisers soon became aware that changes would be necessary if they and their mahika kai sources were to survive. Thus they adopted a form of conservation and sustainable landscape management which would ensure this for themselves and the unborn for generations to come.
From our colonisation of Te Wāipounemū and the extinction of the moa onwards, all tūpuna Kai Tahu practices had to be geared in favour of environmental sustainability or kaitiakitaka. This had been essential from the earliest times since there were such vast difference in climate in Aotearoa and Te Wāipounemū from those of tropical Polynesia. It meant that former crops and methods of production known to our ancestors were not possible in this new landscape. The attitude of the British environmentalists, on the other hand, was directed exclusively towards the environmental protection of outstanding landscapes. These environmentalists were small in numbers during the mid to late nineteenth century, largely from the wealthy, upper-class families and so monetarily secure enough to argue in favour of environmental protection (Thomas 1983: 203-4). Kai Tahu environmental protection was essential for two reasons: the caring of tūpuna who are the landscape since all things derived from it including ourselves came from the same set of primeval parents was the first. The second was essential to ensure the survival and continuation of us as an Iwi.

INCOMING EUROPEAN PERCEPTIONS OF IWI AND OTHER INDIGENOUS.

Daniels (1988) Thomas (1983) and Bell (1996) state that once all lesser beings, the mad and vagrants had been conceptualised as beasts, it could be easily rationalised by the self-defined “civilised,” that the treatment of the “others” as beasts, was both justified and acceptable. The reconstruction of others’ landscapes upon discovery of them and consequent colonisation of their residents was imperative, even in Scotland and Ireland. Because of their beliefs in their own superiority, most colonisers set about dominating and civilising both cultural other’s landscapes and their people.

By the nineteenth century a debate that involved the nature of relationships with other cultures was underway and those in Britain were loathe to involve themselves with affairs
occurring in Te Wāipounemu and Aotearoa. On the contrary they were in favour of informal interaction that was already occurring between Mana whenua and whalers, sealers, missionaries and other adventurers (Orange 1987: 8). Although the Colonial Office in Britain knew Māori, there was no immediate wish to acquire their lands through purchase or any form of colonisation. After all, what little was known of Māori placed them, by British reckoning, as no more than mere savages especially when they were compared with the civilised.

Capitalist ideology including individual ownership of land eroded former Kai Tahu communal lifeways. Our communal lifeways when the capitalist paradigm, such as that which existed in many parts of Britain, parts of America and most of Europe was adopted. In contrast, in tropical Polynesia, were subsistence-based societies living a communally-based lifestyle where the idea of capitalism, expansionism and competition had not yet fully emerged. So while there were still much inter- and intra-tribal warfare over access and use rights to land and sea resources, there was no commercial or business rivalry such as that which existed in Anglo-European and North America societies where these were more technologically advanced.

Yoon states that Māori conceptualised forests and other flora and fauna landscape resources as kin and both they and their landscapes as “descended from the same original parents” (Yoon 1986: 41; Evernden 1992: 146; Gadgil and Guha 1992: 18). The above authors have held that such conceptualisations seemed unambitious. Texts such as those of Burns (1980), Campbell (1984), Howe (1984), Linnekin (1990), Meleisea (1987) and Oliver (1974) have variously stated Polynesian peoples of whom they wrote were of the warrior type and very ambitious for social recognition and status. Therefore one can only deduce this lack of ambition to which Yoon refers pertains to private property ownership and the capitalistic ideology that urged keen competition and the pursuit of individual wealth and socio-economic advancement. Advancements of the monetary and socio-economic could be attained by many
who were not aristocracy in technologically advanced societies, but seldom by the lower classes. Both historical and novelists’ accounts of Polynesian people that include Iwi Māori, from my understanding of warrior-like, hardly seem to suggest they were lacking ambition. These so-called unambitious Polynesian people were power seekers and exercised whatever they held over those who were their followers or genealogical juniors, a recurrent theme of their histories and/or “myths.” At the time of their colonisation, Iwi were said to have a geomentality that demonstrated that their environmental ideas were mirrored in their myths and practised in the way they interacted with and upon their landscapes, meaning that they were still at a stage of mythologising them (Yoon 1986: 31).

MAURI AND KARAKIA

For Iwi, the mauri (life essence) of both atua and tūpuna were placed upon the landscape by being planted or transplanted in the land through the process of takahi whenua (trampling the land). As a kawa (practice) this form of land consecration came through Tāne from his creation of life forms upon Papatuānuku. Kai Tahu records tell us that Tāne went first to his tuakana (older brother) Rehua who lived in the tenth heaven and who removed from his head, some birds that he gave Tāne to eat. The latter refused, knowing the tapu of the head of his tuakana, though he did ask Rehua for some birds to bring back to Papatuānuku. What Rehua gave to Tāne were trees for him to plant that in two seasons, grew rapidly and after three, bore fruit that attracted birds from the sky, after which Tāne made the decision to create humans. His works were completed in and viewed from the eighth heaven after which he returned to earth with his trees and other knowledge gained from Rehua.

Tāne then incanted the karakia which follows:
Tipia, tahia, rakia, rakea,  
Tupea te rangi kia rahirahi  
Toto mai i waho  
te wariki (whariki) o te rangi
Auaha tou ingoa;  
ko Te Rangipua ihi  
Te turuturu o te rangi  
Kia mau ai ko Tāne anake  
Nana i tokotoko te rangi tou

Sweep and clear the land of Tangaroa's seaweed  
The heavens cast a spell to weaken  
and drag from afar  
the Lord of the heavens  
What is your name?  
It is Te Rangi pua ihi  
The foundations of the heavens  
it is Tāne alone who holds fast  
who holds the heavens for you


The reason for this karakia was to remove seaweed that is connected with Takaroa (the counterpoint of Tāne), from Pāptuānuku and to therefore remove also any tangible or otherwise objects that may hinder the progress of Tāne in the establishment of birds and trees (Tau 1999a: 9). Tau also states that the relationship between land and sea is more “easily understood by Pākehā [if they conceptualise it in terms taken] from the Old Testament. Here there was darkness over the deep and God’s face moved over the face of the waters, [while] God separated the elements and created the firmament” (Tau 1999a: 9). Tau (1999a: 10) goes on to compare a variation of this karakia incantation of Tāne incanted by Mārū Kaitatea before his taking of the Takahaka Pa at Kaikōura. With his taua (war party) Maru eventually overtook Kati Māmoe there, going on to bring the mauri of Kati Kurī and so of Kai Tahu upon to the new lands they now settled. It is stated elsewhere that it is unclear whether Iwi perceived the landscape from a central position, or if their perceptions of it came as Thomas (1983: 22) has similarly expressed “from a more localised and dispersed [one] where all

34 Whariki is more likely to be Ariki.
nature was filled with" atua. In Anglo-American societies there was a “collapsing [of] the spirit of nature into a specified site such as a church or temple occurs with settled agricultural economies” (Thomas 1983: 22).

**DENUDING LANDSCAPES**

With the Enlightenment came an eroding of the old vocabulary with its rich symbolic overtones, so that the naturalists went about finishing their destruction of the idea that nature was responsive to human affairs (Evernden 1992: 78). The development that resulted from agrarian land use, the enclosures, and the industrial revolution demonstrated the degree of civilisation that existed in England. Forests were synonymous with wilderness and danger, woods were thought of only as a home to animals not humans and, humans who lived there were considered uncouth (Thomas 1983: 194-5). Woodlands were obstacles to progress, as attitudes by agricultural improvers sought to destroy and replace them with “gallant corn counties” (Thomas 1983: 195). An almost exact mirror of these words occurs in a number of nineteenth-century New Zealand novels on the Land Wars. Here, the novelists state that landscapes that had formerly held useless stands of tī-tree and ferns were now replaced by fields of golden wheat (John Featon [Comus] 1873: 10). At each colonisation when the British arrived, their first act of establishing the new landscape as theirs after renaming the places, was to remove trees to make the landscape look civilised (Thomas 1983: 197).

Tree planting on estates in Britain at that time, displayed wealth, induced leisure and reinforced political security where a system of inheritance instilled confidence of ownership of particular landscapes. Confidence was reinforced by this tree planting because the types of trees planted took up to a century to fully mature, confirming security of land tenure (Thomas 1983: 210-11; Thirsk and Cooper 1972: 135; Wood 1986: 180-190). That ethos of land ownership through agricultural improvement and exploitation became a moral imperative;
after all, God created the landscape “to the end that it should yield things necessary for man’s life” (J. Cooper 1972: 135-6).

DISPOSESSION: ENCLOSURE ACTS, ACTS OF ENCLOSURE

Though the enclosing of land for improved tillage in England had begun in Tudor times, from 1793 after Pitt established the Board of Agriculture, the enclosure movement developed rapidly. Palmer states that the need for corn saw more than 1,500 Enclosure Acts passed into law between 1795 and 1812 (Palmer 1962: 117). Though farms became larger and could maintain greater stock numbers the Enclosure Acts took a heavy toll on the yeoman class. It has been argued by Palmer (1962: 118; I. F. Grant [1961] 1989 Ch.3: 55, 35-64), that the Enclosure Movement represented a deep social revolution, forcing the smaller cottager who depended on customary rights to become a hired farm hand in order to remain working on the land. Thus customary rights were removed and user rights as a lifeway were lost, just as happened for Kai Tahu and other Iwi in New Zealand. Throughout the eighteenth century and beyond, British improvers praised regular landscapes of “opulence and productivity and deplored uncultivated waste” (Barrell 1972: 45 and Ch. 2). The reason behind the love of opulent landscapes was that they demonstrated a fertile, productive land.

These lovers of productive landscape were on the whole, the ancestors of those who came to Aotearoa and Te Waipounenumu. With their organised settlement came an ethos of the landscape denuded equating to a landscape made civilised for the pursuit of agriculture and pasture. This was successfully replicated in Aotearoa and Te Waipounenumu through dispossession and enclosure of the landscapes there. The thinking in the House of Commons in England was that it was cultivation alone which provided land entitlement and if indigenous people did not properly cultivate their landscapes, they ought not bemoan the fact

Identical with the assertions in Barrell (1972) Chapter two, is Thomas (1983: 257).
that "other nations, more laborious and too much pent-up, come and occupy a portion of it" (Evison 1987: 18). This was one aspect of the supposed superiority of the colonisers that they brought with them from afar and imposed upon Iwi and their landscapes. Even when they undertook actions that went against the explicit instructions issued by Lord Normanby of how to obtain what became Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Hobson and others proceeded with the signing of it. Their inappropriate actions and behaviours continued as Hobson, successive Governors and those they employed proceeded with land purchases anyway. As Tau has stated, "The methods of Britain’s Colonial Office here and in Australia and that of the Conquistadors in South America may have differed but the outcome was [the same]" (Tau 1999a: 46). In our case, a ‘‘New Zealand’’ was established as Iwi lands were claimed in the name of Queen Victoria with the placing of a flag; and in the case of South America a ‘‘New Spain’’[was declared] where the land of Spain was claimed in the name of Christ with the placing of a cross. It is within such contexts that [Te Waipounemu] and [its] landscapes may also be placed” (Tau 1999a: 46).

Many of the Tauiwi arrivals who settled at the research areas such as KariTāne, Ōtākou, Kaikōura and Awarua were whalers, usually English, though sometimes of North American extraction. Whalers were also known at Timaru, just fifteen kilometres south of Te Umu Kaha and also around Piopiotahi (or Whiowhiotahi as it is called by some at Awarua and Colac Bay (kōrero-a waha me taku mōhio). In contrast to whaling and sealing arrivals, the 1848 planned immigrants to Otago and Southland came from Scotland. This they did under the auspices of the Free Kirk and they founded the cities of Dunedin and Invercargill. Many Kai Tahu, including the participants in this research and two of their Tauiwi spouses, have been unable to understand how the early Scottish immigrants to Otago and Southland could have treated Kai Tahu so badly, given they had a history of land dispossession and poverty. The Lowland Scots who had worked with the English to disenfranchise the Highlanders, dispossess them of
their lands and forcibly evict great numbers of them proceeded in some instances, to be part of the process that repeated these actions in Te Wāipounenui.

Professor Alan Ward in a public lecture at Otago University (19/5/99) remarked there was a certain irony of Iwi disenfranchisement by Donald MacLean, a descendant of the Scottish Highlanders. Ward went on to state that one would have thought for that reason alone, MacLean would have had greater sympathy for Iwi and less for the English by whom his own had been similarly colonised and made landless a few generations earlier. MacLean had much direct involvement with the disenfranchisement of Māori at Waitara in Taranaki and other areas in the North. In the Otago area, Larnach, another Scot and Member of Parliament for the Province was a moving force in the alienation of Iwi landscapes in the South. According to Iwi knowledge, Larnach opposed any petitions by our Tūpuna to Parliament, regarding the state of poverty to which they had been reduced through huge land losses. Along with the land loss was an even greater loss; that of access to traditional kai. This occurred because the bush where many of the birds were found had been felled, the lakes drained or rivers diverted and fences erected so that physical access was blocked. These “clearances” or blocking of Kai Tahu to such kai sources and landscapes were no less devastating than those that had been first inflicted upon the Scottish Highlanders a century earlier (Iwi kōrero).

Despite the insecurity of land tenure, Scots crofters and sub-tenant clung to the status quo because “their attachment to the land was deep and strong [since] they had peopled it with talking stones, snow giants and mythical warriors of mountain granite” (Prebble 1963: 21; Grant [1961] 1989 4-6). Many in the early days left for Nova Scotia and Canada in desperation, but were no part of “the wretched, helpless exodus that [came] in the next century” (Grant [1961] 1989: 52; Prebble 1963: 24). Large numbers who emigrated became direct participants in similar removal of Kai Tahu and other Iwi from their landscapes. Similarly, many of the lowland migrants to southern Te Wāipounenui were little better off
than their Highland counterparts at the time they emigrated, though this was not universally so. Whether poor or comfortably off, Lowlanders were participants of Kai Tahu disenfranchisement. That they could be part of a colonisation that did unto others what had been done to them and their ancestors was incomprehensible to interviewees and to Alan Ward as cited above. Even though many whalers had gained land near our homeplaces, they at least had either marriages or long-term relationships with the mana whenua of the area (and others nearby). Many of the Scots immigrants, on the other hand, seemed to have scorned or looked down on Kai Tahu (and other Māori), even to relatively recent times (R. Harris and S. Harris 1998: pers. comm.). Participants in this study seemed more upset by the behaviours of the various settler governments who were made up of both English and Scottish members, than of the first Scottish arrivals in particular.

Highland clearances were continuing even at the time of the colonising of Aotearoa and Te Wāipounamu as people continued to be removed from the land in favour of sheep. The Lowlanders nonetheless brought with them the same landscape-use ethos of individual ownership as those, which were currently held to be the ideal, both in their homelands and by the government of nineteenth-century Britain. Thus most of the areas settled were to become farmscapes upon which sheep played an integral part. This continues to the present. According to history, most of those who migrated here under the Scottish scheme did so in the hope of becoming landowners (S. Harris 1998: pers. comm.). In the process, they planned to create for themselves and their descendants a new life, within the ideals of the Free Kirk of Scotland. Many achieved this as they set about clearing the bush and renaming the landscapes after areas or people from their homeplaces. For Otautahi (Christchurch) and the Province of Marlborough further north and that of Westland to the west of the main divide, settlement was undertaken more by English immigrants. Christchurch city to this day is probably (according to one of the English informants who had lived there at one time for a considerable period),

It resembles in many ways though, two of the university cities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Perhaps this is hardly surprising since the Otatara Tauiwi founders named two of the outlying rural areas after these English cities. Te Tai Poutini initially had many Irish connections according to kōrero-a-waha with Kai Tahu of that place and a number of my own whānau from that coast are descendants of Irish Catholics (taku mōhio). Those from Canterbury, on the other hand, are Anglican or Ratana while those from Otago and Southland who are not Ratana have tended to be Wesleyan after the earliest Missionaries, rather than Presbyterian after the Scottish settlers.

The initial influences of Tauiwi upon our people came from sealers and whalers and then from missionaries such as Wohlers and Watkin (taku mōhio). Our ancestors were not gardeners in the same way as were some of the Northern Iwi at the time of the arrival of the potato. Instead, Kai Tahu continued with their traditional form of mahika kai, although they are known to have planted potatoes near these sites and main Kaik (see Anderson 1998: 5). From these Kaik they traded their various types of food with whalers and sealers before the officially organised settlement (Anderson 1998: 5). Such practices are attested to in greater detail in a later chapter. Their landscapes therefore, altered little, as did their use of the land and sea, before colonisation even after some decades of contact with Tākata Bola.

In examining outside influences upon Kai Tahu, the research concentrated mostly on changing perceptions of land use in Britain and, the idea of what landscape was in England in particular, as opposed to Scotland, Ireland or Wales. This is because it was from England that colonial policies pertaining to New Zealand and her successful settlement were derived. It was from those Houses of Parliament that government policies had earlier affected changes in land ownership and landscape use in Scotland and Ireland. For the Irish, famine caused by the potato blight added to their struggle even for basic survival, facts of which are well

36 I make no comment on the validity or otherwise of this statement since I am not qualified to judge the
documented and, it is thought that up to one million died as a result of the famine (Palmer 1964). Between 1847 and 1861 more than two million Irish immigrated to many parts of the world taking with them a “bitter prejudice against the British” (Palmer 1964: 164). Scottish highlanders had had a less than perfect historical connection with the British due to the “clearances” there which continued even after the arrival of the first Scottish settlers to Otago and Southland in 1848 (Grant [1961] 1989; Prebble 1963). Urban squalor resulting from industrialism and the failure of staple crops conspired, so that together in a less than 40-year span it was possible to see “a fifth to one quarter of the total population crowded in” the ill-prepared Clyde Valley in extremely sub-standard accommodation (Otago Daily Times Special Edition March 23 1998: 12). It is small wonder that many of the Scottish settlers who went to Te Wāipounemunu desired to own land from which they could never be evicted in favour of sheep. From these, we turn to the first settlers to Te Wāipounemunu from Polynesia.

LANDSCAPE BEHAVIOURS ON TE WĀIPOUNEMU:

THE FIRST COLONISTS

Though the first settlers from Polynesia were “an agricultural people their derivation from tropical ancestors [supposedly] disadvantaged them enormously” in Aotearoa and Te Wāipounemunu (Flannery 1994: 336). Olssen (1984: 1) states that “the material culture in the early (1100 AD) period firmly links the southern Māori to eastern Polynesia.” The new environments were not always if ever, consistent with these first settlers’ needs. The crops that they had brought with them failed to survive in the much colder climates of Te Wāipounemunu in particular, where the kumera would not grow south of Horomakaka (Banks Peninsula). The kumera (Kai Tahu original spelling of kumara) became an annual in Aotearoa and certain areas of Te Wāipounemunu. Here in the south where it was successfully grown it
required harvesting before frosts killed it. The tubers produced on the vines were also very small in comparison to similar varieties grown in tropical Polynesia or South America (Flannery 1994: 337). This was to be the reverse with the flora and fauna that was brought by the settlers from Britain for it survived and thrived in the warmer than homeplace climate, becoming in many instances noxious.

Olssen states that Māori of Murihiku (the southern Te Wāipounemenu area from South of the Waitaki or Rakitata [depending on whom one consults regarding boundaries] and according to others from South Canterbury to Otago and Southland) moved around their rohe with great confidence, “exploiting the rich resources” of the area (Olssen 1984: 1). However, before proceeding with the first colonisations of Te Wāipounemenu it is necessary to provide the Mana whenua history of it and how its landscapes first came into being. Thus we begin with one of Kai Tahu’s creation stories. This version of creation is one passed on to me from my elders and may vary slightly or even significantly from other versions. The differences merely make each unique, but no less tika since these are our stories. The differences are usually in emphasis, rather than content though it may also vary.

**ĀORAKI IN OUR LANDSCAPE**

It is correct to begin anything to do with our history with our Iwi pepehā that stress the importance to us of Āoraki, since he is central to our creation stories. One of these stories that is to do with him provides an explanation from a Kai Tahu perspective of particular areas of the South Island’s “major geological and geographical features” (Tau et al 1990: 4.12). According to Kai Tahu history, Papatuānuku was not the first wife of Rakinui. The mother of Āoraki and his brothers was Te Pōkohārua o te Pō (also known as Pōharua o te Pō). Āoraki and his brothers decided to undertake a heke (journey) to view Rakinui’s new wife

---

37 Olssen provides a good map on the page facing p.1 in his 1984 text of Otago's history.
Papatūānuku. While travelling through the dark southern ocean, hunger overtook them. They were unsuccessful in catching fish, so decided that they would return to Rakinui. The karakia needed to launch their massive waka was undertaken by Āoraki, but because of the fearful cries from his crew, he temporarily lost strength and faltered at a crucial moment before finishing the section of karakia that would have separated them and their waka from Papatūānuku.\(^{38}\) The only part of the waka to be successfully raised from Papa’s watery surface was the ihu (bow), while the centre and Murihiku (the stern) remained fast in the grip of the dark southern seas. As the errors in the karakia recitation worsened, te ihu o te waka crashed upon Papatūānuku splintering and fragmenting into what is now seen as the multitude of islands in the Marlborough sounds of northern Te Wāipounenu. The area is also known as Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka a Māui, (named so by the northern Iwi who live there and who call Te Wāipounenu, Te Waka a Māui). Kai Tahu kōrero pūrākau have Māui fishing up Aotearoa, but this is some very long time after the journey of Āoraki mā.

During the heke of Āoraki mā, it is said that on the whati (breaking) of the waka the travellers, who included the brothers of Āoraki, were forced to climb on to the west side that was uppermost to save themselves from being drowned. I whakakōhatutia e ratou me ta ratou waka (canoe and all on board were turned into stone), thus forming the first mauka (plural) of Te Wāipounenu named Te Tiritiri i te Moana or the Southern Alps. The highest peak on Te Waka o Āoraki is Āoraki, while the Southern Alps are the many others of his crew who were on the waka including the brothers, Rakirua, Rakiroa, Rarakiroa. They, like he, were all rakatira of note in their own right. That waka Te Waka o Āoraki became the South Island and it was from the place now known as Te Taumata-a-Māui on Banks Peninsula that Māui later stood when he fished up Aotearoa. Hence we have one of the first renamings of Te Wāipounenu as Te Waka a Māui. Dacker (1990: 18), under the heading “Te Timataka­-Beginnings,” notes that there are variations in the story of Āoraki, his journey here and the

\(^{38}\) Dacker attributes the mistake in the karakia to many in the canoe (Dacker 1990: 18).
breaking of the canoe. He also has another proposal for the identity of Āoraki in the Arai te Uru waka story. Here he names the waka on which Māui made his journey to Te Wāipounemū as Mahānui and adds, that, “many features of the landscape were named after this journey” (Dacker 1990: 18). Dacker’s book also recites the story of the journey of the waka, Te Uruao and the feats of Rakaihautu, while lastly the book tells a little of the heke o te Waka Takitimu ki Te Wāipounemū. The basic information is all there, but there are a number of variations from Dacker’s interviewees. There are differences in the spelling of Hawaiki/Kawaiki, Pōkohārua te Pō/Pōharua i Te Pō/Pōharua i Te Pō occur the naming of the “ko” of Rakaihautu as either Tuhiraki39 in Tau (1999b: 17.2), Te Whakaroria in Dacker (1990: 18) or Tu Whakaroria in Davis, O'Regan and Wilson (1990: 91). Despite these variations in spelling or naming of places, the actual kōrero pūrākau in regard to the contents within the pūrākau are fairly consistent with one another. So we return to that of Āoraki.

At the time of the aitua i ruka i te Waka o Āoraki (the catastrophe), Tau mā state that the landscape of Te Wāipounemū was stark, rocky, totally “devoid of life, fresh water and other features” required “for the successful establishment of human life” (Te M. Tau et al 1990: 4.35). These authors go on to tell how the deities extended great aroha ki te Tākata through intervention, while the creation of life forms that resulted from the coupling of Rakinui (Raki) and Papatuānuku (Papa) peopled the land. The stories of Raki and Papa which are well documented elsewhere, need only basic documenting here, though a Kai Tahu understanding of their separation is mentioned in a very shortened form here, after an introductory explanation of Raki and his first wife. These explanations resemble others from various parts of Te Wāipounemū, and are used here largely because they are the most publicly available written sources from Tau mā (1990) and less publicly through a symposium earlier in 1999 from Tau (1999a and 1999b). Since the author comes from Kaiapoi and lives in Christchurch,

39 Other versions of this account have the place in which Rakaihautu planted his “kō”(formerly called Pūhai) as Tuhiraki or Tuhirangi, known in English as Mt Bossu, while the “Kō” itself is known also Tu Whakarōria (see citations included in main text and taku mōhio).
the kōrero he narrates are mostly about landscapes that surround that area. Therefore, many though not all of the names that are mentioned by him are of his particular ancestral landscapes, where he uses whānau and hapū stories with which he has direct connections. Conversely all those places and people to whom Dacker refers are occasionally from South Canterbury, but more usually from Otago and Southland because of the connections he has there through his wife and on his own behalf, with the people of those areas.

LANDSCAPE AND OTHER ELEMENTAL CONNECTIONS

The Kai Tahu relationship with the Canterbury landscape starts with Raki's first wife Pōkohārua o Te Pō, the source of all winds, incantations and tapu. Thus the origins of the natural world commenced with the wind or hau--the breath of life. To Māori, “hau” is the “vitality of man” and the “vital essence of the land.” From Raki's union with Pōkohārua o Te Pō came Uru Te Maha, a name that literally means “The Source of the Westerly Winds.” From this source came Tawhirimātea and eventually Te Mauru, who is known by many Kai Tahu as the North West wind. The genealogy of this wind is as follows:

Te Hau Kai Tākata Whakapapa 1:

Te Hau Kai Tākata Raki e tu nei (Heavens) __ __ Pōkohārua o Te Pō

Uru Te Maha (Source of the Winds from the West)

Tawhirimātea

Te Mauru e taki nei (North West Wind)

(in Tau 1999a: 3).
Raki e tu nei           Pokoharu a Te Pō

Uru Te Maha           Raka Maomao

Tawhirimātea           Tiu

Te Haakuetipu         Te Operuaraki

Te Mauru e taki nei

Punui o toka          Te Puaitaha

(T. E. Green nd: 459).

The Nor’West wind, rather than a more usual landmark, has been used as a starting point. The
name Te Mauru e taki nei tells us that this wind blew from the mountain Maungatere or
Mount Grey, who dominates the North Canterbury region. Tauiwi farmers in particular are
said to know very well the impact that that wind has on the region. Even some of their
landscape paintings confirm this point. The significance of the wind for Kai Tahu is
evidenced in the proverbial naming of it as, “Te Hau Kai Tangata”—“The Wind that devours
Humankind” (taku mōhio). A whakapapa of how Kāi Tahu ordered meteorological events is
charted in Whakapapa 1 above while greater detail of the various winds is seen in Whakapapa
2 which follows it.

Rakamaomao was the group of winds that came from both the north and south, while Te
Pu nui o Te Toka is the Southerly (M. Orbell 1995: 146). Puaitaha is the Southwest wind.
Rakamaomao's child Tiu is the northern wind (H. Williams 1975:426) and Te Ope Ruaraki translates as “The grouping of winds from the north.” The north-easterly in Kai Tahu is known as “whakarua” (taku mōhio; Beattie 1994: 196-200). Uru Te Maha and Rakamaomao are then the origins from which the winds are sourced according to their different directions.

The genealogies above clearly show how through our culture we have ordered our world within a framework of kinship. The Nor’ West wind does not hold a significant place in other tribal groups within New Zealand. For Kai Tahu of Canterbury in particular, this wind has always dominated the landscape and such a powerful phenomenon had to be ordered by way of whakapapa. Tau asks if perhaps ethnographers like Malinowski may perhaps have stated that such was evidence of a myth evolving with the community? The wind as used here is used in order to clearly show how the landscape cannot be taken in isolation or be separated from all the other strands that connect with it and the elements we experience as part of it that bind us as whānau and hapū, within a much larger framework, that of Iwi kinship. Thus, within the epistemological understandings of Kai Tahu, the Nor’West wind is linked to the mountains that line the Canterbury skyline and us, in the same way we are all connected with our human relations and our elemental ones. All the above are similarly connected with each other through whakapapa. Mt Grey, our Maungatere is connected with the Nor’ west wind. The battle proverb of Moko was recited to state his connection to Maungatere and the North West wind. Its content states this connection.

Ai e Moko a Hautere
I am Moko, Moko, son of Hautere

te hau te tuku mai runga a Maunga
The wind sent from the peaks of
Maungatere

tere te tangata i whangaia ki te manga
I am the warrior nurtured on the flesh of the
shark

(in Tau 1999a: 3).
We are told that Moko delivered his proverb at all times prior to entering into a battle. Here Moko states his connection to the landscape from which he came by the reference he makes to Maungatere, while his reference to the Nor'West wind informed any opposing warrior that Moko was the harbinger of death (Tau 1999a: 3).

The link between the Nor’West wind and death continues to exist within Kai Tahu beliefs as demonstrated in this 1976 Wairemana Pitama composition at the death of her son.

I te whitinga o te Ra
Kowhuiwhui ana te Pipiwharauroa
I roto i te ngahere Kui kui kui
me te pupuhi o te hau Maungatere
me te aroha a o tamariki o teina

With the crossing of the son
The Shining Cuckoo flutters in the forest
Lamenting and chanting Kui kui kui
and the wind of Maungatere flows to you
with the love of your children and your
brothers and sisters
and your mother
You are our precious child, now revered as the Tiki Pounamu.

E takoto mai nei
me o tipuna matua
I Te Uruti
Nou te hiahia kia haere
Takoto mai i to moengaroa
Waiho matau i muri nei
Tangihotuhotu ai
Aue aue Te Mamae e e

Lie here
with your ancestors
Within the womb of Te Uruti
Yours was the desire to travel
Rest peacefully
We are left behind
Sobbing and crying
the pain cuts

(in Tau 1999a: 6-7)

Tuahuriri Kai Tahu beliefs about the Nor’West wind, Maungatere, Moko and the connection to death all provide clear understandings of the way in which myth and history are
both buried within and inseparable from the Kai Tahu landscape. Even as the wind from Maungatere is linked to death, the mountain itself is also connected with life by way of Raki's wife Papatuanuku. According to the Tuahiwi understanding of things, tradition alleges that the pool *Te Wai Ora a Tāne* was on Maungatere. There are similar beliefs and places elsewhere in Te Wāipounenu; one originating from Moturata where they have Te Wai Ora that is sited near Blackhead. This place is known as te Wai Ora o Tinirau, he being the guardian of that place and the Taieri area generally (P. Carter: kōrero-a-waha). That place is also known by many as one of our local equivalents to the northern rereka wairua (the leaping place of the spirits) of Te Reinga (taku mōhio).

Translation of *Te Wai Ora a Tāne*, "The Life Giving Waters of Tāne" brings us back to the Kai Tahu kōrero of Raki and Papa. The origin of it comes from the ill-fated union of Rakinui and Papatuanuku. Kai Tahu kōrero pūrākau states that Raki had an illicit affair with Papa in the absence of her husband Takaroa, (or Tangaroa in the North) who is the kaitiaki of the oceans. When Takaroa returned to discover this affair, he challenged Raki to a battle with spears, during which the latter was speared through his thighs (some accounts say it was the buttocks). The wounds caused Raki to remain lying wounded and prone upon Papatuanuku. In this weakened and prostrate state the early offspring that these two begot were either ill or deformed. However, the last child of this union was *Te Wai Ora a Tāne*, in whose name is signified the return to health and well being.

With the creation of these healing waters of Tāne comes the explanation of the moon sinking in to these waters at each cycle's completion where it would be replenished. As is the case with other Polynesian cultures the moon is a further reference point to the menstruation cycle of wāhine which is still referred to by many as their "marama" (the word in Māori also for the "moon"). For many Kai Tahu, this Wai Ora o Tāne is where human life is restored and the sick are once more healed (M. Beckwith 1970: 73). Such a view and its relationship with a mountain is no different from that of other Iwi, for Tuhoe state that their mountain advises:
Hokia ki ngā maunga kia purea koe e ngā hau a Tawhiri-matea.

Return to the mountains and there be cleansed by the winds of Tawhiri-matea (T. Karetu in M. King 1975: 38).

Maungatere as a mountain of note or importance is not unique in this way since all Kai Tahu mountains are claimed by whānau as ancestral and each is seen as a place where clarity of vision and purpose are able to be experienced.

Nonetheless, what can be learned from this kōrero and that of Tāne earlier in the chapter, is that Iwi did not separate their landscapes from their atua. Atua, Tāne, Rakinui and Papatuānuku never did and do not now live in some primeval past hidden behind a shaded veil. On the contrary, they were constantly present before the people. “The earth, sky and their descendants (trees, stars etc.) were the atua, while the primal homeland of Māori, Hawaiki, where the gods lived and carried out their deeds, was not solely located in a distant land beyond the reach of the people” (Tau 1999a: 6). The landscapes of Hawaiki, where the deities walked and carried out their deeds, were also the places and landscapes where people lived and undertook theirs. Maungatere is but one example of a landmark that has multiple perceptions for both Iwi and ethnographer in the same way as does Āoraki. Likewise, many other so-called “mythical” ancestors have mauri that are embedded and embodied in mauka or other landscape markers. Maungatere, like Āoraki was tapu and is still conceived of in such terms. Kai Tahu, nonetheless, gathered food from Maungatere, fought near it and carried out a number of rituals upon it. The relationship to the Iwi who live under is also difficult to understand today by outsiders, namely that it remains a centre point in which is encompassed a community's relationship with the environment, both visible and invisible.

This epistemological perception of the world occurs for Kai Tahu this way because oral traditions were not told as historical narratives and Iwi were not concerned with confirming
their beliefs as “truths” through the imposition of historical particulars important to the modern mind (Tau 1999a: 7). Tau and other participants interviewed, stated that “truths” are often no more than a trick of the mind. This can especially be so in relation to “the ordering of time and space--the starting and end points of history and geography” (Tau 1999a: 47). The type of need where it seems essential to locate events in time and space (location) is almost a wholly Western trait. A Western conceptualisation of the traditions in the Old and New Testaments is an indication of differing perceptions between location and time and the fundamental difference in the way that Iwi and Tauiwi perceive their landscapes and their past.

Kai Tahu have further kōrero pūrākau of other feats by atua that transformed the landscapes of Te Waipounemu. Some of these were undertaken for particular reasons. One such undertaking was done so that Āoraki, his brothers, the crew on the Waka as well as their uri (descendants) would no longer have barrenness to perpetually surround them. The deeds of Raki and Papa and others such as Rakaihautu, attest to the beautification of Te Waipounemu.

Meanwhile, the bounties with which Papatuānuku became endowed demonstrate the generosity and aroha of the atua responsible for the clothing and beautification of her. They and other atua made the landscape of Te Waipounemu fit for human habitation. The next mentioned person is an uri of the Iwi Waitaha and their waka Te Uruao and his name is Rakaihautu.

The whakapapa of Rakaihautu and Waitaha in Te Waipounemu is as follows:

Awe-a-raki
Te Aweawe
Te Whatu
Te Whatuhunahuna
Te Whatu karokarō

Te Whatu ariki

Te Whatu karokata (name of a peak in the Southern Alps)

Tāne Auroa (name of the mountain near Wanaka)

Titi tea (name of Crown Range)

Turu (name of Diamond Lake)

Orau (name of Cadrona River)

Ari (name of head of Whakatipu)

Takaha (beach at Glenavy)

Te Waireika (name of Gentle Annie Creek)

Tokopa (name of range on West Coast)

Koroiko (name of Roaring Meg Creek)

Te Papapuni (name of Nevis River)

Tatawhe (name near Ben Nevis)

Toromikimiki (name of Kawarau Gorge)

Tahauri (name of Mount near Kawarau)

Tamaipi (name near Otaraia)

Roko Te Whatu (name near Waimate)

Kawarau (name of well known river)

Parapara (name near Hawea)

Waimeha (name of Waimea Plains)

Te Karetu (name of place near Mataura Falls)

Tamaipi (name of place near Mataura Falls)

Waiwhero (now called Waiwera-in Otago)

Kahuwera (now called Kaiwera)
Taraia (now called Otaraia)

Te Urumoeanu Uruwera (name of Lake George at Colac)


Waitaha tradition and whakapapa show a people segmenting the landscape into a kind of genealogical order similar to that employed by the Vikings at roughly the same time they were colonising Iceland, according to Tau (1999b: 28.1). The planting of whakapapa over the landscape had a twofold effect where it: a) acted as an external cultural marker upon the mind and at the same time, b) made sure that the land became the Tupuna. This was the first act of the colonising of nature by culture (Tau 1999b: 29). The first settlers who occupied Te Wāipounemū, the Waitaha, carried out this ritual.

Though many of my participants and I know the korero purakau of the preceding and following narratives, I have chosen to cite Tau mā since those written works are closest to, though not always the same, as my own. Such citation also permits any readers of this project to use Tau mā as written sources to consult should they require them, to verify the Kai Tahu versions of creation and other important happenings. This is done since our pūrākau differ from what have become the “standard Māori version” of creation.

RAKAIHAUTU IN THE WAITAHA LANDSCAPE

Rakaihautu was the founding ancestor of the tribe Waitaha and it was he who took charge of the canoe Uruao, that led the migration of this tribe to New Zealand from their ancient homeland, Patunui o Aio. Kai Tahu records tell us that when the Uruao landed at Whakatū in Nelson, Rakaihautu took his party inland using his “kō,” Tuhiraki to gouge out all the major lakes of Te Wāipounemū. Some of these lakes were Pūkaki, Takapō (Tekapo),

40 Te Maire Tau has used Tuhiraki which is a little different from other interpretations as that was the name given to the mauka into which the “Kō” was planted or thrust at the mutuka o kā mahi a Rakaihautu. However this merely makes it a variation on other pūrākau.
Whakamatau (Coleridge), Moana Rua (Pearson), Kuramea (Catlins), Whakarukumoana (McGregor), Ohau, Hawea, Wanaka, Wakatipu-wai māori (Wakatipu), Wakatipu-wai-tai, Manawapōpōre/Hikuraki (Mavora Lakes), Te Ana-au (Te Anau or Teanau), Moturau (Manapōuri) and others. Rakaihautu with Tuhiraki’s assistance undertook his most significant deeds in Piopiotahi (Whiowhiotahi Fiordland) where he carved out the lakes known by Iwi as “Kā Puna Wai Karikari o Rakaihautu” (The Burrowed Springs of Rakaihautu). During his heke over the landscapes that he helped create, Rakaihautu left spiritual guardians at te Awa Waiau, and, while on Bank's Peninsula, he planted his “ko” into the landscape in an area now known as (Tuhiraki) and also as Mt. Bossu. Tribal traditions finish this pūrākau by telling us, Ko Rakaihautu te Takata, nana i timata ai ka ahi i ruka i ēnei motu--“It was Rakaihautu who lit the fires of occupation upon this Island.” That kōrero pūrākau also tells us that the land belongs to Waitaha by right of discovery.

It is not simply the kōrero that enforces this perception; it is also the landscape. The early Waitaha virtually consecrated the land by ritual with their whakapapa. The whakapapa of Waitaha recorded earlier shows how this tribe imposed its whakapapa upon the Southern landscape as a kind of nomenclature by means of genealogy. Thus, as I have stated in the first chapter, archetypal images from Polynesian mythology were brought here and planted across the Te Tai a Mahaanui landscape (Canterbury) and throughout the entire rohe pōtae of Kai Tahu in Te Waipounenui.

However, the laying of myth upon the land did not occur in isolation or outside of the day-to-day domestic activities of the people. While in one sense the oral traditions acted as an ordering tool for the minds of the people, they also had a functional and utilitarian purpose—namely the management of the land and its resources, mahika kai. Mahika kai as identity is discusses in greater detail in the next chapter, Te Tuarima. Thus I have established some small part only, in the creation of the landscapes of Te Waipounenui, the way in which early
Tauiwi conceptualised their landscapes and the human peopling of these. I will now look at their actions upon the landscapes and reactions to them.

KO KĀ TĀKATA ME A MĀTOU KAI

Te Rapuwai\(^{1}\) were the first fully human inhabitants of Te Waka o Āoraki (the South Island) according to some Kai Tahu whakapapa. Olssen mentions those of “Kahiu [sic]-tipua” of the Arai te Uru waka and Te Waka Huruhurumanu both of who are considered spirit-type waka by some. However, a waiata based on an ancient Waitaha karakia, had a raki (tune) composed by David O’Connell of Arowhenua and Taumutu (taku mōhio). This raki was made in order for the Iwi to both “preserve and rekindle our ancient Waitaha pūrākau that explains the migrations of our tupuna across” Te Moananui a Kiwa to Te Wāipounenu, according to the description in a Kai Tahu waiata booklet (R. Paraone 1998: 16). In the seventeenth to the nineteenth stanzas, it is stated that the Iwi aboard the waka were “Te Kahui Tipua, Te Kahui Roko, Te Kahui Waitaha” (in Te Hao Tahupotiki 1998:16 -17). Thus we have three separate though related Iwi aboard this waka, the second of which is given no mention by Western scholars or others, except for that referred to in the Waitaha whakapapa within the ancient karakia cited above.

It is then, Te Rapuwai (also spelled Rabuwai) who are said by various writers or ethnographers to be the next set of colonisers of Te Wāipounenu after that of Āoraki mā. It is also Te Rapuwai who are said to have had few existing root-type species such as the kumera or taro and who learned to make maximum use of aruhe (bracken fern), and kāuru and the many other foods derived from the tī kouka (Cordyline australis) (Flannery (1994: 336; Anderson 1983: 27; Olssen 1984: 2). Edward Shortland in 1844 stated that:

---

\(^1\) See Hulme (1989: 89) who begins whakapapa with Te Kahui-o-Rapuwai; also Anderson (1983 (reprint 1985: 7); Goodall and Griffiths (1980: 5) who mention Katikura as arriving after Rapuwai; and Olssen (1984: 1) who mentions the Kahuitipua [sic] (ghosts or giants).
The natives have learned to dig it [ti] at the season when it contains [maximum sugar]. They then bake, or rather steam it in their ovens. On cooking the sugar is partly crystallized [and] found with other matter between the root [fibres], which are easily separated [for its extrication] (cited in A. Anderson 1983: 27).

Besides ti and aruhe, there was ample protein provided for the first settlers by sea and forest birds (including the moa), fish and seals. Anderson (1983: 27) states that a combination of some of these foods, such as ti, aruhe and fishing, were what formed the basic economy during this (the middle) time period in the Murihiku area.

Regardless of which strand of whakapapa is used, arā Ko wai kā tākata i tae mai i te toka o Te Wāipounemutai we tuatahi both Te Kāhui o Rapuwai and Waitaha were said to have hunted moa and seals. The latter tribe is believed to have fired the forests of Kā Mania Whakatekateka o Waitaha (the Canterbury Plains) which brought about the final extinction of the moa (Anderson 1983: 7; Olssen 1984 1-2; Evison 1993: 4, 15). According to W. Tipa of Moeraki though (1995: kōrero-a-waha), Waitaha history as narrated to him said that it was meteorites landing that caused these fires, which were said by some to have burned for as long as thirty years and over which our tupuna had no control. This kōrero stated that Waitaha were unable to control the fires, thought by them to have resulted from the ire of one of their deities, who then directed the meteorite to land on their whenua. Anderson, on the other hand, suggests that tradition states Te Rapuwai and Waitaha were responsible, and that Matiaha Tiramorehu may have been alluding to this fact when he talked of “making the land open” (Anderson 1983: 26). Others I have interviewed do not read the making of the land open to denote Waitaha had fired the forests, but rather that the fences of the settlers closed off mahika kai sites. It was the loss of access by Kai Tahu to their kai to which Tiramorehu

42 For an extensive bibliography on Ti as a Kai Tahu (and other Iwi) food source, see Jim Williams’ 1996 MA thesis, Ko te Kohika Turuturu, pp. 101-108.
alluded (Anon.: 1999: kōrero-a-waha). Whether the fires were assisted by Waitaha who in turn caused the extinction of the moa may never be accurately known, but that is the pūrākau as narrated to Tipa. Anderson states that, “over-exploitation was [not] the only cause [for] moa decline [so too was] the retreat of the forest from the lowland areas, the only large open grassy areas being in Uruwhenua44 (Central Otago) and the Manuhune (Mackenzie) which lay above 1000-1200m” (Anderson 1983: 25-26; Olssen 1984: 2).

From the middle period the loss of moa and seals as a readily accessible food, apart from the few places listed in Anderson (1983: 27), meant that Kaik (permanent settlements) became less permanent as the Iwi became more mobile and their material culture was affected. Fishing off shore brought the main protein food source to the pre-Kai Tahu Iwi from around 1500, although they also seasonally hunted whio (ducks) and tītī (muttonbirds) (Anderson 1984: 26, Evison 1993: 3, 15. and Olssen 1984: 2). Olssen though, has a slight date variation. The ability to access deep water fisheries at the correct time of the season so that the fish could be preserved through drying was essential to the survival of Waitaha and the Iwi who came and fought or married in to them, Kāti Māmoe.45 The type of food gathering that developed was possible as a result of the adaptability of the descendants of the moa hunters. They became a very mobile people whose hapū structure allowed for user and gatherer rights for particular foods to be shared, but still accessed largely through whakapapa (Dacker 1990: 16; Dacker 1994 : 8). This too is more thoroughly discussed in the chapter on

43 The informants who argued against Anderson's interpretation have te reo and have read kōrero in Māori on what Tiramorehu thought. They therefore believe that Anderson is incorrect in his assumptions in this instance since he does not have te reo and has made his judgement based on an English interpretation of what it is thought Tiramorehu was suggesting. However, in respect for Anderson's knowledge and position in the academic arena, they have asked to remain anonymous as sources in this thesis, so as not to appear to be undermining his work and worth in any way. They did however state that face to face they might be prepared to discuss this with Anderson.

44 Uruwhenua is a variation on the original name for the Central Otago area (J.Williams 1998: kōrero-a-waha). According to William Tihope Spencer, in Beattie Ms MSS82/E/20, p.20, (Hocken Library) the name is Whenuahuhu. The comment is, “Central Otago was known as Whenuahuhu as the poorer parts of it look stripped and bare.” Uruwhenua is also the name of a place in the Nelson province.

45 Tikao though stated in his narrations to Beattie, that in kā kōrero-i-nehe-rā that he had been given, the Māmoe who came to Te Wāipounamu were not from the northern Iwi of Ahuriri (Napier), but had come direct from Hawaiki (Tikao in Beattie [1935] 1990: 57-59).
mahika kai, as is identity, since for Kai Tahu such a concept was similar to and part of that of
identity and landscape.

KĀ TĀTAI O KAI TAHU KI TE WĀIPOUNEMU

By the seventeenth century, northern Iwi had knowledge of the Southern Waitaha
resources and, as stated above, Kāti Māmoe from the north had already begun to migrate from
the North Island and settle among the southern people. Waitaha had taken on some of the
Māmoe hapū and many other names that may still be found on the landscapes and in the
people of Te Wāipounemu. Regardless of their origin, which continues to be debated, the next
inward heke (migration) was from a hapū of Kahungunu called Kai (Ngāi) Tahu. These Tahu
people are said to have come south in three separate heke for the resources of the south, the
pounemu (greenstone) being one of the most sought after (Evison 1993: 47, 73; Dacker 1990:
8-13; Anderson 1983: 44; Olssen 1984: 4). The southern landscapes as well as pounemu
yielded many treasures that were unavailable to Iwi in the north. Despite the greater climatic
and topographic extremes, the resources on Te Waka o Āoraki became like the pounemu,
extremely desirable. Both Te Waka and Āoraki were and continue to be for us, the beginning
and ending of our lives on the landscapes of Te Wāipounemu. Just as Āoraki then is
representative of the beginnings of whakapapa on Te Wāipounemu, so too he is the departing
point for us when we die. As such, he is referred to at takiaue (funerals), as the spirits of our
dead are asked to pause there “and look back at us to acknowledge our crying for them before
their final journeying to Hawaiki Nui” (taku mōhio; Tau mā 1989: 4.36). Before their final
journey to Te Reinga and the leaping place of Te Rereka Wairua the dead may obtain their
bearings from atop Āoraki in order to successfully seek all points needed to undertake this
final heke. Thus Āoraki becomes the “first stepping stone from which the soul departs from
the world of the living, [and] just as [he] is a tao[k]a of Kai Tahu whānui, so too are other
mountains standing within Te Tiritiri o Te Moana and elsewhere on Te Waka o Āoraki” (tuku mōhio; Tau mā 1989: 4.36).

There are many reasons for this, not the least of which is that these alps and other areas of significance to Kai Tahu serve as maps of the mind for us, into which we are able to situate ourselves both individually and collectively. The alps were also (and for some of the oldest fishers amongst us continue to be) visible markers on the landscape that guide the fishers to their wāhi hī ika (fishing grounds). Land heke used the mauka as signposts or focal points in the same way as Tauiwi used the compass. They were then able to get a direct fix from which to set further points of recognition or places of departure. This they did for the many types of trails across the landscapes of Te Wāipounamu as well as the sea. Te Tiritiri o Te Moana were markers whether for mahika kai resources, tiki pounemu (greenstone collecting), kaihaukai (food-gift exchanging), which I discuss further in Chapter six. The mauka were used to travel for pakanga or whawhai (wars/battles), were referred to at takiaue and other hui. The name Tiritiri o te Moana was also known as “the frothing waters of Te Wāipounamu” at the time the karakia referred to in the waiata whakapapa mentioned above originated (O'Connell 1998: 16-17). I have based all this information of Te Tiritiri o Te Moana as a map, on tuku mōhio (personal knowledge) and the sources I cite. As compass reference points, the alps are especially important from the perspective of fishermen whose tales many of us have been told. These include stories on or around their landscapes while at sea and are generally of escapades they have undertaken or survived when things have gone wrong. Such stories of the area are no less true of those who continued to undertake annual heke across our landscapes and whose knowledge of the places and their importance to Kai Tahu, were taoka tuku iho i kā wā i mua (treasures from times past). They remain as treasures for us aianei, me a kā wā a muri ake (now and in future times). All pūrākau and other histories may be easily sourced in

42 Even Western terminology refers to places where fishing takes place at sea as “grounds.” This is despite them being watery in substance.
part or in full with slight variations in other works. These include Tau mā (1990), Tau (1999a and 1999b), Dacker (1990 and 1994), Davis, O'Regan and Wilson (1990), Durie mā, (1987, 1992), D. O'Connell (1998), Kai Tahu and their researchers through WAI#27 (from 1987 through to 1992). Copies of WAI#27 and most of the other sources may be found in many public and university libraries throughout Te Wāipounamu. Evison has aspects of certain of these kōrero in his various works on Kai Tahu, beginning with his MA thesis in the 1950s through to his more recent works of the 1980s and 1990s. However, before any attempt is made to understand an Iwi world perception and its epistemology, it is better for Iwi to understand how Tauiwi developed and evolved in their perceptions of the world and the landscapes upon it and how and why that understanding differs from the understandings of Kai Tahu.

**IWI AND WESTERN CULTURAL BELIEF COMPARISONS**

One of the best examples found for this research of the West which in any way resembles a Māori perception of the landscape, is with the Viking and Early Germanic cultures. The Viking settlers of Iceland supposedly mythologised the landscape by a process called *landnama* (land claiming). Many of the early explorers worshipped Thor and throughout Iceland there are twenty place names that bear the name. These sites were more than historical memory aids--they were sanctuaries dedicated to their god. According to the *Landnámabók* by Ari Thorgilsson (1076-1148), a priest who recorded Iceland history wrote that a chieftain of South Western Norway called Hrólfr kept a temple dedicated to Thor and renamed himself, Thórólfr (E. O. G. Turville-Petre 1964: 86-89). Sometime in 884, Thórólfr immigrated to Iceland and he took the timber of his temple and the soil with him to his new homeland. On seeing the new land, Thórólfr threw the timber into the sea as a means of
establishing his homeplace where the timber beached (Turville-Petre 1964: 88-9). Not only did Thórólfr believe that Thór had guided the timber, he also believed that Thór was in the timber. On his land, Thórólfr built his new temple with the old timber and proclaimed the land holy to his god.

The consecration of land to the gods was not done merely through the erection of a temple; instead the land itself was made holy to the gods of Nordic mythology. Ásbjörn Reykjetilsson took possession of a wooded region in Iceland, dedicated it to Thor and called it Thór's Forest (Lóðsmörk) (Turville-Petre 1964: 87). In other words, the early Viking settlers of Iceland were carrying out the pre-Christian tradition of consecrating the spirit of their gods into the forests and groves of the land in which they lived. Temples and strict areas of worship were not needed, even though they existed. The place names of Iceland are not solely historical memory aids. On the contrary, they are cultural icons that implode to other non-secular dimensions, since icons tell us how the people related to the land and the gods-as beings, all be they supernatural for want of a better word. The powers of these deities and spirits dwelt in the groves, mounds, forests and waterfalls. While cultural comparisons can make a writer nervous they may also serve to explain cultural peculiarities. A juxtaposition can be made of the Polynesian tradition of planting a whakapapa onto or over the landscape through taunahataka or takahi whenua, with that of the early Viking explorers who took their gods or Atua with them and consecrated their new lands with sacrifice and a system of land naming-claiming, known as landnama. That is just what Iwi did in relation to the landscapes when they arrived. I do not consider it consistent with our beliefs to confine gods within walls, or to liken them only to the form of any human countenance.

---

48 Te Maire Tau provided me with a paper he had given which has since become a chapter in a book, released in 2000. All of that follows on the Viking beliefs is credited to him.
49 For more detail read Turville-Petre (1964: 86-89).
50 The beliefs of these people were not much different to those of Kai Tahu at the time of the colonisation in Te Wāipounamu. All of the
In the same way as Iwi Māori had imported with them their belief systems centuries before, the settler society from England also brought and imposed cultural systems upon the new landscapes they settled in Aotearoa and Te Wāipounenu. The settlers placed their systems and beliefs upon what they often conceived of as strange and sometimes inhospitable landscapes. For Kai Tahu the landscapes they were on remained the landscapes of their tūpuna who were the very essence of themselves. Once British settlers arrived in numbers, Kai Tahu were thrust into a battle for their very survival, that proved to be even more harsh and unyielding than that which their earliest ancestors had experienced on their arrival in Te Wāipounenu from Hawaiki Nui. The arrival amongst Iwi Māori by these ra wahī groups was fraught with dangers of a new kind as yet not experienced by Iwi and one whose consequences would be felt, even unto the present.

TE HEKE NŌ RĀWAHI: BRITISH ARRIVAL

The last numerically large inward heke were from the British Isles and their final settlement of Te Wāipounenu definitely favoured them. Prince, in discussing the English and Tauiwī landscape perceptions of the late seventeenth early eighteenth century, talks of the urge to experience the “wild,” as the depiction of woods and wild scenery became more desirable (Prince 1988: 107). The formerly idyllic rural landscapes of Britain and Europe, so orderly and so civilised, were now considered to be insipid by comparison with wild and awesome landscapes either there or in the newly colonised countries of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand (Prince 1988: 107).

There are two theories on what might have caused the change in thinking in Europe, England and America to wild or unproductive landscapes. Thomas attributes this change of attitude to the progress that had taken place in English agriculture (1983). The second comes from Cosgrove (1984) where he argued that the changes to English landscape perception
resulted partly from a desire to distract the nation’s thoughts from the obsessive relentlessness of the Napoleonic wars (Cosgrove 1984: 66). Regardless of which is more correct, at the time in question attitudinal changes did occur. Both make comment on a multitude of other possible theories explaining altered landscape perceptions: these include the ready access by many to poetry and other literature and music that extolled nature’s beauties (Simmons 1993: 81-116 and fn 24-82: 186-189), improved communication, navigational techniques and road maps, all of which assisted and facilitated tourist travels; plus a new sense of the aesthetic (Thomas 1983: 261, 264-5, 285-7; Daniels 1988: 52; Evernden 1992: 25-26). Perceptions of the colonial settlers on the wild were tempered, since landscapes of Te Waipounenu required hard work from them to turn wild landscapes into productive ones. It was this work ethic and the ideology that accompanied it which came to dominate the thinking and practices that were undertaken on the new landscapes. This ideology included beliefs on agricultural and pastoral practices that held that taming wild landscapes was essential. These practices and beliefs in turn paved the way for the later formation of a New Zealand identity that is still somewhat mythically portrayed as consisting of a rural do-it-yourself people.

THE WHY OF BEHAVIOURS ON NEW LANDSCAPES

The way colonising people behave upon a landscape is usually governed by their practices upon former ones. This is especially so where those landscapes were in comparable situations. Norton (1989: 80) states that there are nine recognised factors that determine human behaviour towards landscape. These are,

(i) previous experience; (ii) individual characteristics; (iii) the membership of a group; (iv) institutional considerations; (v) goals; (vi) the environment; (vii) interactional links with other groupings; (viii) how the new landscape is perceived and (ix) attitudes.
An important determinant when similar aspirations are followed in the occupation of a new landscape is a familiarity of appearance in the new environment. Another factor in coloniser behaviour upon a new landscape is contained in the notion of the transferring of their existing cultural practices (Norton 1989: 81). Behaviour which is based on previous practices and knowledge is deemed to be appropriate, more particularly if the role of institutions (such as government bodies) is negligible, as was the case at the time of the very first Tāuiwi settlement in Te Wāipounamu.

A similar example was the settling of the American mid-west by the incomers who found that only pockets of infrastructures existed in the most populated areas of America (D. McKean 1999: pers. comm.). Therefore, how one acquired land in the American mid-west was simply to stake a claim to it, whereas in most other early colonial states, one had to purchase land from either government agencies or other sellers the government had designated to act as land agents. In the two decades prior to the 1840 Treaty, most infrastructures had not yet been put in place in what was to become the new colony of New Zealand. 51 In the American mid-west as in parts of New Zealand, it could be clearly seen that when the characteristics of individual members are stronger than those of the group, then these are more prominent in determining goals. This applied for instance, to a number of the New Zealand Company members, the first Governors and many of their employees (such as those alluded to Evison 1997, Orange 1987, Dacker 1984). The accounts, like many others, talk of the power individuals were given to alienate Iwi lands, which seemed to require such persons to have a certain preconceived idea of those they were disenfranchising.

51 For textual accounts that support this, one needs only understand the reasons behind the 1835 Nui Tirene Declaration of Independence by Iwi in the North. It attempted amongst other things, to establish some sort of infrastructure so that lesser elements of Tāuiwi behaviours and land acquisition could be brought under the control of the British since Iwi did not consider it their place to govern the Pākehā. See Orange (1987), Durie (1994). Orange and Durie are not in agreement at all times, which might be put down to one being an etic and the other an emic perception of events. In a 1998 public lecture at Otago University, Manuka Henare stated that prior to the Declaration of Independence, Māori from many tribes had been sending their young men abroad to Europe and America to study political systems operating in these countries. By this time Māori were aware of some of the shortcomings in their social and political systems and the young men's role was to study others' systems and to report on their merits or otherwise, on their return home.
The idea that attitudes contribute to how landscapes are affected is discussed in the behavioural literature of social geographers Lowenthal and Prince in their analysis of the actions of incoming people on new landscapes. They contend that landscapes are created in certain instances by tastes (Lowenthal and Prince 1964: 309-346; Lowenthal and Prince 1965: 186-222). “The eyes that see the colonization frontiers as civilised landscape are eyes structured by a particular kind of visual practice,” where the landscapes are based on ideal types found in rural Europe in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Gow 1996: 43). This helps explain why a deforested landscape was often perceived as the most ideal type. Once land becomes a deforested and reconstructed landscape, its conceptualisation is derived from an economic mode of production that rationalises a need for reconstituting its appearance to give it a civilised look (Gow 1996: 43-44). Barnes and Duncan note how landscape may be conceived of in economic terms as well as in ideological, political, industrial and natural wonder terms (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 5; Simmons 1993: 77). Depending on how landscape and land ownership are conceptualised, the behaviour employed to recreate a particular landscape will be influenced by its present or intended future economic use and the consequent expected added value that such action, or lack of action, will place upon it.

**HUMANISTIC LANDSCAPES**

A totally different component to how a landscape is evaluated is the humanistic one. Here, social and cultural forces are said to influence human perception. Glacken (1985: 46-57) identified four interrelated areas regarding nature that include, but are not confined to: environment as cause; morphology which may be unconvincing as an account of landscape since it ignores a certain symbolic and cultural meaning invested in it by those who have produced and sustained it; humankind as modifier of nature; subjective attitudes to nature and,
from the mid 18th [sic] to the latter part of the 19th centuries, [an] efflorescence of writings on the subjective, emotional and aesthetic attitudes towards nature [and even though] most ideas were old, the depth and extent to which they were explained [was what really] mattered (Glacken 1985: 54).

Contentions made by Thomas (1983: 261-4) and Sack (1980: 144-189) are mirrored here. Cosgrove’s discussions of landscapes state they are never only the physical world, but are as well, a construction or composition of it and as such, are a social product that, as a result of human action, are also a “transformation of nature” (Cosgrove 1984: 13).

To regard landscape as both object and subject has important consequences when theorising on the relationships between human[s] and their environment as [they] give rise to characteristically differentiated areas. Morphological analysis only operates at a surface level of meaning below [which] are deeper ones (Cosgrove 1985: 17-18).

A specific place may be coupled with a unique experience of it and the associated meanings attached to that, so the uniqueness of a place can “become a function of the [experience’s] quality” as opposed to an accurate description of it (Entrikin 1991: 1). The observer and observed are interwoven to the point of their being inseparable (Simmons 1993: 71, 77). This is what I believe Edward Ellison was suggesting earlier when I quoted him in the introductory chapter. There he argued that high-country lessees experienced a type of spiritual connection to the alpine landscape due to its awesome grandeur, but otherwise the connection was based largely on the land as a commodity. From that perspective of the high-country landscape, Ellison believes it is more about an experience of awe-inspiring scenery where those who farm it experience something spiritual, but that spiritual experience was different to the spirituality of Kai Tahu. Kai Tahu spirituality comes from an ancestral tātai (connection) which emanates directly from Āoraki through whakapapa.
If, as has been argued by Entrikin (1991) and Norton (1989), there is ambiguity between subject and object and personal and social in the perceptions of landscape, then such views may be construed as ideological, in as much as they demonstrate particular ways in which groups view themselves in relation to nature (Norton 1989: 83). An assumption that an evaluation of landscape might be more accurately measured analytically from an individual’s conceptualisation of it does not necessarily hold true, as it takes little if any cognisance of the social perspective. Norton (1989: 83) suggests a humanistic focus is of value, in that it views landscapes “as places occupied by social groups.” Nonetheless, as with other theoretical arguments, the humanistic one has, no doubt, areas of grey that will ultimately pose some difficulties for both its proponents as well as its critics. It is worth noting that it is from such a theoretical perception that landscape studies are said to have evolved and will be addressed later. According to Cushen (1997: 37), “landscape studies emerged from the humanistic geography subfield in the 1960’s” and were concerned with the “subjective meaning of places for people” (Bourassa 1991: 2).

NEW ZEALAND LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTIONS: FARMING, TOURISM and MORE

In spite of all the above discussions, new environments into which colonisers venture are not always, if ever, consistent with the incoming settler perceptions of them. They are “even more rarely totally amenable to the resolutions of the colonists [landscape use] aims” (Norton 1989: 80). As a result, perceptions of landscape in relation to their newly intended uses require adjustment and modification. For Iwi Māori and for the Tauiwi who followed at least a millennium later, (longer, according to some whakapapa), there was a process of initially claiming, naming and then acting upon the landscape. Action upon the landscape was deemed necessary for it to be used in ways consistent with the aims and aspirations of the occupying group, but also to enable any incoming group to attain these when they were
different. Both peoples’ actions upon the landscape brought enormous changes to it and therefore to the appearance of Te Waipounenu.

The technology available to the first colonisers Waitaha, meant that the quickest way to clear sections of it was by fire. Despite the much more advanced technology of the Tauiwi colonisers, they too fired enormous tracts of bush. This was a quick and convenient means of clearing it, while making the landscape ready for new pastoral and agricultural pursuits (Schultis 1991: 171). The settlers could not be dissuaded from such clearing even when it was not always in the best interests of land preservation. Sheehan (NZPD, 1874, Vol. 16: 351: 36) in Schultis stated that:

...any attempt to preserve native timber in New Zealand will result in failure. It is impossible it should be otherwise. I cannot explain the reason: but the same mysterious law which appears to operate when white and brown races come into contact and by which the brown race sooner or later, passes from the face of the earth, applies to native timber. Whenever grass, clover, and European plants and animals find their way into the bush, the forest begins to decay away.

It is stated in Schultis (1991: 172) that there was little point in trying to preserve native forests at all since the “settlers were attracted to areas which had been reserved” and so treated any attempts of preservation as contemptible meddling by bureaucrats. Even as late as 1907, rather than placing areas of forests out of bounds to settlers, the Lands Department were of the mind that settlement needs required access to the richest soils, as these were most suited to pastoral and agricultural management of the land. This access and use of the land was considered tantamount compared with setting aside areas of scenic reserve (Schultis 199: 178). The technically advanced British and other European colonisers were able to modify their commodified environments. Hunter-gatherers meanwhile, still held a more holistic view of landscapes with themselves as part of them, and were nowhere as agriculturally or technically advanced as their colonisers. In 1840, Kai Tahu landscape use was not agricultural
and pastoral in the way the colonisers understood them and were considered to be slightly past the hunter-gatherer stage (Schultis 1991: 344). Of course, as has been argued, the Kai Tahu version of our land and seascape practices was that of a deliberately managed environment based on a sustainable harvest.

Tauwi settlers' earliest reactions to and actions upon Te Wāipounamu culminated in many denuded landscapes and fenced off and fenced in farmscapes. Meanwhile, certain areas of the rural landscapes were romanticised as idyllic arcadia or tourist venues. Bell said that New Zealand soon after settlement was “The mythical natural garden paradise [that] was awash with almost spiritual values, [which] contained a happy nuclear family, attuned to nature” (Bell 1996: 35). In relation to tourism myths and how a landscape is represented, Simmons (1993: 77) states that:

... the concept of attachment perhaps reaches its extreme form in tourism, even to the point where the place cannot be very much like the prior cognition of it, when the travel company's brochures for instance are the source of the initial perceptions of that charming and unspoilt landscape.

Both lots of incoming settlers Iwi and Tauwi had grappled with and reconstructed to their immediate needs parts of the untamed wilderness. They did this in a lifestyle that was harsh, lonely and tough. For the first of the incoming Iwi settlers, it was a harsher, colder climate than in other parts of Polynesia. For the Tauwi settlers, it was often milder than British climes. Sinclair believed that the “superhuman effort [undertaken in taming the landscapes] formed [our] national character” (cited in Bell 1996: 35). The national character is said to have formed itself by action upon and reaction with a land that has a multitude of wide-open spaces.

52 Some whakapapa has us here many centuries before the time acknowledged by Tauwi scholars, which makes our arrival a matter of belief and whose is the more correct – whakapapa lines or archaeology?
These spaces that for Kai Tahu consist of awesome spiritual landscapes induced in their Tauiwi citizens, similar types of responses in regard to the way they could inspire and be held in awe (taku mohio). That idea was suggested very early in the nation’s history. It has continued to be perpetuated through pictorial accounts, through artistic portrayals and through texts about the aesthetic beauty of New Zealand which equals the world’s greatest and most awe-inspiring of landscapes (in Pound 1983; Ihimaera 1995; Coney 1989). It has come through literary accounts and through tourist promotion literature in both the printed and audio-visual media. For Kai Tahu, that landscape continues to be conceptualised in terms of our pepehā.
Our texts are not mirrors which we hold up to the world, reflecting its shapes and structures immediately and without distortion. They are instead, creatures of our own making (Barnes and Duncan. 1992: 2).

Landscape is a kind of backcloth to the whole stage of human activity, consequently we find it entering into the experience of many kinds of observer as it is encountered in many kinds of context (Appleton 1975: 8).

The quotation from Appleton above, suggests considerable importance has been placed on landscape. This chapter then will first examine landscape studies and what these are, even when there is no single definition or agreement on the meaning of “landscape.” The chapter will look at where landscape as a concept arose and how the ongoing debate on this continues. It discusses the idea of landscape as text and as tūpuna. In the context of this thesis the former has to do with a particular way in which the writer, the painter or the visual media producer portrays it and how Kai Tahu do this differently as our various tūpuna. The perspective taken by me in relation to my own authorial place within and as part of the research is as in previous chapters. That is, as a self-ethnographer since Kai Tahu and I are one and the same, whether as past, present or as future. A multitude of definitions of how landscape may be perceived by different individuals or groups exists as they vary and alter according to how they are presently used or how they might be used in the future. Landscape may be and is defined in many ways as a text even when displayed in an artistic painterly manner, in that, the geography of it does not require change in order for it to have multiple definitions. Some of these definitions of landscape will be examined.
MULTIPLE DEFINITIONS

Appleton's quote above suggests a considerable amount of importance has been placed upon the study of landscape. It may be a means by which some form of understanding of the relationships that exist between people and their environment might be gained. The word landscape embodies many issues that are far from straightforward, whether the term has to do with perception or to do with the definition of a geographical landscape itself. It could be asked if landscape is merely the backdrop to human activity as suggested by Appleton, or whether it is understood cognitively by humankind in a way, which causes them to interact with it in a particular manner. That might occur because an understanding of it accords with peoples' cultural ethos and belief systems. Tilley, quoted earlier, talked of landscape being cognised and of placenames having memory associations through which landscape becomes humanised, in order that we are then able to connect with it ourselves (Tilley 1993: 24). If this is indeed so, landscape may then be seen by an individual or by whole societies (such as Kai Tahu), as an extension of themselves and of their cultural beliefs in the manner that Yoon (1986: 31) has named as a geomentality. Claire Kahu White believes:

...it is there within me. And its part of the thing that drove to find out who I was, originally, seems like a long time ago now. It's the thing that still inspires me. You know, those physical things that are still there and, that's why I feel quite strongly about the place names too. The things that are left from the things that connect us to our tūpuna, the same mountains and the same rivers that our tūpuna saw and fished in, and walked around. (C. Kahu White [nō Arowhenua me Puketeraki], 1999: kōrero-ā-waha, Otautahi.)

Or,

...the perspective that we have of the land. And of the rivers, the livingness, the aliveness of the rivers somehow we have a relationship, I don't see that it is very apparent in the predominant culture. The land for them seems to me that it becomes a thing to use in whatever way they want to use it. Whereas, from where I
I always think of Mount An gle m, Hananui as my mountain. Riki Pitama said to me Motupōhīue but I said ‘No.’ I think of Hananui as my Mountain, because my family came from the Neck. Nobody started from Bluff, Rakiura really. But we came down here. But I think of Rakiura, Hananui is my mountain and I always think of my family, my Tupuna that were there, the Neck is my warmth, I think of Rakiahau as the other mountain. And Patterson, although I have lived in Bluff. It’s so beautiful for me, I always think of it as the Neck (Bessie Hildebrandt 1999: kōrero-ā-waha, Awarua).

This geomentality alluded to in Yoon (1986) in fact does occur within Kai Tahu thinking, as previous chapters and the quotes have clearly shown. Many of us within Kai Tahu Whānui consider we share common primeval parents with the other offspring of Rakinui and Papatuānuku. Hence the trees that clothe our earth mother, the animals of the forests, seas and inland waterways and the birds are all our kin (Beattie [1939] 1990: 1; Sinclair [1975] 1992: 64). Of course such belief systems are no more homogenous or universal on the true meaning of landscape than are societies’ or the definitions understood by a particular society or an individual within it. Meinig states the term landscape is an ambiguous one where there are “problems of translation between fields and often uncertainties of exact meanings even within any one [field]” (Meinig 1979: 2). There is still no clear agreement in the multiple definitions of landscape. However, this is not essential in order for the term to be validated in relation to this or any other research about landscape as a concept. Various writers such as Greider and Garkovitch (1994), Schama (1995), Yoon (1986) Tilley (1993), Cosgrove and Daniels (1988) and Massey and Jess (1995) have all
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suggested that landscape is a cultural construct as opposed to a geographic or scientifically proven one. Massey and Jess (1995) believe,

... when people lay claim to territory, when they grieve for home, when they construct and re-construct the meaning of place, they are 'imagining geography'-producing images and creating identities which then form the bases both of the future character of those pieces of space and of the behaviour of people towards them, be that acquisitive or defensive. By starting with migration, we are therefore immediately into questions of place, and the relations between cultures and places [or landscape] (Massey and Jess 1995: 2).

Landscape becomes interpreted via an individual’s cognitive understanding of what it means as a construct for them. Landscape becomes just that, a concept that exists in people’s thoughts, if not as a scientifically proven fact. In attempting to understand how it is that people come to conceptualise landscape as part of their reality, I. G. Simmons has argued, one must,

... look beyond but not subsume the individual, and the starting-point is a naivety of mind which precedes knowledge (in the sense of full cognition) in the way that the countryside precedes Geography or the wild cherry blossoms precede Botany. This experiential knowing must precede the kind of observation that is informed by science and subsequent analysis; the cause of things not [the] issue [but] the meaning, so the first requirement is not explanation but description (I. G. Simmons 1993: 79-80).

Landscape has meaning according to the understanding of it within the cultural society that people inhabit. Even with similarities in thinking, individuals or societies view similar and even identical landscapes differently and assign their own interpretations and visions of them. Simmons (1993: 71) said, there is some kind of relationship “between cognition and [how a culture becomes established such as] the different ways in which a place appears to a visitor and a native; and indeed the whole attachment to place.” Experiential knowledge of a place and activities which humans undertake in it where future aspirations for it exist, add further
layers to an already existing perception of a particular landscape and how we might cognitively conceive of it.

**LANDSCAPE DEFINITIONS**

Though landscape is said to be a cultural concept, how it will come to be defined within the confines of the study of it, will depend on what the academic thinking about it is at any given time. Historically, the origins of landscape as a concept are as follows: In twelfth-century England the term landscape stood for a region or a land tract (Bourassa 1991: 3). Bourassa went on to note that landscape as an idea was coming into common usage as both a term and a conceptually understood construct even at that time. Tilley (1993: 24), on the other hand, states the idea of landscapes originated in early capitalist Italy. The Dutch landscape painters came to the fore in the early 1600s as they represented a particular and painterly way of representing rural landscapes. This was followed in England by late eighteenth-century artists who in turn reflected attitudinal changes towards landscape. Bermingham (1986: 9) stated that as the Enclosure system gained greater importance in regard to the practices of agriculture, a new middle class of land owners in England developed a so-called awareness of a rustic, rural view that constituted the culturally aesthetic landscape. Artists such as Constable and Turner in their nineteenth-century landscape paintings simply reinforced the rustic view as a romanticised ideal of a picturesque England. Alongside this, landscape was being textually constructed and re-presented in the same way through the poets of the time such as Keats and Wordsworth (I. G. Simmons 1993: 81-89, 102-103). Thus the concept, from its original meaning in twelfth then sixteenth century England to that as re-presented through art and so called high culture in the late nineteenth century, saw land become romanticised and actually become "the landscape" (Swaffield and O'Connor 1986: 18).

Meanwhile in Europe, German theorists and the concept of "landschaft" instigated a field of study that examined the landscape's form in particular areas and included in their
studies, landscape classification. This study came into being from the middle to the end of nineteenth century. As a theoretical concept those in the area of landscape studies sought to lend their research a scientific base by distinguishing between naturally occurring landscapes and culturally constructed ones (Gregory 1995: 318). Critiques of literary works have summarised what are believed to be the five essential areas of landscape:

(ii) landscapes are lived in places as opposed to being viewed from without; (ii) landscapes as have resulted from their being utilised by humans; (iii) the value placed upon landscapes derived from their practical use to humans; (iv) landscapes are symbolic; and (v) landscapes alter as do the societies that inhabit them (Norton 1989: 84).

What might well be worth consideration as a sixth point of reference is that as landscapes alter, so do the perceptions and definitions of them by each incoming group. These altered definitions are often at variance with the ones held by the former occupiers of such landscapes, and may result from different cultural beliefs or different ideologies. This proved to be accurate in the settlement of Te Wāipounenu in that the dominant beliefs of the incoming colonisers paid scant attention to the belief systems of the already resident Mana whenua Kai Tahu, in regard to the landscapes:

_I don't see that it is very apparent in the predominant culture. The land for them [it] seems to me, becomes a thing to use in whatever way they want to use it. That seems quite apparent by the way the predominant culture, or the western culture, uses and abuses the land. As if it is there to be taken from._ (T. Jardine kōrero-ā-waha 1999).

Or:
I don't look at the land the way that the Pākehā think of it, my understanding from my up bringing is, the land is something that you look after for future generations, not something that you can own. It's not something any Māori can own. It is something we must nurture and look after for our children, mokopuna and hope they leave it in a better condition then when they inherited it. I don't actually think we lost our land, I think in a sense it was taken from us, whether we liked it or not. But we never lost our attachment to the land itself. The land itself was something that money could not buy from the Rangatira or the Arikinui of this land because they knew the value of something that they were looking after for future generations. It wasn't 'til the arrival of the Pākehā that other values were put on the land. Not by us, but by the Pākehā who had a different value for land and it was only valuable for improvement and ownership, where our ideas were, it was of value all the time and can not be diminished (J. Waaka, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

In relation to pre-literate expressions of art created upon the landscape, it has been argued that one of their purposes was to form and create expressions of environmental settings as well as to accentuate the settings by bringing attention to them (Tilley 1993: 81). Earlier in his chapter on art in the landscape, Tilley contended that whether Neolithic artworks were as large and imposing as megaliths or as small and contained as rock art, they were effective in that they had been worked on site and had become an integral part of the landscapes where they were situated (Tilley 1993: 51, 79). It should be noted though, that despite the quote by Tilley, neither Stonehenge nor the Matakitaki of Rapanui were worked on site. Tilley further stated that such works of art "embod[ied] a sense of place, of belongingness" in a manner that was quite different from that of the painterly landscapes committed to canvas from the sixteenth century onwards by European artists (Tilley 1993: 51).

LANGUAGE AND PARTICULAR LANDSCAPE MEANING

In their critique on language use, Barnes and Duncan (1992: 2), have stated that writing (and any accompanying text) is “a particular view” of landscape as a text, which they
term "naive realism" or "objectivism." Cosgrove and Daniels (1988: 1) consider that within human geography, there is a tendency to reify landscape. When interpreting landscape and culture, the former is often treated as an empirical investigation, the practitioners of which argue is a cultural or symbolic image, especially when it is likened to a text and interpreted as a reading (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 1). Particular phraseology or emphasis then, may confer a new meaning upon how various individuals or groups, through descriptive narrative, name something.

With regard to the rural landscape, the perceptions of it and therefore the way in which it is portrayed vary according to who it is that is providing the text. The intention here is to examine various texts on Te Wāipounemū and discuss them. The texts are based on the differing interpretations of Kai Tahu as Mana whenua as well as various other Tauiwi descriptive interpretations of the rohe, in relation to its landscapes. The various beliefs, conceptualisations and definitions of the landscapes of Te Wāipounemū that existed at the time of first settlement and colonisation were often described in painterly or artistic terms to the would-be migrants. Most of those have altered over time, yet some landscapes, such those the Kai Tahu Negotiating Group referred to as "the mountain tops," have remained unchanged in the way they are both perceived and described. This is so in two particular instances - the way these mountain tops are described in tourism brochures has remained constant, the only differences being between the idioms used in the nineteenth and those of late twentieth century; and the description of the mountains in the Kai Tahu pepehā, in which the idiom has remained unchanged.

Descriptive (texts) narratives on New Zealand's landscape have Pound (1983: 64), quoting William Hodgkins, the Dunedin painter, from around 1880 where he emphasises one of the points made above:
We have here, as it were, almost at our very door, the special features of every country which is remarkable for its scenery: the English lakes, the Scottish mountain and glen, the snow-covered peaks of Switzerland, the fiords of Norway, the tinted geysers of the Yellowstone.

Though some have taken umbrage at the way Hodgkins compared New Zealand landscapes with those of Britain, Europe and America, “like all humankind [he] sees and treats them in terms” of his existing knowledge of the world’s landscapes (Pound 1983: 64). This he does according to Pound (1983: 64), whether through first-hand experience of them, or intimate knowledge gained through others’ artistic representations.

What has tended to occur as a result of such conceptualisations coming into print is, that these landscapes thus described then “translated from one discourse to another [along with a new knowledge of them, while] this knowledge is transformed, commodified and disseminated to a wider audience” (Byrnes 1997: 87). Art and artists, and how they represented then re-represented Kai Tahu (and other) landscapes, created altered perceptions of them as much as did the new uses to which they were put post-Treaty. As Brynes states, “These perceptions of land were irrevocably changed by the coming of the Pakeha [where] physical boundaries became symbols of identity, established and maintained in official discourses” (Byrnes 1997: 96). Through the Tauiwi invention of the Native Land Courts, Iwi’s traditional perceptions of landscape were changed as a system of land tenure based on European definitions came to be the dominant and more acceptable one. There were, therefore, not only artistic re-presentations of landscape, but also new and altered discourses about them. Along with the new representations was the way they came to be textually defined. If we Kai Tahu are to retain our own discourses on landscape and how that is defined and cared for by us, we will need to take heed of what Paul Waaka stated so as not to in any way disenfranchise our mokopuna:
We've got to start right down at our wee people, (our Rakatahi). If you send the signal to them that the ground and the work that has been achieved upon it... that they are walking on isn't theirs... they don't own it, they never have they never will... they accept that. While Pākehā think that they own the land and they are the only ones who know how to work it, they don't own it. They are only there as someone that's got a need for it... that's it, end of story (P. Waaka, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

According to Greider and Garkovitch (1994: 1), landscapes are an environment that symbolically reflect the self-definitions of a people within a particular cultural context. Meaning is then conferred upon nature and the environment of familiar (and familial) landscapes, “through a special filter of values and beliefs [which] are grounded in culture” (Greider and Garkovitch 1994: 1). It has been argued elsewhere that, “it is culture, convention and cognition” which combine to create a national identity of landscape in which a nation’s topography becomes mapped and elaborated upon to enrich it as a homeland (Schama 1995: 12, 15). In his 1988 essay on the symbolism of trees, Davies posits the idea that symbols may do all or any of the following: demand attention; stimulate peoples’ thinking so as to place new associated meanings upon concepts; and create a publicly accessible conceptualisation on what was formerly an abstract or idiosyncratic idea.

A classic example that applies nationally to a Kai Tahu concept of landscape would be Āoraki. Before Kai Tahu obtained the new right for his renaming from the Crown as part of their Settlement agreement, many Tauiwi had conceived of him just as Mount Cook. Now just as many refer to him as an important Tupuna and/or sacred place of Kai Tahu. In 1997, Prime Minister the Hon. J. B. Bolger made such a statement at the interim signing of the Deed of Settlement between Kai Tahu and the Crown on Takahanga Marae, Kaikōura, as if this were and had always been a national fact.53 It was as if the sentiments in this statement had always been there and we were all discussing Āoraki as having always existed thus as part the

53 Taku mōhio i Takahanga Marae 21/11/97.
nation's familial landscape. But this is simply not true. He has achieved that kind of recognition as a result of Kai Tahu continuing to state what he means for them and the media picking up on it, that has contributed to certain sections of the rest of the nation convincing themselves this was always so. Aoraki after all dominates that part of the landscape in which he is situated so that he is perceived by many as a familiar part of it.

Whereas many of the theorists cited in previous chapters have tended to refer to "familiar" landscapes, Hulme (1989: 10-11 and throughout) and Haunani-Kay Trask (1993: 80), an indigenous Hawai’ian academic, in their texts, discuss and refer to their particular landscapes as familial landscapes or in familial terms. Landscapes, as defined by the latter, fit with the contention by Greider and Garkovitch (1994: 1-2), that cultural groups socially construct landscapes as reflections of themselves, to explain their place within them. A similar argument is also mirrored by Schama (1995: 6-7) when he states that,

... before it can ever be a repose for the sense landscape is the work of the mind [whose] scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock.

This quote from Robyn Bull as she remembers, mirrors what Schama has argued:

I consider all this my landscape, because I was born here. I... not actually Colac Bay. I was born in Riverton and then I was brought back here to Colac Bay, and that was back in 1937. The places here, I remember when I was a kid. Around about Mutton bird island time (before actually going to the Mutton bird Island... going with Mum and Taua and my Great Grandmother, over the back of the Hill. It looks so different now, and not what it used to be like when I was a kid. There used to be sand hills and flax and that's where we used to go, over there and cut the flax for making the baskets for the Muttonbird Island. There used to be a track going up the hill and over the Joan Berry track, the back beaches we used to call them, Wakapatu. We can't do that any more, it's been wired off, fenced off, and the flax is gone. And there used to be ponds over there, which we loved to going too because they had fresh-water crayfish. I remember going over there with Taua, she used to have-I think it was liver, I'm not sure, I know it was raw meat, something that made a lot of blood. And then in the water the crayfish used to
come and she would throw them out. Once they caught them they would throw them out on to the bank. They even used to catch on to your toes. I remember sitting on the side of the bank once just dangling my toes in the water, you know, no fear in those days, (I wouldn’t do it now), one of the crayfish grabbed hold of my big toe. And the Hills, the hills over there. I have lots of remembers of the hills we used to go climbing on when we used to be kids. It used to look like a mountain, now it doesn’t, ‘cos I’m bigger of course. It used to be a great feat to climb to the Trent station. The rocks, we lived on the rocks. We used to always have our Kai Moana there, still get it from the same places but it’s not as accessible as it was. Cockles, paua, mussels, kina we used to get lots of Kina. Everything was related to everything else then, not now. (R. Thomson neé Bull 1999: kōrero-ā-waha, Ōraka (Colac Bay).

This is about formerly remembered places, in time and in the memories of many of the things she was then able to do on them that are no longer possible with the fencing off and the many changes that have been made through farming and newer cultural practices of landscape ownership.

**CONTESTED VIEWS ON CONNECTION AND SPIRITUALITY**

Cosgrove and Daniels (1988: 1) in their introduction state that landscape is a cultural image that is pictorially represented and which structures or symbolises surroundings so that each study of it transforms further the meanings onto it, as more layers of cultural representation are added. This type of a transformation in perspective was used by Tauiwi agriculturists and pastoralists during presentations before the Waitangi Tribunal at the Kai Tahu hearings. It was done initially through an American anthropologist, Michele Dominy (1990: 11-15). She was the expert witness who was engaged by and appeared on behalf of the high-country lessee farmers. However, she also encouraged the lessees and farmers to use similar means of presentation to strengthen the case in their favour. In discussions between other Kai Tahu and me and with various Tribunal members in 1988, one of the major differences, which they noted was that Michèle Dominy in her tribunal evidence used the
expression connected to the landscape, whereas Kai Tahu used, connected *with* the landscape (my emphasis). A subtle difference, yet the meaning that the two words conveyed was interpreted and understood quite differently by members with whom I spoke. Although delivered from a perspective deemed to be similar to that of Kai Tahu and their expert witnesses, the actuality of the way in which both Dominy and the lessees portrayed their borrowed trope (*of connection to the land through lineage*) was markedly different from that of the Kai Tahu portrayal. This was made obvious to all who witnessed it and was remarked upon in their daily summing up by some of the Tribunal members.

Kai Tahu emphasised spiritual connections "with" the land, which gave an understanding of a quite distinct and different spirituality from the one described by the lessees. "With" connotes a different degree of understanding of and working with a landscape as opposed to attempting to tame it through domination over it. Tribunal members understood the term "to" as giving a sense of exploitability of the landscape described above. That sense sees that after dominating or reconstructing aspects of the landscape the lessees put it to such uses as they considered to have a more purposeful use value than those which had been made of it previously by Kai Tahu. In fact, some lessees and freehold farmers stated that they were now the only people to have occupied the high-country landscape long term and therefore were more connected to it than Kai Tahu had ever been (*taku mōhio*). The farmers failed to understand in each of our presentations, what that area of landscape meant for us. That was, that we could not farm or in any way make noa these particular areas of the land through working them (even though forms of work have occurred on other places such as Maungatere). They were and are for us still, our founding ancestors to be spoken of with certain reverence and respect and not to be desecrated into farmscapes by configuring them to an alternative use requirement.

Some Tribunal members interpreted the Kai Tahu conceptualisation of the landscape as having a pre-colonisation use value for its people. However, they understood that the access
to mahika kai landscape areas occurred in a way that met the needs and purposes of its Māori inhabitants. That did not require reconstruction or boundary enclosure in the way it did for the British immigrants. The former use was a way of working “with” the landscape and what it provided, as opposed to making alterations “to” it in order for it to assist in the production of food. The food production use serves a capitalist society’s ideology, as opposed to being based around a minimum interference.  

This last point fits with E. Ellison’s statement (1998: korero-ā-waha), that he did not act aggressively upon his farming landscape by ploughing it, because there was so much history in that land that could be irrevocably disturbed by turning it over to serve our needs. Matapura Ellison (1998: kōrero-ā-waha) stated that he often felt a pull between what he described as his Kai Tahu side and that of the farming practices he must adopt to extract a living from the farm. These two-way pulls were about whether or not he should make public the knowledge he and his whānau have on the location of the special (to Kai Tahu) places on the farm, by fencing off any old wāhi tapu sites on his property. The reverse pull is whether to let things stand, since he knows where the site is located and he was concerned that fencing may not protect, but draw unwanted attention to such places. He continues to perceive Hikaoraroa, the hill above this homeplace, as “a sacred place of the Tūpuna as well as part of the farm on which the sheep graze” (Matapura Ellison 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). He perceives these places in both terms though they seem to co-exist uneasily for him since he continues to dislike the amount of landscape destruction and reconstruction that has occurred from farming. Matapura also acknowledges that this is at present, the only way to retain his personal piece of the landscape since farming it enables him to contribute financially to his “greedy child called mortgage” (Matapura Ellison 1998: kōrero-ā-waha).

---

54 Taku mōhio; see also the sources cited earlier (Evison (1993:13), states that Kai Tahu were “independently self-sufficient.”

55 Hikaororoa is also referred to by some as Hikaoraroa and Hikaroaroa.
The views of cousins Edward and Matapura Ellison have elements in common as well as differences. These differences are mostly of expression rather than belief systems, though there are elements of these here too. Nonetheless, it must also be stated that many Kai Tahu known to me have difficulty with or refuse to acknowledge a spiritual aspect as part of their identity and landscape perception, which for others is absolutely essential and inseparable from both landscape and identity (taku mōhio). So how much is landscape a part of us and we of it, that we do not have to consciously think about our identity in the landscape as existing in isolation from everything else in our lives? How much of this form of expression by us is merely a convenience to be brought out when we are in a defensive situation such as during our Claim hearing, or for use in a Kai Tahu hui or similar situation? There seems to be reluctance by many Kai Tahu to publicly own a personal spirituality and landscape connection in the way that we do when reciting the pepeha. Is that because this is only acceptable in hui or such sorts of situations? If the answer to the last is yes, then we are in as sad a state as alleged by such as Paul Waaka and Tim Rereti to name but two. Small wonder then that a certain Tribunal member expressed to one participant that he felt Kai Tahu had an apparent lack of spirituality.\textsuperscript{56} There continues to exist an inner-personal contestation as well as the intra-Iwi contestation of identity and landscape connection and how these are outwardly acknowledged in the public arena as part of who we are as Kai Tahu.

Dominy (1990: 12) has argued that:

*Anthropological language derives from the mentalities of indigenous peoples, [of the] Pacific [aspects of] which may have been absorbed by settler populations [including] assertions of identity based on idealizations of [a Polynesian] ancestral past.*

\textsuperscript{56}Not all tribunal members expressed such views. When discussing this topic with another Kai Tahu, she stated that one member in particular expressed to her the view that from his perception, Kai Tahu lacked the type of spirituality so noticeable in Northern Iwi case presentations before the Tribunal (L. Waymouth, 1997: korero-ā-waha).
Dominy went on to suggest that the Kai Tahu idea of a connection with their landscape was based on mere myth, suggesting it should be treated as such rather than as actual fact. Yoon conversely states that “myth is considered as legitimate oral history” (Yoon 1986:31). The supporting evidence produced by the lessees was by way of photographic, historical (oral), genealogical and inheritance patterns, which were argued as a clear demonstration and proof of their special relationship to the landscape (Dominy 1990: 13). In a response on behalf of the New Zealand Association of Social Anthropologists (NZASA) (1990: 3) by Goldsmith and others to an article by Dominy about the Tribunal hearing of Kai Tahu, it is stated that initially Dominy’s “presentation conceal[ed] the politics and economic contributing factors which established the high-country culture.” Therefore, in presenting the case on behalf of the lessees Dominy under-represented certain aspects of the high-country culture and over-represented others, something which she had accused Kai Tahu of doing while maintaining all the time that this was something her clients did not do (taku mōhio).

After the great estates were broken up by the Crown, the original lessees (that is, the high-country farmers), expected to realise an economic gain which would be ongoing for their descendants. Dominy considered such evidence of attachment to the land in the form it was presented by the lessees as totally validated by their photographs (as well as written sources). Yet she denounced the validity of evidence produced by Kai Tahu which was from our perspective, no less meaningful even when there were no accompanying photographs. We created images through recitation of whakapapa and waiata that told of who and what we were in the landscape. As we understood things, the landscapes around us and we ourselves were our photographic equivalent, since they were clearly visible for all to observe (taku mōhio). E. Ellison called the lessee’s presentation a junior type of spiritual connection, since the time line of their occupation of the high-country was short in generational terms compared with that of Kai Tahu, and, since they were not literally of that landscape (E. Ellison 1998:
kōrero-ā-waha). Thus, the places where most high-country farmers hold a similar spiritual connection as Kai Tahu hold, are where their ancestors were spiritually connected with landscapes that they humanised. That type of connection had taken place much further back in time than Dominy was stating was so on their behalf, in regard to the high-country. In evidence Dominy said that her research had stemmed from participant observation amongst “two generations of high country farmers and [pertained to] their relationship to the[ir] land” (Dominy 1990: 12). Kai Tahu on the other hand, could, through whakapapa, waiata, whakataukī and kōrero i neherā, trace their connections with the landscape over almost the whole of Te Wāipounamu, going back at least twenty-five generations and according to some, such as Pere cited earlier, much longer even than that. It was noticed by many Kai Tahu observers that while Dominy alleged Kai Tahu ways of connecting with our landscapes were mere assertions based on mythological beliefs, she encouraged the lessees to borrow a similar trope which in their case, she deemed as having both merit and validity (Dominy 1990: 15). Her “style of [presentation] was used to persuade the reader [of the text or] the recipient of the discourse,” in a manner as stated by Barnes and Duncan (1994: 5) as the use of a borrowed trope. To add strength to the argument it was also alleged that the isolation in which the lessees lived, further shaped their culture into one that was close to nature and very much in tune with the landscape and its climatic extremes--so much so, it was considered that they had come to form a special “relationship to the place” (Dominy 1990: 13).57 The validity or otherwise of this assertion was never questioned by Kai Tahu, though other documents and research have shown the high-country’s delicate ecosystem is being constantly damaged through erosion that has come about partly through the burning off of the tussock, in order to have more acreage for sheep farming (Smith 1994:35). Ellison and others when interviewed for this research project, understood how a relationship such as that which the high-country

57 Refer to the remarks by Goldsmith et al. See also S. Levine, (1990: 4) as he talks of the provision of the “subjective self-presentations of the high country families.”
people had with that landscape could be formed, as it was both magnificent and awesome (E. Ellison 1998; Wesley 1998; and J. Williams 1997: R. Harris 1997 kā kōrero-ā-waha). Even so, they saw this as different from the relationship Kai Tahu have with their landscapes (kā kōrero-ā-waha anō 1997 and 1998).

Arguing that spiritual affinity is a concept that is also cultural, Dominy stated that, "land and identity [of the lessees] are [so interconnected as to be] inseparable" (Dominy 1990: 14). Because land and identity are so interconnected, they are unable to be perceived by many as individual concepts, distinct from one another (Dominy 1990: 14). Rather than accepting that Kai Tahu might want, and have now through the Deed of Settlement and Tōpuni, some sort of input into the best use of the high-country landscape, she argued that it should be the sole preserve of the lessees, because they are the present occupants and know best how to manage its delicate ecosystem, as a result of their long connections to it (Dominy 1990: 14). Yet Smith demonstrates that substantial areas of the high-country have been removed from farming due to the irreparable damage to that landscape through farming practices (Smith 1994: 35).

In contrast to Dominy, Levine (1990: 5-6) has stated that political and legal affirmations of self-definitions of the high-country families had implications "of cultural and territorial displacement [that arose] from appropriation of another people’s language and self-imagery." Turner mirrored the thoughts expressed by Levine and contended that it was not a very spiritual connection to the landscape that the high-country leaseholders held, quite the contrary in fact. He stated that instead he saw it as a materialistic locational connection while the "passing of identity from [parent to child] was not in itself spiritual" (Turner 1990: 7). These debates reflected cultural contestations over the representation of landscapes and whether Tauiwi, (in that instance, the high-country lessees), had an equally recognisable spiritual connection to/with the landscapes which they inhabit, as do Iwi Māori. The lessees are certainly materially and locationally connected to the landscape though they do not own it,
as is so in the debate over Taranaki leased landscapes which have sparked so much controversy over the past century and longer (taku mōhio). However, the New Zealand news media have brought contestations over leased Iwi land into the consciousness of the nation as recently as only the last five years (taku mōhio). Just as the news media showed descendants of Taranaki leasehold farmers to be more deserving that the descendants of original Taranaki owners, so too Kai Tahu as people were not initially considered to have been the ideal occupiers of the high-country by Dominy and some of the farmers there (taku mōhio; WAI #27). Besides, Kai Tahu as recognised Mana whenua have felt no need to own or permanently inhabit all of their landscapes, in order to stay connected with them spiritually. Nor have they considered this essential to the retention of their status of kaitiakitaka over these landscapes of Te Wāipounamu. However, since the Settlement, according to an Iwi pānui (notice) sent to me in March 2000, it was said that as a result of our purchase of large areas of forested landscapes, Kai Tahu are now without doubt, the second largest owners of land in Te Wāipounamu (Te Puni Kōkiri 2000: Nā te pānui rorohiko).

Though Kai Tahu have had very little ownership of any of these high-country areas of landscape they still conceptualise themselves as being of them, both spiritually and physically. Such a perception was clearly evident in Hana O’Regan’s thesis, where one of her participants believed that what his Kai Tahu-ness meant was that he could connect with the trees, the mountains and the rivers (Tau 1996 cited in O’Regan 1997: 119). Such sentiments of attachment have been expressed already in various ways by my own participants in relation to how they consider themselves as part of our landscapes. The recently negotiated Deed of Settlement promised that in all future decisions affecting their landscapes, Kai Tahu will now have input into the decision-making process (NTNG 1997 sec. 2, 3 and 4: 33-47). From their

---

58 NTNG stands for Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group, who put out two documents on the settlement: Crown Settlement Offer, which was taken around the Kai Tahu rohe and to Kai Tahu living in Aotearoa. In a series of hui the group made a visual and oral presentation to Kai Tahu was made, to assist them in making an informed vote on whether or not to accept the offer. The second document was featured in a special edition of Te Karaka, that coincided with the annual Hui-a Tau in November 1997 at Takahanga Marae, Kaikōura (taku mōhio).
perspective, such participation in the decision-making process is another manner in which they are exercising their Rakatirataka over their landscape and goes some way towards what they have been attempting to achieve in the pursuit of their Claim, Te Kereeme for the past one hundred and fifty years.

LANDSCAPE AS TEXT

Texts are said to draw upon other texts that have derived their present meanings from a range of previous ones (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 2). Landscapes in text (or in any artistic representation) therefore are represented by groups or individuals, based upon their particular world view, local interest, identity and ethos. Once landscape becomes text however, the way in which rhetoric is used to convey meaning becomes central to such discussions (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 3). Landscapes and their many interpretations may be said to represent respectively,

... the economic world of profit and loss, the political world of ideology, the physical world of natural wonder and the visual world of industrialisation. (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 5).

These contentions will be discussed more fully with particular relevance in an examination of the work of Claudia Bell (1996: 34), especially in relation to her interpretation of Tauiwi notions of renaming and recreating the landscape and a national identity. Bell (1996: 34) states that actions like these are a substitute for ownership of land, deemed necessary in order to create a sense of belonging. This results from the lack of having no long, established, familial ties with the land (Bell 1996: 34). Central to the idea of a landscape-derived identity in regard to my research is the importance to Kai Tahu of all rather than only certain parts of their landscapes in Te Wāipounamu, since they are both Papatuanuku and ourselves past and future. Many participants and others worry that the seeming elevation of 78 placenames could
in time see them afforded greater significance to the history of Kai Tahu in the landscape than those that were not re-named. Negotiators deemed this aspect of the Deed of Settlement with the Crown an essential requirement by us, as it was for many but not all the interviewees and other grass-roots people spoken with. It has caused much debate regarding the sincerity or otherwise of the negotiating team and the Crown in selecting a mere 78 names. The manner in which this selection was carried out is also questioned as some Kai Tahu ask whether this was simply an exercise in “mana munching” by a few in a position of power that enabled them to dictate certain of the terms of settlement to the Crown. The long quote which follows expresses what so many of the participants feel. These sadly, are not the views of a few isolated malcontents;

...we lost lands through the public workings there, where ever. We've got ongoing battles down here with the local Authority, because of this Public Works Act. So in saying that, Ngai Tahu have actually done deals that are, I believe, outside the kaupapa of our Tupuna that put it [kaupapa] there at the table [and] that they took to the Crown. They [Tupuna] expected when they took that take [complaint] to the Crown they would get it [land and mahika kai access] back. And they got one per cent. Te Maiharoa our great Tupuna who took that last hikoi of our people back up to Te Aomarama to settle up there, I think his biggest wish was that, whatever came out of this settlement [it] must suit the people. And I think that he would be disappointed as well. I think this and I stand by what I say. In the original claims we went for our ‘Mahinga Kai.’ That is what we were aiming for. I think last year or eighteen months ago we were well on our way to negotiating [that] with the Crown. I was actually at a hui in Kaikōura up at Uncle Bill’s and them, on a works hui. I was working for Ngai Tahu at that time, was in the B group or the A group, some sort of group that they set up for negotiation. And she (the then Administrator) came out and told us ‘Ngai Tahu have lost the Mahinga Kai section of the negotiation.’ To me that was like getting smacked between the eyes because that was the biggest part of our Settlement, the Mahinga Kai. When our people went out the Waitaki Valley hunting the weka, and they were going to cross the fence, that fence was the end of our hikoi into the high-country to retrieve our resources, our Kai. To me that was the beginning of our claims on the Mahinga Kai. And we lost it. Not only that, that was my example. We lost our fisheries, our eel fisheries, everything was lost.
I think that Riki Tau took our "take" to the Crown and it was the last day issue. I think in his mind he knew what he wanted, and I think when you look at what we have got, me personally I wouldn't like to be a negotiator.

There is no way! Well I say that now, because this is what other people have said. I believe deep down people say that... 'there was no way we should have been treated like that.' And I say we'll carry on battling, we just may have to change who[m] we are backing. I think that it was tokenism of its worst kind and I hate tokenism because we have had to live with it, we still do.

When we do it, Ōraki is an example, that has caused so much grief amongst our people, and it will be never resolved, They, the Crown are going to gift Ōraki back to Ngai Tahu. Great, we never actually lost it. I think the story one of our Whanauka over in Tai Poutini sold it.... I can't work that one out. They sold their side of it.

Oh. OK. But as a gesture of utmost good faith, whatever, Tahu will give it back. That is bullshit, that is tokenism in reverse! Would they (the would-be recipients) give up a Taoka? a Tipuna? We are playing Crown games now, we are playing the Crown games.

We had a Hui here, month, six weeks ago,(July 1999) with our Upoko, one of whom we had here to discuss this issue. And one of the issues that came up was who will receive it and who gives it back. 'Arowhenua will receive it but Arowhenua won't give it back.' Joe made it clear, he made it perfectly clear that they will receive it or whoever he chooses, so it may be his Mokopuna, but he is not going to give to back to the Crown. So the Kāiwhakahaere and TRoNT are now debating that issue.

It is tokenism in reverse and I can't stand that. I reckon that's garbage. I said to my father, "so what if they (Crown) bring Manutioriori, [have] a week of celebration, spend many hundreds of thousands of dollars on this hui, this is a Pākehā game."

I said that the area that we are creating into a Wetlands that is all part of Kemp's Deed. He sat on his arse in Wellington, looked at a map, and said 'Arowhenua people will live here, Kati Huirapa will live there.' He put us in a swamp! It was surveyed off, partitioned off and every time it flooded, that area just went under water. I said to Joe, 'we have never received compensation for this.' [Tauiwi] built the stop bank on the north side of the river and every time it floods it pushes all the water over to our land. "Māori reserve land is good for nothing."

Anyway back to Ōraki....

When you receive Ōraki, you go down in to that swamp, you take O'Regan, Doug Graham down there. You take Ōraki back, up here at the wharenui. Then you send those two down on that swamp and they do the deal down there. There'll be no Manutioriori, there'll be nothing like that, no bullshit. This all Pākehā-taka. And if they [TRoNT] want to give it back, let them do it down on a piece of land that we are still fighting over for
compensation. That is how you celebrate, you don’t have a big party, hui. If they won’t to do that, go somewhere else, not takahi our Mana at the wharenui of Te Hapa O Niu Tireni. And that’s what it’s all about, it’s all crap. I had to get that off my chest. And I now see a lot of that stuff starting to corrode, captured by someone else, or absolutely trashed (P. Waaka kōrero-ā-waha: 1999 [his emphasis]).

Paul, as a Kaitakawaeka (liaison officer) at the Department of Conservation, is passionate about the landscapes of Kai Tahu and his work. It sees him, Matapura Ellison of Puketeraki and Stephen Bragg (the newest Kaupapa Atawhai Manager ) doing their utmost to protect Tahu sites. They continue to inform the Conservation Department of our Iwi values and the need for true partnership and conjoint management of our landscapes. Paddy Gilroy of Awarua was the first for Awarua/Murihiku kaupapa Atawhai person and one of the participants in this research. He died suddenly and unexpectedly on the 24th of December 1999 at only 51 years of age.

Many ordinary, everyday Kai Tahu consider that the final choices of the negotiated settlement including the dual renamings, were taken on by some who were “mana munchers” (who are not all necessarily part of the Negotiations team), on their own behalf. This selection of name changes, Tōpuni and nohoaka sites were based largely on (what was considered) a display of one-upmanship as to the degree of history known by certain of the negotiators or their advisers, rather than on behalf of the people whose choices they were supposedly representing (Anon. 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). The number of participants such as Paul cited above, Joe Waaka, Kelly Davis, Harold Ashwell, Lavinia Moemate Reihana and some unwilling to be named or quoted in other sections of the thesis have expressed their concerns at the negotiation process. Lavinia was on record at TRONT meetings as being extremely displeased at the manner in which past and present negotiations have and are being handled. As the quote from K. Davis (Chapter 7) states, no heed was paid to the wishes of the people in regard to the re-namings and that those who made the decisions did not know the history; instead they used their positions of power to choose the names and many other settlement
issues as proof of their ability to do so and show they knew what was best for the grass roots. Because of that lack of knowledge and the fact that those without it went ahead or allowed others to do so without the true mōhio, Kelly, Paul and others refer to these decision makers as the “mana-munchers.” Though each Papatipu Rūnaka was asked for a list of placenames based on historical knowledge or of importance to them, in the final analysis their wishes did not determine the names that were selected. Other aspects of our landscape and the settlement process became the prerogative of a small number of the negotiators. This has already been discussed and there is no need to repeat it since this section concerns landscape as text.

**SOURCE OF LANGUAGE AS TEXT**

The concept of landscape as text stems from post-modern theory in which signification through cultural practices and the relationship with and to landscape are perceived and textually presented, but are seldom if ever, duplicated references (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 5). In other words, what is told by cultural others to ethnographers about themselves in their landscapes is not necessarily understood in that same way as was intended by the tellers. Participants in this research though, felt many of them could read their particular land and seascapes like a book and perhaps their sharing it with us all has in its own way turned the storying into text. How theirs and other tellings then come to be represented in text are not usually as duplicated references of the storytellers. Instead they have the propensity to become interpretations of what ethnographers have believed were the stories being told, without acknowledgement by the ethnographers that the re-presentations reflected their filtered version. The same criticisms will probably be levelled at me in time, even as I try to ensure that the paradigm, epistemology and theory are Kai Tahu.
Barnes and Duncan citing Ricoeur, juxtapose the four areas that constitute his theoretical paradigm of text and apply them to landscape as follows:

(i) once meaning becomes text, it tends to be set in concrete; (ii) the intended authorial meaning and resultant text do not always agree; (iii) a text's initial composition is interpreted then redefined, according to its subsequent purpose of intent; (iv) textual meanings are understood and interpreted differently by various readers (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 6).

Barnes and Duncan directly relate Ricoeur’s thesis to various societies’ perceptions of landscape. These are “a social and cultural production removed from the original author’s intention, [regarding] the social and psychological impacts and the material consequences” that result from altered perceptions of landscape (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 6). Tilley (1993: 32) also contends Ricoeur correctly emphasises “the poetic qualities of narratives in producing configurations of events and objects,” and narrative of itself is one way of understanding or providing a description of the person’s world and the relationship with that world. Altered and imposed upon landscapes are, in the same way, reconstructed or deconstructed not only through text, but also physically. This is done according to their former use and any use that might be newly intended for them. The last is precisely the argument raised by Bell (1996) that occurred on the discovery of Te Waipounenu (and Aotearoa) by Tauiwi explorers. Barnes and Duncan, by their own admission, are doing what indigenous people have done and what their subsequent colonisers did: that is, reinventing definitions of landscape to justify a newly constructed idea of it that is different from the original one. Just as textual representations of landscape often reconstruct it, so too does artistic representation through various media and in the style of the artist.

According to Cosgrove and Daniels (1988: 1), the artistic “interpretation of symbolic imagery” has its roots in Renaissance publications, the purposes of which were to
act as artistic guides that systematically drew upon the use of symbols, images and allegories within the Classical repertoire. Iconography as a study probed the meanings within art works, by placing them into an historical period and context in order to analyse more accurately the ideas that were implicated within their imagery (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 2). Iconology, defined as iconography turned interpretative, examined in greater depth the work of art by striving to unravel the intrinsic meaning within it.

These unravellings including a nation’s attitudes, an historical time period, the relevance of class systems within that nation, and possible religious or philosophical persuasions contained subtly or otherwise within the artwork (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 2). Most art works from painterly representations to Gothic architecture were interpreted as cultural symbols of their time, by such as Panofsky who juxtaposed iconography with ethnography, when he argued for a much broader “truth for all cultural study [that is] stressed in anthropology” (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 4). Simmons says the same of John Ruskin whom he states believed that “landscape should be subject to exegesis rather like a text and that art was one of the ways of accomplishing this” (Simmons 1993: 89). The place of art in the ways the British and their European counterparts from the eighteenth century onwards conceptualised landscape will be examined later. However, it is worth mentioning here, that during the eighteenth century in Britain, the middle classes and a new, wealthy, working class were able through literature and the arts, to appropriate for their own consumption what had formerly been within the domain or experience of the highest artistic genre; an artistic concept of the sublime in landscape (Cosgrove 1984: 230). The subsequent significance of the romanticism attached to landscape was said to be as much about art as it was to do with the newly perceived value attached to land under industrial capitalism (Cosgrove 1984: 231). These industrial capitalists who could purchase and consume landscapes as art could also purchase real landscapes as under-utilised land in far off places.
Thus, a little over a century later the New Zealand Company and the British government obtained a Treaty which would permit them to begin the process of colonising Te Wāipounenu and Aotearoa. From the day the Treaty was signed, the reconstruction, redistribution and re-conceptualisation of the New Zealand landscape began in earnest and with great rapidity. Many of the middle and lower class Britons who settled in Te Wāipounenu had perceived landscape in both a romantic way and as a valuable asset. As a valuable asset they strove to impose cultural ideas of what constituted for them, more appropriate landscape utilisation, that of pastoral and agricultural use.

**KAI TAHU IN POST-COLONIAL LANDSCAPES: UNDERSTANDINGS AND CONTESTATIONS?**

As general discussion of this topic has evolved, I have looked further at Kai Tahu families who had become farmers at the areas of research to see whether they had at any time felt compromised in this particular form of post-colonial landscape use. I asked if while maintaining their Kai Tahu perceptions, how in hui situations especially, were they were able to publicly relate themselves to their farming use. I asked Kai Tahu farmers and workers questions about landscape use including:

a) was their own method of farming considered an issue of contestation and concern around the practices they undertook;

b) did such activity cause any of them to question their Kai Tahu-ness in regard to their views of themselves as part of the landscape; and if not,

c) was this because they were already so colonised that they felt no sense of compromise?

The only definite conclusions to be drawn from their responses are that their farming practices are almost always different from those of their Tauiwi counterparts and this relates to the
differing cultural conceptualisation of landscape and the need to minimise the types of assault farming might inflict upon Papatuanuku. These questions were particularly relevant in relation to statements made by some Tauiwi farmers (and others) who saw things which they believed demonstrated that their Kai Tahu counterparts were not good farmers. This, the Tauuiwi felt was, because Kai Tahu farmers often failed to appropriately “manage” their farmlands. In fact Kai Tahu farmers were often viewed as lazy in the way they apparently failed to undertake the working of their landscapes. As earlier stated, one Kai Tahu participant stated that he had never been an aggressive farmer of his landscape. Many Tauuiwi he felt were extremely aggressive in the way they ploughed and seemed to always cutting into Papatuanuku. However, he had not ploughed or turned over any of the earth upon the farm because of his wish to not further disturb the whenua (E. Ellison 1998: korero-a-waha). For him, “Māori were more akin to and in tune with the whole of their landscape; that they had [had] such a long relationship with it that there was no need to go out and check it every morning” (E. Ellison: 1998). In other words, Papatuanuku did not need constant re-reading in order to be understood. The Tahu farmers felt as if their Tauuiwi counterparts were constantly consulting the earth like having to re-read a recipe that one is using for the first time. That need for checking was quite differently understood and expressed by another participant Selwyn Harris when speaking of his work ethic and practices. He felt that constant checking was exactly what was required if one was to properly manage the landscape one farmed;

... farming properly includes good management practice of land and animals and knowing when to do things and I’m a panicker: I know now what is essential, but five years ago I would work really hard ‘til all hours checking both animals and land conditions (S. Harris, Ōtākou 1998: pers. comm.).

At the same time Harris also stated that he worked the land in a way that was approved of by “the tūpuna,” meaning those of his Kai Tahu wife (S. Harris: 1998). Here is the major
difference, as I understood their responses. Of the two directly quoted, Harris spoke of "working the land," that is, of taking charge of its management by dominating or moulding it into producing what he required of it. Ellison instead, spoke of working with the land by causing it the least possible amount of further disturbance while hoping to achieve similar ends to Harris. Both agreed as did Raymond Owens and TaTāne Wesley that stock at crucial times did need to be checked upon so they did not suffer. Harris also contended that his wife was unable to read the land in the same way as he could;

... she cannot see the growth changes in a paddock, that there is not enough grass for the animals [while] in a near paddock the grass has grown so it makes sense to shift the sheep there. It's those finer points she can't read, some of the stock could be hungry and she would not be aware of it (S. Harris: 1998).

Conversely, Raewyn, his wife felt that he was unable to read signs in the landscape which for her were so obvious. Such things as weather patterns, clouds, the signs of the sea, the stars and phases of the moon as well as unnecessary further clearance of the remaining bush from the landscape in order to create a dam. From Raewyn’s perspective, there were other places in which a dam could be located (for the benefit of the animals) which would not further alter the landscape. She believed the differences between her and her husband arose because he conceived of it first and foremost as a farm and not as part of whom he is. Instead he saw it as the place on which he undertakes and engages in the work of farming (R. Harris 1998: korero-a-waha). From E. Ellison’s perspective, it was suggested that the work of farming as he and other Kai Tahu farmers practised it, was undertaken as such, because of their long-standing affinity with their landscapes. But for non-Māori these Kai Tahu farming practices (or lack of them) were often mistakenly seen or misunderstood as laziness. 59 One then has to assume that Edward Ellison has some insider or experiential knowledge of being

---

59 Whether these misunderstandings were accurate or not, has no bearing here. Neither do I make suggestions or judgments on the way any of the participants farm their landscapes.
both Kai Tahu and a farmer in order to make such suggestions with confidence. Matapura Ellison from Karitāne on the other hand stated in his interview, that it was somewhat of "a conundrum for me between my Kai Tahu beliefs of what [my] landscape embodied and the need to try and earn a living by Pākehā farming" (Matapura Ellison 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). There seemed to be no such conundrum for Edward, though others who farmed in the more so called "lazy" fashion did so because of the difficulties they said they experienced between their Tahu beliefs and the needs of farming. Little wonder there exist such different contestations and understandings of how landscape should be best treated. Here though in both Tāuiwi and Tahu understandings, we also have many references to the landscape as being something one reads, as if it were a text that could (for Kai Tahu) or should (for Tāuiwi) be constantly consulted. Fishers also talk of reading the sea or the signs of its behaviour in the weather.

Such feelings about work practices and Kai Tahu belief systems were also believed to occur for many Kai Tahu fisher people. There seemed just as many contestations about good fishing practices as there were about farming ones. In some instances, old cultural practices still go hand in hand with modern day ones in that industry, while others are no longer maintained and are in fact frowned upon when mentioned. (R. Harris 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). Many commercial fishers have no concept of customary fisheries, their connection with the overall landscape perception of Kai Tahu and how to sustainably manage both these and the commercial take, since they simply see their work as a job (V. B. Russell i ērā wā). Others are very aware of the whole of the resources of Papatuanuku and like the farmers, are pulled between the need to make a living and in the Tahu belief systems. However, not all the participants who by virtue of their whakapapa are Kai Tahu felt a similar need to affiliate in

---

60 According to R. Harris (1998), in her kōrero-ā-waha it was stated that until her father’s generation of fishers, certain cultural practices were carried on in the Kai Tahu fishing industry. She also noted with regard to landscape attachments, that a really close love of and affiliation with the Ōtākou landscape had passed completely from one whānau in less than two generations.
an identical manner with whānau, hapū and Iwi and the belief systems and ethos that being Tahu might involve. Nor, as a consequence of that connection, did these Tahu people feel for and about their landscapes in the same way as those who continue to have a close relationship with it. Those with close affinity to their landscapes saw those without such feeling as being deprived by a supposed inability to read and understand the landscapes which are theirs too by right of whakapapa. This was expressed by some as “aroha ki te takata and aroha mo te takata,” who had been lost to their landscapes, so were felt for with real love and not scorn. This loss for some had resulted because they had been alienated either from their wāhi tūturu and their Kai Tahutaka or had alienated themselves from both. It occurred whether or not they were direct research participants or Kai Tahu with whom the research topic was spoken about in general conversation. Even though many had been raised on or had childhood connections with their homeplaces, they had formed no intimate bonds with them and saw such beliefs as utter nonsense.

Robyn Opie originally from Ōtākou and 30 years separated from it in both Australia and now London, said that her father told her not to be “concerned with all this Māori nonsense as it won’t earn you a living or advance you in the Pākehā world” (R. Opie 2000: kōrero-a-waha). She told me when we spoke in 1998 that she felt she would not feel at home or fit in any more in her homeplace, since she had been too long away from it. Although she felt the same in April 2000, in contrast to our first chat, she said she had been thinking seriously about taking a trip home. This need had become stronger since she had been ill at the end of 1999 and had become so low and disenchanted with the winter in England that Ōtākou and the need to touch home base once more seemed very beckoning. Robyn also said that the feeling was possibly only the result of being ill rather than strong home ties, yet we had a long discussion on Treaty matters and things of home about which she had no idea and had never been told, even as a young person.
On the other hand a number of Kai Tahu both rāwahi and in Aotearoa had retained a deep love for their wāhi tiituru in spite of having long since separated from it. For another group there were feelings of connection held for a place upon which they had never lived at all. So what was it that made connections with landscape and identity, or the need to leave them so strong? In the latter group, it was for many, a newly found discovery of their taha Kai Tahu or their taha Māori that turned out to be Kai Tahu. Within this group a number have proclaimed a connection with their homescapes because, as is often the case with the “come newly types,” a romantic perception of Māori identity tends to blind them to all else. Some in this group fitted this “come newly” category and conceived of their ancestors and their Iwi as being so in tune with nature as to be as one with it mai rā ano. This may well have been so to some degree, but at the same time this group generally chose to ignore all the mistakes and misdeeds made by their tupuna in making the initial adjustment to the very different climate into which they came from Hawaiki Nui over a millennium ago. They also tended to gloss over the contestations both inter and intra-Iwi and hapū. Many were anti-Tauiwi as opposed to being pro-Iwi and had little understanding of Kai Tahu history in regard to land sales, land loss and the Claim with its settlement, having only recently decided to acknowledge or had newly discovered their tatai Tahu. This was far more pronounced for the young among the group, who had learned their mea Māori and Treaty issues at high school or tertiary institutions. Some of the most tunnel-visioned and anti-Kai Tahu were in the middle age section of this group, who continued to blame their parents for their lack of knowledge of Te Reo and Iwitaka (commonly mis-described as Māoritanga). They further held that it had much to do with the nation’s many systems that denied them access to their landscapes and the histories surrounding them. There were some extremely bitter individuals in this group who were such a complete contrast to many mis-informed romantics in the younger ones.

Others who were not direct participants, but with whom the project was discussed felt a greater affinity with the sea than to the land. They view this as part of their landscape
anyway seeing no need for a separation between land and sea, as both are part of Papatuānuku. I had expected them to view the landscape by looking towards the land from the sea. On the contrary, they perceived the sea as their landscape, as though it were the land upon which they lived and worked. I refer once more to the way the Epeli Hau'ofa conceptualised the Pacific as “a sea of Islands.” Hau'ofa made the point that the peoples of Oceania as attested to through their myths, cosmologies, legends and oral histories, perceived of their landscapes as the whole of the Pacific region; they were not mere tiny atolls and islands upon which the people lived (Hau’ofa 1993: 7). Their landscapes rightly included the entire “surrounding ocean as far as they could traverse and exploit it” (Hau’ofa 1993: 7). Hau’ofa then argued that Pacific peoples view their world as a sea of islands, a vast landscape that is mostly ocean. Hau’ofa cites a Tongan example where those from the mainland have referred to those from the offshore islands as “people from the sea [with] the underlying assumption that the sea is home to some people” in the same way that land is to others (Hau’ofa 1993: 8). This adds to his earlier contention that the sea for Oceanians is part of an enormous landscape. Likewise Rapaport states the places close to the akau (shore) such as lagoons in Tuamotu, Marovo [Solomon Islands] and Takaroa [Tahiti] are considered to be the same as if they are land (Rapaport 1996: 39-40). For Kai Tahu above to whom I refer, this was precisely what the sea was: their home (for most of the time); their place of work; their solace; their special place.

That conceptualisation was not always merely to do with descriptive terms though sometimes special areas of sea were described and pinpointed using a land reference. In such instances, they spoke of a sunrise, a sunset, a particular view and how that could alter according to the moon, the direction of the prevailing wind or as a result of a season. These people described scenes and the sea in the same ways as did those who described similar scenes of the land. For the most part the seascapes were so intimately known to the story teller that a non-sea person was unable to visualise the area and no attempt was deemed necessary by the one with that intimate knowledge to assist in the understanding of their experience of
these places. One either knew them or did not. This was especially obvious in hearing the
differences in how an area was described by the sea people:

Getting back to the landscape, I think the sea, the sea is [it]. When your fathers could have been fishing and men
that you know. Being a part of going to Ruapuke, going to the muttonbird island, Stewart Island. I would have to
say where Bowler memorial is. That for me is a lovely spot, looking out over the Neck and over to Ruapuke, That
is a wonderful place, you couldn’t have chosen anything better, it is delightful. Stewart Island is totally different
to Ruapuke. There were nine of us on the boat, [and] we had Tapihi who gave a wonderful karakia before we left
Bluff. We had a terrible crossing, (that generally happens) and we did a tour around Stewart Island by boat.
Five days and the weather was absolutely wonderful. We had Mercury Television on board and Linda who
owned the boat, did all the cooking. It was a wonderful, wonderful time and I would have to say it was one of the
highlights of my life. We stayed two nights at Pegasus and Harold took us tramping, that little old one guided
and pushed us, but we really, really enjoyed it. Wherever he took us we were fine. He showed us places that I
never dreamed were there, and when you think about the National Park and I think of those places.
Coming in each night, we anchored to go ashore at a little cove. This was absolutely beautiful. It was just a
wonderful day, and [when] the surf was too dangerous, they had to stand in the water and it came up to there on
them (high chest indicated). And I guess when you think about it, to leave it was so hard.
Then we went to Masons Bay. To the special place where they [our tūpuna] used to tie their waka up. Topi said
a Karakia and I found a taonga, a whale’s rib. (Susan Summerville, kōrero-ā-waha, Murihiku, 1999).

For many, strong connections with the landscape remain, as do strong connections
with seascapes. The true landlubbers recalled only seasickness. As already stated, many
amongst Kai Tahu feel little if any affinity with the landscape, the seascape or conceive of
themselves as being of it. Invariably, though not always, these are Kai Tahu living away from
Te Wāipounemū who often feel estranged from their homeplaces. In some instances, they are
Kai Tahu whose parents or tūpuna (for whatever reason), sold their lands and who no longer
feel they belong. Others choose not to feel part of Kai Tahu Whānui for all number of
personal reasons, often connected with bad childhood experiences in their homeplaces. As
Nicki Walsh said, such people tend to associate the “place” with the bad experience and not
the "person" or "persons" who caused them pain (N. Walsh 1999: kōrero-ā-waha). Conversely on the Otago coast, as in the high-country, there are Tauiwi outside and inside the participant group who feel strongly for the land or farmscape, upon which much work and care has been given over many years.

Often the relationships are far from simple, as one incident illustrates. During a wānaka on a hikoi around some of the sites of Ōtākou on 6th June 1998, there was a conversation between a particular section of a group of which I was part. It was about former practices and how that area of landscape had looked when the oldest among the participants were young. One stated that when the father of another had objected to the planting of (pine) trees in what the father had considered the best mushrooming paddock “on the Kaik” (R. Harris 1998, kōrero-ā-waha), it was explained to the man (now deceased) that “I put the trees in there to stop the house sliding down the hill to meet yours” (T. Wesley 1998, kōrero-ā-waha). Wesley’s perspective at the time was that any trees that would help arrest further erosion were acceptable to clothe and so save his landscape. At first it would have seemed to an outsider listening in that the old man was more interested in mushroom gathering for the few weeks of the year that they are guaranteed to appear at the Kaik than in the landscape.

However, further conversation revealed that this was far from the case. The same old man who had initially objected to trees on his mushroom patch was stated by another, now almost the same age himself, as being so much a part of the landscape that it was almost as if he rose from out of it each morning and returned to it each night, so closely was he connected with it and so well did he understand his place in it. When I asked the elder to further explain what he meant, rather than interpreting it for myself, he said that, “the old sod knew every inch of his landscape including the sea and was so attuned to the elements of both, that when in his company I felt totally protected” (Anon. kōrero-ā-waha: 1998). The elder quoted stated that this same kind of connection and understanding of homeplace landscapes continues to exist in my own generation as he named two of my sisters and me amongst others he knew,
and those of our homeplace in whom he sees such connections. We in turn have attempted to pass that on to our uri and mokopuna (children and grandchildren), as have many others who retain wakawaka at their homeplaces and awaawa and manu rights in their mahika kai places.

It can be seen then, that landscape as text, as discourse, as farm, as sea, as identity and as ancestor is one and the same whether place or person, but differently conceptualised. It has a number of definitions nearly all of which are contested whether between individuals, members of a collective society, between or with a Tauiwi culture group or an Iwi one. If confined by certain divisions within academia who also contests the definition of landscape, (or any other interest group) to a single definition, landscape as a term may end up understood only as it has for so long by so many, as an aesthetic artistic concept only. This research continues to demonstrate that the term is multi-faceted in its definitions and understandings. Thus we will continue to examine it as a concept in the chapter which follows through its rediscovery, re-naming and so re-defining into a nation.
We used to get food from all over our Island; it was all mahinga kai. And we considered our Island as in a far superior position to any other, because it is called Te Wāipounamu, the Greenstone Island; the fame thereof reaches all lands. Wiremu Te One Te Uki, Kaiapoi, 12 May 1879. (in Evison 1993: title page).

This chapter presents a traditional understanding of Kai Tahu identity from the perspective of the procurement of food and other bounties of Papatūānuku from their land and seascapes. It considers the method they employed to trade surpluses, called kaihaukai. It also looks at general Māori values, those of Kai Tahu, and at how the latter interacted with their landscapes in order to stay within the bounds of the ethos and behaviour belief systems they considered appropriate to proper kaitiakitanga (guardianship).

Much of this chapter is autoethnographic in content and represents a lifetime of activity to acquire the information presented here. No citations are given where this knowledge is cited or relied on. That same knowledge given to me was also relayed to Tauiwi sources cited, such as Dacker and Evison, who readily accepted their emic knowledge. Others chose not to.

The chapter discusses the importance of kaihaukai and how its working as a form of trade and reciprocity was dependent upon an intimate knowledge of both land and seascapes. In any experiential understanding knowledge was essential between and across whānau and hapū in order to undertake successfully annual harvests of ti-kouka, tītī and other seasonal foods. Even once the potato was introduced as an alternative to aruhe and other forms of staple dietary requirements, Kai Tahu did not initially alter their work patterns around its
cultivation, but grew it near their pre-contact mahika kai sites so that they could continue to travel widely and interact with their relations.

**WHAKAPAPA: KO WAI Ā NŌ HEA MĀTOU: IDENTITY AND MAHIKA KAI**

"Whakapapa is the routeway, in which mana and tapu are transmitted" (Tau 1999b: 3). Whakapapa is also the principle from which chaos (or more correctly perhaps, the lack of order) can be rationalised, in that it places some sort of order upon place and time. It is the agent that connects opposites at the same time as being the tātai between the living and the dead, atua and tākata, and the seen and the unseen. Whakapapa is the backbone that permits humankind to interact with their land and landscapes. In this way, the earth and sky were understood as our original parents, while the sea, flora and fauna and all the elements of the natural world were also connected to us as people through a web of common kinship. The plains, the mountains and the forests and bird life on them, were to be understood as the descendants of Tāne, the creator of all life, who was in turn the son of Raki and Papatuanuku.

Connections such as these were not merely an external abstract belief system so often found in Western thought. Atua were real and immediate even though Atua Māori were vastly different from the pantheon of Greek Gods, who were constantly interfering in human affairs. In fact, it could be argued that the West's relationship with the landscape is as an object rather than as a spiritual being, which as a thought process can be traced back to the Creation myth of the Old Testament where nature and humankind were separated in the Garden of Eden. Such a separation did not occur for Māori.

In my experiential understanding of the Kai Tahu relationship with the land and to the landscape, it is crucial to first understand how the Kai Tahu world is ordered and understood. This may then be compared with Tauiwi understandings. This type of difference in understanding between pre-technological societies and those who colonised other places in
the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was discussed in the previous chapter. For Iwi the difference is significant and the point of departure is marked when Iwi interact with the history of the land. If we are to understand the Kai Tahu relationship with the local landscape we must start with the elements that act as references to the gods as mentioned in the previous chapter—namely the winds. It is from such understandings that Iwi derive their inseparability from whakapapa. Identity of Kai Tahu stems from the land that emanates from whakapapa. Hence the term tākata whenua (people of the land).

Identity, as defined in the Oxford dictionary (Allen 1990: 585), is said to be “the quality or condition of being a specified person or thing”, whilst ethos is said to be “the characteristic spirit or attitudes of a community, people or system” (in Allen 1990: 402). Anthropology has a number of somewhat ambiguous definitions of “identity” which in some instances refer to “properties of uniqueness and individuality, the essential differences making a person distinct from all others as in self-identity” (Byron 1996: 232). Conversely “identity” in anthropological terms can mean the opposite when it is used to define “qualities of sameness,” in that persons associate themselves or are associated with others on the grounds of commonalities, this being “ethnic identity” (Byron 1996: 232). Though anthropology at times conceptualises “identity” based on Erikson’s psychoanalytic, cognitive type of selfhood definition, usually the idea of “identity” is a social and cultural one with the emphasis based more on an individual or collective definition. Thus anthropology concerns itself with the social and cultural surroundings of what constitutes “identity” and “the mechanisms of socialization and cultural acquisition” of cultural identity (Byron 1996: 232). Identity from this perspective is concerned with “the social and cultural world” composed of segments in which individuals are defined in relation to their rights to belong to a group (Byron 1996: 232). But identity is also about meaning. Individuals usually share features in common with the cultural group that has an established concept of the individual’s particular status and role.
as well as that of the group. Both carry expectations of required norms of behaviour and ethos within that group.

Given these multiple definitions of understanding, it is not surprising to find there are many factors that contribute to what may constitute a tribe’s particular uniqueness, within the landscape and world-view of Māori as a conglomerate of individual Iwi (T. O’Regan 1987: 21). For Kai Tahu (and no doubt other tribal groups) who have been socialised and nurtured within a Māori world-view, identity includes a sense of interconnectedness with their land, as stated through the pepehā in the “Introduction.” As such, identity is embedded within an ancient understanding that those from whom Kai Tahu descend were the original arrivals to settle Te Wāipounenu (T. O’Regan 1987: 21), or were already in residence at the time of the first colonisers (Pere 1996: kōrero-ā-waha.). Such a place is both the geographical and cultural home of their heritage in which their identity and ethos have evolved. Within that evolutionary process, prior to and immediately post colonisation, there appear to have developed over time, quite distinct niche groups within the traditional Kai Tahu tribal boundaries. A loss of Mana whenua status resulted from new uses on the landscape. That in turn created four distinct tribal areas.

As a result of Te Kereeme, Kai Tahu worked as a unified group until the settlement of Te Kereeme in 1998. Perhaps all that has happened is that sections of those within the four geographical areas have consciously or otherwise reverted to pre-Treaty groupings. The present groups were, and are, geographically separate and separated by the places referred to in our pepehā

---

61 In 1996, I attended two hui conducted by Rangimarie Rose Pere, during which she stated, her old people considered there had been a huge continent in the Pacific called Hawaiiki Nui. Because of ongoing sins of the then tangata whenua, the Atua returned the bulk of their land mass to Te Moananui-a-Kiwa (perhaps Te Patunui o Aio, according to J Williams (1998: kōrero-ā-waha). Areas remaining above the ocean are what constitute the present Pacific Islands. Pere contends Hawaiiki tautau (the pulse) is the area known as Te Tai Potini (the West Coast of the South Island of New Zealand) and, that all tribes have whakapapa inter-connections to these first people of Hawaiiki Nui. Pere considers the separation from one another is what has caused the language and protocol differences now existing. Polynesians have commonly shared names and some similarities in creation histories.
“Ko Āoraki te Mauka, Ko Waitaki te Awa, Ko Pūkaki te Roto, Ko Kai Tahu Whānui te Iwi.”

This chapter proposes that, though both the ethos and identity of Kai Tahu have a number of aspects in common with other tribes, we went on to develop a markedly different cultural identity, one based around mahika kai which was derived from both their land and seascapes. A preliminary report that discussed the many aspects of Māori customary and traditional instream water values by D. Crengle and T. O’Regan (1997: 9) stated:

Mahinga kai has been literally translated as the ‘food works’[and] refers to the production and gathering of food and other natural resources, [that include] raranga (weaving) materials, or other cultural materials. In other words, for Kai Tahu mahika kai embodied much more than the mere acquisition of food, in that it was inseparable from other forms of work and the trading of goods with our own hapū or other Iwi. As will be clarified later, our Iwi developed a particular inter-hapū trade, through the exchange of specialty foods, known as “kaihaukai.”

This has remained a constant cultural aspect of Kai Tahu identity through changes in time for many of us who continue the practice. Kai Tahu cultural identity nonetheless is like that of all tribes.

It stems from whakapapa (genealogy), which is rooted in the land and in the place-names of that land. Our history is deeply embedded within and sourced from those place-names. That human-derived identity begins with Waitaha cosmological whakapapa from Raki and Pōharua-o-Te Pō, to Āoraki their first born and those of his brothers Rakirua, Rakiroa and Rārakiroa, who travelled with him on his canoe to view the new wife of Rakinui,

---

62 For the purposes of avoiding awkward descriptions, mahika kai will denote all forms of food gathering, whether land, lake, river or sea based.

63 In the version of Tiramōrehu, Pōharua-o-Te Pō is written as Pōharuatepō. (Tiramorehu [1849] 1987: 1, 23). Note also earlier explanations and spellings of her name as Pokoharua o te Pō and Pokoharua i te Pō. I have used the macrons in my spelling of her (Pokohārua o te Pō).
Map 6.1 Four Boundary Areas

SOUTH ISLAND, NZ

Area 1 Rakahuri to Waiau Ua or Kaikōura hapū
Area 2 Rakahuri south to Waitaki: includes Tuahuriri, and other hapū of Horomaka
Area 3 Waitaki south to Awarua and Rakura
Area 4 Te Tai Poutini

Because Kai Tahu, in common with other Iwi Māori in times past, accepted and continue to believe in our cosmological ancestry as an integral and therefore, inseparable part of the whakapapa from whence comes our human ancestry, we also accepted the responsibilities of guardianship over our primeval parent Papatuanuku. It is upon her that our landscapes and seascapes have been placed. She was and is seen as a parent and the source of all “human, animal, vegetable, insect, reptile, fish and bird [life, as well as that of] the mineral and spiritual worlds” (Beattie [1939] 1990: 1, Sinclair [1975] 1992: 64). In Te Ao Marama (the human world), the foundations of Kai Tahu whakapapa were completed upon the arrival of hapū, over a series of generations, from the northern Ngāti Kahungunu Kai (Ngāi) Tahu, until their last migration to Te Wāipounamu (J. Williams 1995: Ā-waha; Anderson 1998: 29-39). 65

As already stated by T. O'Regan (1987: 22), “Māori traditions of ancient times are [those] of small separated groups, of tribes rather than race or people.” Māori and Polynesians, in broad terms, acknowledge an interconnectedness with one another through whakapapa and genealogical relationships, which are said to be basic to identity (T. O'Regan 1987: 22). This is also true in relation to political and social interactions between whānau and hapū, hapū and Iwi, Iwi and waka. The above have been called “Te Kupenga o nga Tupuna” (the net of ancestry) (O'Regan 1987a: 21). In tandem with identity, and part of it, is the ethos of a group.

For most Kai Tahu, the geographical world which we inhabit and its landscape was to be held in sacred trust: this required that this world be respected as a mother and similarly

64 I discussed this story with Hana O'Regan who supplied me with a photocopy of it as written by her father Tipene O'Regan, which she had translated into Māori.

65 At a weekend hui which took place from 26-28 May 1995 at Mosgiel, Jim Williams spoke to a group on the origins of Kai Tahu, at the request of the hui organisers. I was both a participant and tutor.
cared for and cared about. The reasoning behind this was to ensure that the whenua remained as an asset for the whole, from the beginning until such time as the many as yet unborn become its kaitiaki (guardians)—that is forever. Whenua has two meanings and knowing that its other meaning is placenta helps explain why Iwi who hold such as their theory or epistemology view the concept of whenua with greater depth of meaning than do non-Iwi. Whenua may equally be defined as landscape and as an embodiment of Papatuanuku (although the present care of her has become a difficult task to enforce in areas that have passed from Kai Tahu guardianship). In order to protect the assets we had, restrictions were placed over areas of “well-defined land, over areas of sea, of lakes and waterways and over rivers” (Sinclair [1975] 1992: 65; V. B. Russell kōrero-ā-waha.). A protective restriction of this type is known as rāhui, in this sense meaning a form of conservation, which ensures protection against defilement and overuse. In times past, it allowed food sources of all kinds and related resources to replenish themselves, and it was upheld through rika kaha (physical enforcement). 66 Where a tapu is permanently in place, it is usually due to an urupa (burial site) being in that location, or as a result of some form of disaster having occurred there which had caused loss of life (Sinclair [1975] 1992: 65). A classic example in which a rāhui was placed in 1994 resulted from the drowning of some young men off the coast at Tautuku beach. Here a tohuka placed a ban on all fishing around the area for one year (Holmes 1994: kōrero-ā-waha).

Interestingly, it is only since the mid to late nineteenth century that marae 67 have come to play such an important role in the ethos and cultural identity of Kai Tahu. According to T. O’Regan, (1987: 27) and Taiapa (1996: 4), marae have become an enduring cultural feature of Māori lives and identity. This is in part due to the whakapapa that are represented within their confines. The nearness in proximity of urupa and more recently (for Kai Tahu) of houses,  

66 It was Jim Williams (1998:kōrero-ā-waha) who supplied me with the term “rika kaha.”

67 According to the Williams’ dictionary (1985: 180), marae are the “enclosed space in front of a [meeting] house, courtyard, [or] village common.”
some of which are now carved with depictions of tūpuna, are further contributing factors. At Kaikōura, the wharenui, which was decorated by representatives of many Kai Tahu hapū, depicts both tūpuna and the various types of mahika kai from throughout our rohe. Marae complexes have now become a focus for the way in which Māori perceive themselves through their particular visions of landscape.

For Kai Tahu and other Iwi, oral art and the ownership of it in the forms of waiata (songs) and haka used on the marae (and off it as well), are dependent upon references to tūpuna. These ancestral references may include all or any of the following: the topography of their rohe, such as mountains, lakes and rivers; the whakapapa that are referred to in whaikōrero (formal speeches); and also history and tradition, around which all the aforementioned are structured. Without aspects such as these, Māori would be no more than “brown New Zealanders” (T. O’Regan 1987a: 23). A contemporary example of waiata is Hana O’Regan’s 1996 post-graduate diploma in Arts dissertation which included newly composed waiata for those participant hapū in which she undertook her fieldwork: waiata that amongst other things were narrations of famous tūpuna, places and events in the history of Kai Tahu, which the participant hapū had narrated to her (H. O’Regan 1996: kōrero-a-waha.). Similarly, two kōrero pūrākau (famous stories of ancestors and their feats) of Kai Tahu, are to be found in the 1990 publication of the New Zealand Geographic Board (Davis 1990a: 78-90). Kai Tahu often refer to such kōrero as the survey pegs of their landscapes (H. O’Regan kōrero-ā-waha: 1997; Te A. Davis 1990a: 5). In the 1920s and 1930s, many songs were composed about both fishing and hōpu tītī (muttonbirding). In recent times Te Manutioriori, a Kai Tahu tutoring group, have travelled around both Te Waipounamu and Aotearoa, teaching Kai Tahu both old and newly composed waiata.

68 My late father, great uncle Turumaka Taiaroa and other family members, sang such waiata heard in our home from my earliest memories.
Map 6.2 Rock Art Sites

SOUTH ISLAND, NZ

1 Tonga Bay
2 Monkeyface
3 Motunau
4 Weka Pass
   (Tippendean)
5 Castle Hill
6 Mount Somers
7 Tekapo
8 Pukaki
9 Benmore
10 South Canterbury
   (Raincliff, Frenchmans Gully,
    Craigmore, Hazelburn)
11 North Otago
   (Takiroa, Maerewhenua)
12 Notornis Valley
13 Clitden

nā Bill Daker tēnei ahua
The Kai Tahu psychological view of kā wā i mua (the distant times past), is both a personal and a tribal one, because kinship is part of the self as are tūpuna, the two being spoken about in whakapapa (T. O'Regan 1987a: 142). Similarly, many of the songs and stories are both personal and tribal. However, that which connects the past with the present is whakapapa. Whakapapa is embedded in the landscape and is from and of the land, since tākata whenua are people of the land and whenua is also the placenta or afterbirth which is planted in the whenua after birth.

Whakapapa, as earlier stated, are derived from the landscapes of both Te Waipounemu and Hawaiki Nui and they function as the backbones that connect history to identity and those of the past with those of the present. As a result, all Kai Tahu are bound one to the other, as are the many place-names we have, through the concepts and enactment of taunahataka, takahi whenua and ahi kā roa (ongoing occupation). A claim to all, which originate from the first, comes from T. O'Regan (1987: 24), as he explains how whakapapa encompass the wider Pacific, where place-names upon their landscapes are familiar to him. These include such as Fa’a’aa (Whangara), Aora’i (Āoraki), Nu’utere (Nukutere), To’omaru (Tokomaru), which emerge in Tahiti Nui. Likewise, such names can be found in Samoa, including Aolagi (Āoraki), Ihulagi (Hikurangi of the north and Hikuraki of the South) (T. O'Regan 1987a: 24).

With the principal Kai Tahu pepeha as well as the variations on that theme, in combination with whakataukī (proverbial sayings), wherein are contained names, events and places that bind them together as an Iwi Whānui. This applies regardless of distinct hapū divisions, and what particular area of the Kai Tahu rohe individuals within it call home. The word “whānui” was stated previously as indicating the “diverse streams of whakapapa that collectively embody who Kai Tahu have now become” (Beattie [1939] 1990: 57-59).

Both O’Regan and Dacker, amongst others, note that various early Takata Bola or Pora (Tauiwi) ethnographers, when writing of Kai Tahu, failed to fully comprehend the use and
importance of whakapapa. This was particularly so in regard to female lines within them, through which arriving northern hapū were assimilated into the conglomerate of Iwi already resident in Te Wāipounemu (T. O'Regan 1995: kōrero-ā-waha; Dacker 1994: 5). Most ethnographers seem to have portrayed a succession of invasive conquests in which the victors subsumed the Mana whenua (sovereign rights over that land). Though this at times did occur, the more frequent outcomes from the various heke (migrations) were many alliances through politically astute marriages to Mana whenua females (taku mōhio). Of paramount importance in this type of alliance was that of the women’s hapū affiliation, which from the Kai Tahu perspective (unlike that of some tribes), varied, depending on what the reason was for it being stated.

One example was in 1864, when people from Ōtākou, in arguing for their tūī rights, wanted to claim these through a Kāti Māmoe hapū connection, but ultimately were ordered to use their Kai Tahu whakapapa (MacKay 1873: II: 60, in Anderson 1980: 10). As J. Williams (1997: kōrero-ā-waha) contends, many of the hapū from Kāti Māmoe were named after women, and their eponymous ancestor Whatua Māmoe was a tupuna wahine. Conversely over time, Kai Tahu, on gaining either ascendancy over or recognition by the Māmoe Mana whenua, used mostly male ancestral names for hapū, though some are female such as Irakehu, Atawhiua70 and Te Ao Taumawera. Williams also stated that when Tuahiwi people ceased to use the hapū name of Tūhaitara, one of their female eponymous ancestors, it was said to be as a result of the loss by them in warfare, of Mana whenua status formerly held by that hapū. Even so, Tūhaitara is still used as a hapū connection and those connected with her refer to her in the pepehā.

---

69 For similar thinking elsewhere in Polynesia see, Nick Thomas
70 The whakapapa of Te Atawhiua is Kāti Māmoe, rather than Kai Tahu (J Williams 2000: kōrero-ā-waha)
THE DYNAMICS OF MAHIKA KAI

Though some academics, census takers and other Iwi have measured degrees of Māoriness based on the way many northern tribes have expressed their identity and culture through their whakairo (carvings), wharewhakairo (carved houses) and other art forms, they have not always appreciated the way Kai Tahu have expressed their art through a particular form, rock art. These well-documented sites are situated particularly in South Canterbury and North Otago (Harsant 1987: 133-138; Dacker 1994: 5).

The rock art at the various sites (see earlier map), illustrates that the Waitaha, Māmoe then Kai Tahu lifestyle, as portrayed through these drawings, was almost exclusively to do with mahika kai. Kai Tahu consider this a result of a mahika kai identity that developed from an economic culture. That economic culture has centred around the relationship we have with the environment of land and sea in which we lived. As a result of this development, Kai Tahu constantly reaffirm that our culture has existed in continuum (contrary to other tribes' perceptions of us as an Iwi) and was not lost with colonisation. Our traditions and our Kai Tahutaka of tribal integrity, identity and tikaka (customs and habits) have been retained to the same degree as those of other Iwi--perhaps to an even greater degree than some. We do not deny that we have lost an overall Iwi ability to kōrero (speak) solely in Māori, but we are not alone in that respect. Language, which Kai Tahu acknowledge to be an integral part of any cultural group including ours, is just that. It is part of a group’s identity and ethos and does not constitute the totality of it. Rather, for us, mahika kai was and is given equal importance.

The practice of mahika kai grows out of the nature of the landscapes, which include the sea. As Kai Tahu Whānui, the rohe over which our Iwi may claim Mana whenua and Mana moana, stretches from Te Parinui-o-Whiti (White Bluffs) on the east coast and Kahuraki (Kahurangi) on the west. It extends southwards to Awarua (Bluff), Rakiura (Stewart Island),...
the Tītī (mutton bird) Islands and further south to include Motu Ihupuku (Campbell Island) and Tini Heke (Snares Islands). Because the climate south of Horomaka (Banks Peninsula) is much colder than the more northern land mass, kumera were unable to be cultivated here, whilst karaka trees did not produce fruit south Horomaka (Dacker 1994: 5; Evison 1993: 6; J. Williams 2000: kōrero-ā-waha). However, although any one area might have extremely harsh conditions, so long as it had one major resource, the people of it could trade and exchange this specialty kai for other kinds, in the practice of “kaihaukai” (Evison 1993: 6; Beattie [1939] 1990: 130-131; Dacker 1994: 9; Dacker 1990: 14). The vastly different landscapes, combined with a distinctly seasonal climate, meant a new economy had to be devised in which it was possible to facilitate our growth and prosperity as an Iwi.

The cooler climate saw Kai Tahu dependent upon what early ethnographers such as Boas, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown and others have termed, a hunter-gatherer mode of production. That lifestyle mirrored what anthropologists have described as independently operating bands who, though tribally connected, seldom acted as a cohesive unit. Instead, Kai Tahu gathered and preserved seafood of all types, plants and the fruits these produced, fern root and stems, both land and sea mammals and animals, including many bird species from the forest and lakes (Evison 1993: 6). Harvests of native rats and seals took place annually, as did those of the tītī, tuna (eel), kauru (sugar) from the ūī-kouka (cabbage tree) and other delicacies from the many areas within the Kai Tahu larger rohe. Such products of labour were exchanged between various whānau and hapū in order to acquire other specialty foods that were available to us only through kaihaukai (Evison 1993: 6; Beattie 1990: 130-1). Kai Tahu did not just forage for food, quite the contrary:

1). We managed the land and water resources having learned from the disasters of our tupuna and the loss of the moa (not all directly attributable to our slash and burn practices);
2). We gardened; though not in the way that northern Iwi did. It was nonetheless, a form of plant domestication, especially in relation to the annual harvest and replanting of tī kouka, as attested to in J. Williams (1996);
3). Such practices ensured that each year the products from the tī, (the kouka) would be assured as part of the kaihaukai;
4). We did (in certain areas and do still), practice selective kai moana farming with paua and other shellfish;
6) Habitat improvement such as periodically opening up Waihora Lake Ellesmere near Taumutu near Southbridge (J. Williams 2000: kōrero-ā-waha, taku mōhio).

Exchanges and trade of this type came, in the late eighteenth century, to include pounamu (Dacker 1990: 7). In some instances, this was worked at Te Tai Poutini (West Coast), then transported to the east coast where it was processed for trade with northern tribes (Dacker 1990: 7). Such practices merely add to the argument of a mahika kai cultural and economic identity, lending considerable weight to a Kai Tahu world-view in which we consider ourselves to have much more of an economic as opposed to an artistic culture, when measured against other Iwi from Aotearoa. That is not to say that we are or have always been culturally bereft in an artistic sense, rather that the lifeways of early Kai Tahu demanded that culture consisted of economically related affairs. Art for us, was and continues to be but one aspect of what constitutes culture and Kai Tahu consider that though our artistic expressions may be fewer or different from our northern Iwi counterparts, our culture is nonetheless as distinctively Māori as theirs.

Food resources with access and gathering rights were of the utmost importance to Kai Tahu (Dacker 1994: 6, 8.). Dacker (1990) and Anderson (1998), provide very detailed lists of Kai Tahu food resources from land, rivers and sea, maps with some of the food resources and maramataka (calendar) in which is explained the times and places for obtaining these resources (Dacker 1994: 6, 7. Dacker 1990: 8-13; Anderson 1998: 135). It is said by some Kai
Tahu that certain seafood areas are still known by a personal name, as are areas of ocean, 
where particular fishing spots are coordinated by named coastal landscape markers (Sinclair 
[1975] 1992: 66). Within this economically based culture Kai Tahu applied rāhui, through 
which we have maintained an ongoing care of the land and so have retained many of our 
mahika kai resources. The ideas behind rāhui and their enactment have stemmed from the 
mana of Kai Tahu. The care of our landscapes in order to retain and maintain mahika kai 
areas constituted the economic identity of Kai Tahu while also being a cultural one. Currently 
an active ongoing participation in mahika kai enables Kai Tahu to express our cultural 
continuity. Such activity is still governed by cultural practices expressive of an ethos that 
embodies environmental concepts, including obligations and rights.

Ethos and behaviours of Kai Tahu are not merely to do with environmental management 
and sustainable ecological practices, but also embrace appropriate moral behaviour. Kai Tahu 
were much more than some ethnic grouping who occupied Te Wāipounenu. Kai Tahu were 
also a moral community whose practices, once hard environmental mistakes had been made 
and learned from, had more than material requirements as ethos. There were riteka (Māori 
religious) practices, correct relationship and moral behaviours with others and the various 
deities, as well as those tikaka (customary practices) of a secular nature, which ensured the 
survival of whānau, hapū and Iwi.

The type of economy and culture which Kai Tahu had developed before Takata Bola 
arrived could be achieved only where a population was relatively small (Dacker 1994: 8). 
Having specialty food resources that were confined to particular areas, when combined with 
the practice of kaihaukai, meant that Kai Tahu needed to be a very mobile Iwi. We had rights 
to food and other resources and could exercise them over many areas of their landscape (and 
seascape). The social structure of Kai Tahu is consistent with (anthropologically defined) 
related, but not cohesive bands. Mahika kai identity was born out of diverse weather patterns,

71 My Dad, Boydie Russell, showed and told trusted people of many such places. He also provided "in
differing micro-climates, and environments encompassed within such an extensive land mass. It was a way of life that saw Kai Tahu travel constantly and confidently around their landscape.

Throughout our earlier history we worked and properly utilised the resources of our takiwā and as a result were able to engage in the trading of surpluses with other hapū (Dacker 1994: 6). Such a lifestyle saw many of our Tūpuna engage in particular hapū affiliations, derived through wise marriages or inherited rights, and to use these marriages to gain access to mahika kai resources scattered all over the rohe (Dacker 1994: 6. Evison 1993: 12). The quote at the beginning of this chapter confirms this. Such contentions are also mirrored in Dacker when he describes how Kai Tahu moved over a large area (Dacker 1994: 6). In another text Dacker (1990: 6) has stated that “one historian collected the names of over two hundred different plants and animals” that Kai Tahu used, as food or mahika kai related resources. Despite this, a Tauwi ethnographer thought we were devoid of any resources, given his translation of the whakatauki, “E pakihi hakinga a kai” which was incorrectly interpreted as meaning that the Canterbury Plains area was all but devoid of food (J. Williams, 1998: kōrero-ā-waha on Shortland’s interpretation). On the contrary, the whakatauki referred to the comprehensive Kai Tahu knowledge of their landscapes and mahika kai, even in a landscape that seemed to the outsider to contain nothing by way of sustenance.

What was implied in the Tauiwi rendition of the proverb is that the landscape was so barren that it was small wonder there were no permanent Kai Tahu settlements between Horomaka and Te Umu Kaha (Temuka): that the only visible resources were tīkouka and tutu (J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha). Williams (kōrero-ā-waha 1998) also stated that Bishop Selwyn made comments in this regard in 1844 when he said the Plains were “incapable of...” evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal on the existence of such places, using grid references.

72 Having rights all over the rohe did not mean that these included automatic rights to the whole landmass, but rather those rights of entitlement inherited through whakapapa.
sustaining human life.” But the message really contained in the proverb is, that one needed knowledge of what to look for as much as where it was located, in order to access mahika kai. Kai Tahu with use rights to these areas had so understood their landscapes. An intimate knowledge as well as wise guardianship of them was essential to their ongoing use and ensured Iwi survival, as the tūpuna had ultimately come to understand. Such conservation practice as a necessity had been a lesson well learned by our tūpuna the hard way through the loss of the moa and huge areas of forest. Mahika kai was undertaken during the appropriate seasons in the various takiwā. Those leaders who were made responsible for deciding in what area the work would be undertaken, and who should undertake it, had to have extensive knowledge of both the landscape and the time required to complete the work. This was necessary to accurately coordinate any particular task, so that the tasks that followed and preceded it could still be accurately undertaken and carried to completion. Such knowledge was paramount, as was that of the most easily accessible resources required to sustain the group during long journeys to the food resources and to nourish them properly during their work (Dacker 1994: 8).
Nga hua o te whenua
Nga hua o Tane
Nga uri a Tangaroa

The fruits of the land
The fruits of Tane
The children of Tangaroa

These are some of the most important foods worked by Kai 'Iahu and the time of year they were most likely to be worked. The Maori calendar is based on two known by James Te Rauparaha in the 1850s, different traditions sometimes used different names but the principles were the same.
Some examples of major Kai Tahu resource areas after the introduction of potatoes. For hundreds of years the specialities of the various areas were widely traded -- from district to district, and between Te Waipounamu and Te Ika a Maui (North Island).

Some Kai Tahu resource areas

- FISH
- WEKA
- EELS
- FOREST BIRDS
- TIKUMU
- WEKA TARAMEA
- TIKUMU EELS
- POUNAMU
- WEKA TARAMEA
- KAURU
- POUNAMU
- KANAKANA EELS
- TITI
- POTATOES
- KANAKANA EELS
- KUMARA
- FISH
- EELS
- FISH
- EELS
- POTATOES
- FISH
- KARAKA (BERRIES)
- DUCKS

nā Bill Daker tēnei ahua
Evison (1993: 6) also talks about the specialty foods of Kai Tahu throughout their rohe, from the northernmost boundaries to the most southern, and about their pounemū. Both, he argues, were what brought Kai Tahu, and the other Iwi from whom they are descended, to Te Wāipounemū (Evison 1993: 6). He provides information about pounemū sources from Piopiotahi or Whiowhiotahi (Milford Sound), Arahura and Te Awa Wakatipu (the Dart River), and about Kai Tahu’s extensive knowledge of pounemū and the many varieties and uses it has (Evison 1993: 6 -7 and fn 21: 16). However, before exploring the role pounemū played in the cultural identity of Kai Tahu, reference should first be made to the Kai Tahu ethos: how that pertained to rituals associated with all aspects of mahika kai; the collection, selection and associated work of pounemū; and appropriate behaviour upon the landscapes that yielded these resources.

**KAWA ME TIKAKA**

Areas from where kai was obtained usually had an associated tūahu (altar). These were set aside in places close to the food source, yet sufficiently removed from the area being worked, so as to separate the tapu (restricted) aspect from that of the noa (unrestricted) (Dacker 1990: 16). Tohuka undertook the ceremonies required to ensure a favourable outcome, whether for a productive growing season, favourable weather, or a most propitious harvest. Such karakia (incantations) and associated rituals were carried out using appropriate ceremonies and tikaka for the task at hand; both prior to and at the completion of work (Dacker 1990: 16). No one undertook these works without such ritual, karakia, or ceremony, and these continue to be used by many to the present time in certain types of mahika kai and pounemū gathering. The tapu was lifted before any work beginning while rāhui was placed at its completion. As stated earlier, the latter prevented the depletion of food and pounemū resources.
Pounemu was an intrinsic aspect of the Kai Tahu mahika kai identity, and had its own patterns and traditions. Dacker (1994: 6) states, that “by the 18th century pounamu had become a major source [so that] some hapū attracted by its wealth” shifted to Te Tai Poutini. As a result of this movement, regular trade routes came into being between the west and east coasts of Te Wāipounamu. The pounemu was initially worked at its source then transported across Te Tiritiri o te Moana (also called the divide or te tūārā [backbone] and the Southern Alps), where it was worked and processed and from there was traded with Iwi from the North Island (Dacker 1994: 6-8). The original people of Te Tai Poutini as earlier referred to were known as Kāti Wairangi (Tootell 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). Kai Tahu gained knowledge of and access to the pounemu from a Wairangi woman, Raureka who had been banished from Te Tai Poutini for adultery. Tootell stated that she and a servant crossed the divide, arriving in a dreadfully weakened state near Geraldine (South Canterbury). On her recovery she observed the Mana whenua there attempting to cut the tī-kouka with inadequate equipment. She persuaded the man she had by then married to bring an accompanying group with them to Te Tai Poutini, the source of pounemu. Once there, she had a toki (axe) fashioned for him and on discovering its superior strength for particular mahika kai purposes, a number of Kai Tahu decided to settle there. Over time they learned how to work and fashion pounemu into tools, weapons and jewellery (Tootell 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). Joe Waka of Te Umu Kaha related the purakau almost verbatim except that he knew not the reason for her haereka ki te Tai Rawhiti o Te Wāipounemu and certainly not of the alleged adultery (J. Waka korero-ā-waha: 1999). According to Evison (1993: 4):

*a section of Ngai Tuahuriri moved to Tai Poutini to wrest control of the pounemu from Ngati Wairangi [and] became known as Poutini Ngai Tahu [resulting in] Kaiapoi [supposedly becoming] the greatest pounemu centre of trade in the land.*

73 Evison (1993:16), cites his source for the above story as MC I (meaning the McKay papers), Part III (Traditional History) pp. 44-45 in endnote 13. It may originate from Kai Tuahuriri, and, that it is different from
Dacker (1994: 8) writes of Otago kaik working pounemu. At KārīTāne, the Te Wāhia whānau were famous for their ability to fashion pounemu. This was confirmed in a kōrero by R. Kirikiri 1997: kōrero-ā-waha) at a hui there in 1997. Taiaroa of Ōtākou and Taumutu is said to have had a pounemu factory located at Te Ngaru Bay, just south of Aramoana, where even in recent times pieces have surfaced on the site. Pounemu obviously played an important part in the Kai Tahu economy, while at the same time it was, and continues to be, prized as an ornamental treasure. In former times, the pounemu which had its source at Piopiotahi (Whiowhiotahi Milford Sound)—known as Takiwai—was used mostly for ornamental purposes, because it was more yielding and therefore easier to work. The pounemu from both the Arahura and Te Awa Wakatipu (Dart) rivers was on the other hand, extremely strong and was used for tools and weapons, although it was much harder to fashion.74 All of these descriptions clearly show the ability of Kai Tahu to undertake very long heke (journeys) because they knew their landscapes intimately. It further demonstrates they had sufficient understanding of the weather patterns to know the most propitious time when these long treks would be achievable in safety.

By the late seventeenth century, pounemu had come to be a major resource of Kai Tahu for a number of reasons, both practical and ornamental as evidenced in Dacker (1994: 7-8). In the early nineteenth century, it was said to have been an important catalyst for the raids by Te Rauparaha, who allegedly expressed the desire to establish ownership of the pounemu—it having become such a prized asset for all Māori (Evison 1993: 49, 73.). Whether heke from the north were to establish new alliances or not, the principal driving force seems to have been connected to the specialty food, mahika kai, and pounemu of Te Wāipounemu, and

74 Taku mōhio.
access and gathering rights to these. Kai Tahu communities exploited and used the natural resources for immediate consumption as well as for the purposes of trade; the latter being seen as basic to our economy and therefore to the whole social fabric of tribal and inter-tribal life (T. O'Regan 1997: 9). As such, mahika kai resources have more than a mere sustenance significance; they include elements of physical, psychological and spiritual health and wellness, as well as elements of cultural artworks and economic value in relation to trade (T. O'Regan 1997: 9). Alongside these, other culturally associated values have significance, particularly the ability to appropriately host both expected and unexpected visitors. Possession and maintenance of such ability demonstrated the mana of an Iwi or hapū, as committed kaitiaki (caretakers).

Kai Tahu ethos was and is not merely a marae-based one (even if some of our power brokers believe it should be), but continues to include mahika kai and pounem. This we do as it mirrors our identity. It has been easier to maintain this ethos, because although there were always elements of ritual associated with mahika kai, they could take place wherever the resources were. They did not require the structured formalities of marae-based interactions. Kai Tahu do, it should be stressed, have their own particular marae-based tikaka, which have elements in common with other Iwi, but which also have differences, both internally and externally. As part of this kawa (protocol), references to landscapes and who or what these stand for are alluded to in marae-based interactions. The topic of identity was discussed with Hana O’Regan, who stated that during her research regarding who Kai Tahu were as an Iwi it was asserted time and again that they considered mahika kai to be uppermost in their self-descriptions (H. O’Regan 1996: kōrero-a-waha.).
"Kā kai e taona ai e Rehua: [the foods of the summer star, Rehua are self cooked through the process of ripening"] (nā J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha).

"E pakihi hakinga a kai: [a featureless plain will reveal its food if search[ed]]" (J. Williams 1998: kōrero-ā-waha).

These quotes show the importance of kaihaukai to Kai Tahu, which was further dependent upon an intimate knowledge of both land and sea. It was essential for such knowledge to exist across and between whānau and even hapū in order to undertake annual harvests of such things as kauru. The practice of kaihaukai was an exchanging of specialty foods from one area with those of another. There was significant ceremony attached to the food exchange. It took place at particular times such as after the annual harvesting of tī kouka (cabbage tree) when the kauru (the sugar extracted from the pulp of the tī kouka) had been manufactured, or after the annual hōpu tītī (muttonbirding). Many writers (Beattie [1939] 1990: 130-131; Dacker 1990: 14; Dacker 1994: 9; Evison 1993: 6) discuss or describe what kaihaukai practices entail. Anderson (1998: 126-129) also discusses the gifting of special foods to Rakatira called tamatama.

Kaihaukai as a practice meant that Kai Tahu made a particular effort to preserve the most important food as a means of trade with other Kai Tahu, or with northern Iwi (Dacker 1990: 14). These resources, such as the annual harvests of tītī, kauru and, outside of food, pounamu, were what constituted the wealth of Kai Tahu. Our unique ability to have access to virtually the whole of the island and its many specialty foods meant that kaihaukai involved a great range of such foods that were available to particular whānau and hapū, and a reason for getting together to exchange these with each other. Such exchanges helped form part of the basis of the Kai Tahu traditional economy (Dacker 1994: 9) and were a courtesy related
matter which included reciprocity. The practice of kaihaukai also helped give variation to the

Regarding tītī and tī-kouka, it is said that at the completion of every season, the first of
a particular kind of kaihaukai began as the birders returned northward to their various kaik
(Dacker 1990: 14). After paying with birds for pre-season koha (gifts) of food or pōhā (kelp
bags) to store and preserve the birds, tītī were eagerly exchanged for tī-kauru (Dacker 1990:
14; Dacker 1994: 6). It is also stated that both tī kauru and tītī travelled great distances in the
kaihaukai, whereas many other foods did not (Dacker 1990: 14).

A classic example of kaihaukai is one described by Tikao to Beattie. He stated that
word would be sent ahead when a kaihaukai was going to take place (Beattie [1939] 1990:
130-131; Tikao nd: “Mahika Kauru”). He used as examples Rapaki (Lyttleton) as the hosts
and Kaiapoi as the manuhiri (guests). The hosts would gift to Kaiapoi, tuna (eels), kiore
(native rat), kurī (native dog), aruhe (fern root), and kumera (sweet potatoes). In return,
Kaiapoi would bring mako (shark), dried fish and shell-fish. All goods would be placed by the
guests on one of two specially constructed whata (stages) which held a series of kaho
(platforms), at varying heights in kete (flax baskets). On the empty whata was put food gifted
by the host hapū. However, no eating occurred at this time. Rather, bearers from Rapaki
would help those from Kaiapoi to transport their kai to their homeplace, then return home
themselves. It was only after all these events were complete, that a hākari (feast) would be
enjoyed by the participating hapū. This narration has been sourced entirely from Beattie
pecking order among gifting chiefs, which is not an integral part of the usual kaihaukai. He
names this kawa as kaihaukai, but for most Kai Tahu, what Anderson refers to is instead
tamatama.

75 It is said (according to a Taranaki kaumatua, the late Ruka Broughton) that Ngā Rāuru had come south for
In a korero-a-waha with Jim Williams, there was mention of a similarly related food exchange named “tamatama” that he stated had been alluded to in Tau’s thesis (Tau 1993: 185-6; Beattie [1939] 1990: Note 7; 140-1) and mentioned earlier by Anderson (1998: 126-129). The two descriptions though similar are not identical and this is so for many Kai Tahu understandings of concepts.

The variation between these understandings stems from the original korero. There are regional differences in the explanation of things Kai Tahu that continue to occur between those who still hold experiential understandings and those who have the knowledge based on outside sources. This merely makes each different, not incorrect. In Tikao Talks ([1939] 1990) Beattie expresses the enormous differences in the knowledge of his informants, as collected and collated in the early 1930s. Even names for fish and other resources varied, depending on the area where Beattie had gathered the information, as is attested to in his 1939 version, edited by Anderson and reproduced in 1994 as “Traditional Lifeways of the Southern Maori.” Nonetheless Dacker (1990: 14) under the heading of “Kaihaukai” talks of particular foods considered as special, which were reserved for important guests or Rakatira, although this did not preclude the rest from eating such food delicacies during kaihaukai.

This form of food exchange has been the precursor for the ongoing ability of Kai Tahu to provide hākari type feasts at any hui we host. As Tikao has stated in Beattie “there was more food down here than in the North Island, and nothing was stinted in the efforts to create a good effect” (Tikao in Beattie [1939] 1990: 130). Some Iwi though have neither the ability nor the opportunity to access such specialty kai as that which Kai Tahu are still able to provide. Thus in Te Whanganui-a-Tara in September 1998, Kai Tahu though manuhiri (guests), provided hākari food specialties including tītī, kōura and other ika, for the

---


77 From sources such as the old Tāua referred to earlier and inside knowledge, it is clear that the fruits of kaihaukai were shared by all and not only highborns as suggested in Anderson (1980:13-15)
consumption of all present. Some Iwi have neither the ability nor the opportunity to access specialty kai in the same way as we do. This may perhaps be due to the fact that so many of all Iwi have become urbanised, hence the knowledge and skills required have been lost, even when the resources are there. It has been my experience, and that of others with whom it has been discussed, that the ability to manaaki (show hospitality to, care for) and feed visitors to our Kai Tahu region is unsurpassed. Kai Tahu continue to koha with our specialty foods when we attend hui, whether amongst ourselves or with other Iwi, so continuing the practice of kaihaukai based on mahika kai.

Although present day kaihaukai are experienced in a vastly altered way, they occur at least once a year, sometimes at Kai Tahu Hui-ā-Tau (annual gathering). Here, delicacies from various takiwā may be brought to be shared by all. Though the protocol too has changed in that all share the food during the hui, some trading still takes place in the old way. Although the tikaka (customs) and kawa (protocol) of former times have evolved and altered, as have some of the collection methods, the idea of mahika kai and kaihaukai along with the ethos behind them remains intact. The host marae always supplies its specialty foods on the first day and, where necessary, provision can be made available for the safe and hygienic storage of any exchange food until the day of departure. It is the vast range of specialty foods and ability to inspect and purchase pounemu (and other specialty goods outside of special kai) that help make Hui-ā-Tau such greatly anticipated occasions. As diverse as their foods and resources are, so too are those who provide them.

WARFARE AND DISRUPTIONS TO MAHIKA KAI: VIOLATION OF LANDSCAPES.

The arrival of Takata Bola brought huge changes to Kai Tahu relationships with their landscapes. These new people introduced new crops, technology, trade items and means of
transport that we welcomed, but so too did other Iwi that coveted our resources. Neither they nor the newcomers were to move gently in the landscapes that had afforded us our identity and livelihood for generations.

The potato removed the need to travel in search of staple foods, so what had been a necessity gradually became an option (Dacker 1990: 22). But potato crops apparently were still only planted and tended “in the course of other economic activities” (Anderson 1980: 5). Leach, according to Anderson (1980: 5), posited the argument that Kai Tahu did not initially interrupt the existing tradition of mahika kai in order “to accommodate the cultivation of” potatoes. However, with newer evidence Anderson has revisited his earlier work and revised much of his original time line (Anderson 1998: 72-75). At Omāui, at Awarua (Bluff), and at Ruapuke, an island off the coast near Awarua, both potatoes and other foods assisted the establishment of trade between Kai Tahu and whalers. Anderson gives a long quote from Edwardson about extensive potato and other vegetable gardens at Pāhia, and a piece based on the diaries of Thomas Shephard talks of Kai Tahu from the Pegasus Harbour area growing both black and white potatoes. Caddell also describes how Kai Tahu worked as a group to clear land for the cultivation of potatoes as a main crop and the growing of other vegetables (Anderson 1998: 95-98). The dates of these recorded witnessing of potato cultivation begin at 1809-10 and the last quote is from 1826.

Through the trading of potatoes and other foods, iron tools were obtained, as were muskets. The latter were first acquired and used from the mid to late 1830s by Kai Tahu from Otago and Southland to engage in warfare with Te Rauparaha (Dacker 1990: 22; Evison 1993: 91-96).78 Those Kai Tahu outside the zone of contact with whalers and sealers were often disadvantaged, being unable to readily access the Tākata Bola technology that included their weaponry. When this was combined with the unexpected ferocity of Te Rauparaha and

78 These two areas were never invaded by Te Rauparaha though one unsuccessful attempt was made at Tuturau by one of his allies from Ngāti Tama. Except for Arowhenua (which is east of the divide and north of the Waitaki), all other incursions into Kai Tahu lands occurred north of the Waitaki and west of the main divide.
the first attack of his Ngāti Toa taua (war parties), the outcome for Kai Tahu at Omihi near Kaikōura was horrendous slaughter. The attack was said to have been an act of utu (revenge) as a result of Kai Tahu supposedly providing refuge to an enemy of Te Rauparaha, from an earlier northern battle (Dacker, 1994: 10). Evison (1993: 71) however, contends Te Rauparaha was certain of his musket superiority and so,

\[ \text{wished to conquer Te Wāipounamu [to] acquire the famed [taoka]. In 1830, he captured and later killed Te Maiharanui (the paramount Chief of all Kai Tahu) from Akaroa, the following year he overran the pa at Onawe and in 1832, the pa of Kaiapoi was taken.} \]

Following that fighting season, Niho and Takere of Ngāti Rārua, went down the west coast of Te Wāipounemenu where they overcame the Tai Poutini Kai Tahu; yet no slaughter took place here because the aggressors needed the Poutini knowledge of pounemenu (Evison 1993: 91). In fact, under the Rakatira Tuhuru, Niho and Takere established for themselves a lucrative pounemenu trade. They maintained its smooth running at all costs, even against former allies from Ngāti Tama, who later requested safe passage to the south east coast in order to attack and try to defeat Kai Tahu there (Evison 1993: 91), though they were unsuccessful in that attempt. It is said that some of the people of Poutini hapū were described as being of gentler nature than Kai Tuahuriri, (and this may be contested by them or others among us), yet their loss of mana was no less devastating (Tootell, 1997: kōrero-ā-waha). This was particularly so in relation to the kaitiakitaka (guardianship) of their pounemenu. Though still in their takiwā, it was judged to be nominally in their possession since they were forced to work it for their captors (Tootell, 1997: kōrero-ā-waha).

Kai Tahu south of the Waitaki in Otago and Southland who were the most effective in repelling the Ngāti Toa attacks, were also the most effective at maintaining greater interaction in continuum, than any of the other three geographical areas. For some time after the land sales, the Kaikōura people continued to exercise their tītī manu rights that facilitated ongoing
inter hapū interaction. In modern times, fast transportation has meant such isolation has become a thing of the past.

Dacker states that even before the 1830s, Kai Tahu had eagerly acquired the material goods of the Tākata Bola through trade (Dacker 1990: 22. Evison 1993: 27-8). Before the Treaty and subsequent colonial rule, Tuhawaiki, using his own vessels, had southern Kai Tahu engaged in the processing of flax, potatoes and whale oil from Ruapuke, to trade with merchants in Sydney (Evison 1993. 88). Kai Tahu thus adapted an economic culture based on their practices of mahika kai, kaihaukai and pounemu, and merely continued such practices as we took on the trading concepts of the Tākata Bola, by the use of their technology (H. O’Regan 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). The one area of mahika kai that did not alter in its method of harvesting was that of hōpu tītī (mutton birding), though over time, the types of storage vessels have undergone a number of changes, as have the means of transportation to the islands.

H. O’Regan considers that her Kai Tahu tupuna always had leaders of vision, from early pre-colonial contact to the present, who deliberately engaged in trade with Tākata Bola and actively sought acquisition of the introduced technology. These measures, in conjunction with the utilisation of the new technology, saw Kai Tahu initially competing on equal terms with Pākehā in early trans-Tasman trading opportunities (H. O'Regan kōrero-ā-waha: 1996). One old Taua (elder) said that from the 1830s sealers and whalers on their shores, who had become familiar with their rules, saw Kai Tahu make a “deliberately conscious decision to give Tākata Bola to their women as husbands” (Anon. 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). It is worded here from her perspective, and mirrored in Dacker (1994: 13), that the Tākata Bola were given to the women as husbands, not the women given to them as wives. This demonstrates a markedly different perception from ethnographic accounts where the concept is most often reversed. Such an understanding of historical events removes any suggestion that the women were treated as chattels or tradeable commodities. Rather, this practice was part of an existing
tradition in which agency remained fairly with Kai Tahu. The Tāua or old people were influenced in this way because they themselves had an economic trade-based ethos and arranging marriages of this type made access to the new technology and trade easier (Anon. 1996: kōrero-ā-waha).

Though some of the very early encounters were not always so amicable, while Kai Tahu were still in the ascendancy their existing proprietary rights in the landscape could not be ignored. Once such Kai Tahu kawa had been clearly established, properly understood and adhered to, the new technology and economic practices, and those who brought them, were more or less effortlessly incorporated into the existing Kai Tahu culture (Anon. 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). This was done in the certain knowledge that it would be of mutual benefit to both parties (Anon. 1996: kōrero-ā-waha; Dacker 1994: 13). As a result, a large number of Kai Tahu whakapapa include names from the early sealing or whaling areas. These were often translated into a Māori equivalent from the next generation onwards, and some still do so to the present while others do not (Anon. 1996). Kai Tahu easily adapted then adopted new ideas into our world-view. After all, our tūpuna had done so centuries earlier on their arrival in Te Wāipounenu out of necessity, because of its vastly different climate and resource base.

Participants in this research who were formally interviewed sometimes stated that as a result of an economy-based ethos, it would have been a reasonably easy transition for their Kai Tahu tūpuna to begin trading with the Tākata Bola. They also felt it would have been less so for them to adapt to the confines and work practices of farming and the concept of fenced off boundaries. Many of the areas that became fenced off for the purposes of Tākata Bola farming were areas that Kai Tahu had formerly used for traditional mahika kai resources. In other instances, areas now fenced off were sacred places (wāhi tapu). It became impossible for Kai Tahu to have access to or any control over what took place around these wāhi tapu. As

---

79 Parata, one of my tūpuna names, has retained its Māori form of Pratt. Russell is another and my given name, which was what my paternal grandfather used, yet his parents are known also as Retara or Ratara in old Māori land court minutes, the 1848 Kaumātua list and other records of that era.
a result, our tupuna often witnessed what was perceived by them as a lack of respect for the sacred places now being farmed. Such practices were seen as acts of desecration from the perspective of Kai Tahu who were only able to look on helplessly at what would equate in Tauiwi terms to vandalism. Such acts were hard for many Kai Tahu to understand and even harder to accept (R. Harris mā 1998: kā kōrero-ā-waha). For those who continued to fish for food or later to engage in the work of fishing as a means of employment, the same lack of comprehension of their actions applied. Many fishers (including a few who were our own) failed to conserve the fishery, especially in the boom days of the 1950’s and 1960’s when many fishers were known to scrape the eggs off female kōura in order to legally land them. From my late father’s perspective, such actions would come back on those or the descendants of those who treated the resource in that way. It has proven to be true as numbers of fishers have dwindled, larger fish have become a rarity and fewer are caught than was the case years ago. Such actions demonstrated a total lack of respect for the fishery and in no way had anything to do with sustainable management. During those times, large number of Kai Tahu were commercial fishermen and continued with a form of bartering between themselves and farmers whose properties were coastal and who, like the fishermen, were happy to exchange mutton, venison or beef for fish and especially kōura (V. B. Russell, Waitangi Tribunal hearing, Ōtākou: 1987). This practice of exchange or bartering had its roots deep in the Kai Tahu psyche as did the Tauiwi form of trade as attested to by Tuhawaiki and others a century or so earlier.

However, not all Kai Tahu entered into the alternative system of trade as did Tuhawaiki and others. Many continued to exercise their wakawaka (land to sea working area), awaawa (river fishing area) and manu (birding area) rights (Leach in Anderson 1980: 5).\(^8\) Wakawaka (south of the Waitaki) were mahika kai places where use rights were held by whānau. Such

---

\(^8\) See Anderson 1998: 111-112; also 114 for a diagrammatic description of wakawaka. See also Anderson(1998: 226) for sources of definition on wakawaka.
places were usually, though not always, adjacent to one another in a mahika kai gathering area. After the arrival of the Treaty and the Otago purchase, the term wakawaka came to represent areas of land which whānau held in their kaik. These were normally though not always, strips of land which usually abutted one another and upon which whānau lived. The land strips were (and still are) used for the purposes of gardening and where possible some were farmed. Many were not viable as farm units due to their size, but a number of domesticated animals could be kept on them for whānau use or consumption. Most units had, even up to the time of the birth of my youngest child, a house cow or two, kunekune (local pigs), a couple of sheep, hens and sometimes ducks. Some continue to keep such animals. In Tauiwi terms these practices when undertaken by them or at least the practitioners of them in present day terms would be referred to as “lifestylers.” That is not the case for Kai Tahu on our wakawaka, ours is a 150 year-old practice (taku mōhio). The wakawaka upon which present Kai Tahu still live were derived from the lands awarded to individual whānau as a result of the 1848 kaumātua establishment rights after the landscapes had been bought or acquired and placed in Tauiwi ownership. The landless natives’ allocations were also named wakawaka (V. B. Russell korero-a-waha i kā wā i mua). Since many are still used to produce food for either selling on, trading or whānau consumption, the original wakawaka concept continues, even though in an altered form. Some along with other sections of farmscapes are incorporated into that form of employment (taku mōhio).

It is believed that the concept of access to mahika kai, though vastly altered, was still the reason for having wakawaka that were usually (though not only), bordering or very close to the sea shore. Use rights were on the one hand to grow food and on the other to catch food (V. B. Russell: kā wā i mua). Awaawa gave similar rights to undertake customary fishing on a certain area of a river or lake, and now days these are especially for tuna, kanakana (both types of eel) and inaka (whitebait). Manu gave rights to bird gathering areas, and in the case of tītī still apply (although manu areas on the islands have not become the sites of permanent
residence in modern times). Other manu rights except for weka in certain whānau manu and tītī, along with most of the traditional mahika kai wakawaka have long been extinguished, since the ideology of the coloniser subsumed that of Kai Tahu and created a vastly altered national hegemony and economy. This has resulted in an enormous land loss and landscape change for Kai Tahu, along with a loss of access to mahika kai sites, despite 51 newly created nohoaka (exclusive camping areas that where possible are situated near former traditional mahika kai sites) and many of the food species that were formerly available as part of the mahika kai resource base have been forever eradicated from the landscape (Evison 1993: 253 and throughout his text). However, along with the renaming of 78 landscape areas throughout the Kai Tahu rohe, there is also the creation of the nohoaka sites from which Kai Tahu after August 1999 were theoretically able to again have exclusive access-only rights for certain periods to camp. The idea behind these sites being awarded was that we as might wish to once more undertake the work associated with mahika kai. These were never to be exclusive resource use rights as has been stated and believed by many Tauiwi. We will also be able to have time together as Rūnaka or whānau and hapū on what were once our landscapes in either a wānaka (learning) situation or to simply experience our old wāhi ataahua landscapes (A. Goodall 5/5/99: kōrero-ā-waha i tētahi hui, Otepoti). The whakapapa rights associated with traditional nohoaka disappeared with colonisation, land purchase and the losses and changes made in how landscapes were used and boundaries enforced.

I HOKO TE WHENUA Ā KAI TAHU: KA TŪ TE KEREEME

The arrival of the colonial power to Aotearoa me Te Waipounemu required huge adaptations, from our existing lifestyles to the new order for Kai Tahu and other Iwi. Early

---

81 Evison, under the heading of "mahinga kai" in his index, p. 550, provides all the references to its losses, by whatever means.
contact had altered and extended our existing economic capabilities. The new technology provided a number of benefits for Kai Tahu. However, remarkably soon after the signing of the Treaty at Waitangi, enormous environmental changes occurred with great rapidity within the Kai Tahu rohe. As our land mass receded, so did our access to our mahika kai landscapes. At first we had the freedom of choice over whether we farmed in a similar way to the earliest Tākata Bola, or continued with practices of mahika kai, or combined the two.

From the early 1840s, Kai Tahu became impoverished and landless upon the ancestral landscapes we once roamed (Dacker 1990: 22). Insufficient lands created an inability for Kai Tahu to equally participate and compete with the settlers (Dacker 1990: 23). Loss of mahika kai or access to it resulted in our being unable to feed ourselves, or to trade in the way we had traditionally done (Dacker 1990: 23). Dacker states that Pohio described Kai Tahu in 1876 as "living as manene--virtually beggars and strangers in their own land" (Dacker 1990: 23).

As a result, Te Kereeme came into being in 1849 through the written complaint to the governor by Matiaha Tiramorehu (Evison 1993: v. and throughout his work). It was in 1868 that Kai Tahu first approached the courts in this regard (Ngāi Tahu Development Corporation 1999: 2). Tipene O'Regan, in the introduction to Evison’s book states that “the claim, Te Kereeme, then became their culture” (T. O'Regan in Evison 1993: v). It was a major factor that contributed to the perpetuation of the concept of a Kai Tahu economic identity based around mahika kai. Te Kereeme united Kai Tahu not so much as a solid group, rather it became their driving force. None of these things came easily and the cost has taken its toll in a number of ways.

Kai Tahu continued to access mahika kai in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries wherever possible. But the identity we once had altered and from 1849 revolved around Te

---

82 Many have written of Tiramorehu’s letter to the Governor in 1849, a mere nine years after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, protesting at Kai Tahu’s loss of land and the small pockets remaining in their ownership. This denied Kai Tahu the guaranteed access the treaty had granted them, to their mahika kai sites.
Kereeme (the Claim) for the next 150 years. Hana O’Regan stated that though colonisation created enormous changes, Kai Tahu adapted,

... strategically planned and executed ideas that would benefit Kai Tahu [and] although the land and fisheries claims were of enormous importance, it never fully consumed [them] (T. O’Regan in Evison 1993: v).

Rather it became a source of nourishment, while the grievance of dispossession caused Kai Tahu to form a group identity that focused upon the claim (T. O’Regan in Evison 1993: v). Tipene O’Regan further contends that,

through grinding generations of perseverance with the due process [of law], it sustained [them] to the core so [that] as a tribe [they] have never succumbed to despair, as attested to by Te Kereeme.

Evison throughout his text attests to the injustices suffered by Kai Tahu and the countless attempts for redress undertaken by us for the past 150 years, much of which makes depressing reading (Evison 1993: 347 and throughout).

By 1890, many Kai Tahu were dependent on paid employment (Evison 1993: 26). As an Iwi, we have disputed (and still do dispute even after settlement), what amount of land had been purchased, and have testified through submissions to countless enquiries. Many found in our favour, though some individual submissions were said to be too Māori in context and were dismissed without further consideration (Evison 1993: 23-25). Interestingly, the exact opposite was intimated by the Waitangi Tribunal member who in 1993 said the Kai Tahu submission was quite un-Maori in that it lacked the spirituality of other Iwi presentations.83

There have been endless obstacles faced by Kai Tahu over the period of colonisation, yet the generations have doggedly persisted with the claim (Charles Crofts signed the interim
Deed of Settlement with the Crown, on Takahanga marae at Kaikōura, 21/11/97). In the same way, over many centuries past, Kai Tahu continued to maintain intimate connections with our mahika kai takiwa by ahi kā roa (ongoing occupation). Though Kai Tahu lost much of our land, what few pieces we were able to retain ensured there would be ongoing rights of access and use, through continued occupation. Despite a vastly altered manner in the practices of mahika kai and kaihaukai, the identity of Kai Tahu has continued and still stems from these as it does from our landscapes through whakapapa, whether in our ownership or not. Though we acknowledge the importance of the language of a people, we still argue that it is but one aspect of whom we consider ourselves to be. That is, Kai Tahu Whānui with an identity that embraces mahika kai and is incorporated within our land and seascapes.

Kai Tahu on entering the commercial economy did so initially as equals with the early arrivals to our shores. Over time, the dominant ideology did not favour the indigenous as equal participants and so ensured that the right to develop was not as accessible to us as it was to large numbers of the settler society who were both encouraged and financed into development. Through our persistence for redress by means of Te Kereeme, we have reached a stage where Te Kereeme is complete, settlement agreement reached and final enactments of the settlement are slowly taking place.

Since contact, everything that Kai Tahu possess has been earned by taking on the technology of the Tākata Bola and, as an Iwi, we have developed good management practices (H. O'Regan 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). Our leaders have had or have sought people with expertise in professional business management and related skills and all are accountable to the Iwi (H. O'Regan 1996: kōrero-ā-waha). Meantime, Kai Tahu's business leaders, in only six years, have turned a $39,000 asset base into one presently estimated at $37 million even

83 A Kai Tahu woman who is doing her Doctorate at Auckland University told me in a kōrero-ā-waha we had at my house, that one of the Tribunal members (who had been one of her lecturers in her undergraduate years) had remarked on the lack of spirituality in the presentation of the Kai Tahu claim.
before any settlement payments. Mahika kai, in its widest interpretation, has more Kai Tahu as fishermen, working out of Ōtākou and Awarua, than all other tribes combined. We still harvest our tītī annually for tribal use, exchange, gifting and for sale. Rāhui as a practice continues, though often ignored by Tākata Bola and other Tauiwi, over which Kai Tahu have little if any control. A personal whānau example was when our brother was drowned at Te Umu Kurī in Otago harbour. A rāhui was placed over that place on the gathering of kai moana. Iwi and some locals adhered to the rāhui, but many more ignored its existence.

The settlement of the claim was enacted into law on Tuesday, 29 September 1998, witnessed from the public gallery of the House of Representatives in Wellington by around 400 Kai Tahu, and listened to at various gatherings or by individual Kai Tahu in the thousands. With the settlement of their claim, Kai Tahu will now, as part of the settlement agreement, have input into the management of resources within our rohe and upon our landscapes. With better conservation practices being sought, acceptance by Crown-owned enterprises will be required to make the nation a healthier one in which to live. That will necessitate good will from both sides to effect better environmental management of the land and sea. Meanwhile, as Kai Tahu we intend to maintain our mahika kai identity which will be made a little easier with the creation of the nohoaka sites around Kai Tahu takiwā. The greatest challenge is coming from some Tākata Bola and Tauiwi who are already objecting to the existence of such sites, claiming they have rights of some decades, in that they have fished in these places all their lives. What seems to have escaped that thinking is, that Kai Tahu until colonisation had done so for centuries, so much was it an integral part of our mahika kai identity and as a result of this practice, the need for an intimate connection both with and to our landscapes.

In the year 2000, we had grown the profits to $50,000,000, yet are still accused of being non-Māori, largely due to our success. Each non-success or problem within other Iwi who have had a settlement and compensation, becomes newsworthy as a failure. This then allows the media to fit them into the mould the media has manufactured (Lange 14/11/2000: interviewed on National Radio).
DEGRADATION OF LANDSCAPE AND KAI TAHU VALUES

As an Iwi, Kai Tahu have retained mahika kai as the integral feature of our cultural identity throughout the changes of history. We have retained our ethos but have adapted it in ways appropriate for our use in present times. This was never more important as a food gathering practice than immediately after the first large area land sale and again during the depression last century in the 1930’s (Iwi mōhio). At both times, knowledge of mahika kai resource and places were the things that enabled whānau and hapū to survive in times of extreme poverty, for us or, shortage for the nation as a whole.

Due to the changes in land tenure and use, many former foods (or access to those still in existence) have been lost. The clearing of huge areas of formerly forested and wooded land, as well as the introduction of exotic species of trees, fish and other animal life that fed upon the native fauna and flora, have also contributed to the food losses (Mikaere 1990: 66 - 68, 129). Kai Tahu since the 1860s have found recognition of our mana and our total land being reduced in essence and substance while our once bounteous landscapes have suffered enormous degradation through alteration.

According to Dacker (1990: 34) many of those with whom Kai Tahu were employed initially frowned upon most of the kai Māori (Māori foods) so dear to us. Since then, however, some such kai have become sought after delicacies by Tākata Bola. What has unfortunately resulted is that particular Kai Tahu sea and river delicacies have been appropriated for commercial and recreational use, thus being unavailable to Kai Tahu for traditional use (Dacker 1990: 34). This would include an inability for using them for hospitality purposes during hui. When outsiders have stripped areas that we have replaced with new stock, the following season has seen a repeat depletion (Dacker 1990: 34). Even with rāhui on fishing around these areas, activities of this kind continue (Dacker 1990: 35). In
shellfish takiwā, despite a combination of rāhui and local Mana whenua policing, recent Tauiwi and Taurahere (other Iwi) arrivals of all ethnicities, continue to ignore such kawa (protocols) pertaining to both the way these are picked and the most ideal amounts to be harvested in order to maintain the supply. These kinds of activities and others described by Dacker (1990: 35) deprive Kai Tahu of our most important identity feature, mahika kai. So too, the marine and inland waterway environments have pollution to contend with. Both problems according to Dacker (1990: 35):

...have affected the remaining mahika kai throughout Kai Tahu's traditional territory; [including] sewage disposal, salmon-farming and the silting of rivers from high country erosion

Given both national and international concerns for better environmental management, the concern by Kai Tahu in relation to despoliation to their landscapes and mahika kai “and renewed controls [over] them” will benefit the nation as a whole if pursued (Dacker 1990: 35). As J. Williams (1997: kōrero-ā-waha) stated, a classic example of over exploitation by recreational fishers is the “decimation of kōkopu numbers.” The larvae of the kōkopu (galaxids) once hatched, are what are commonly referred to as inaka (whitebait).

In the past, threats to practices of mahika kai existed as a result of altered land tenure and use, but today the biggest threat to kai Māori is pollution of the waterways and sea coasts. None of these occurrences has altered how Iwi conceptualise their landscapes, even in their vastly altered states. Their landscape continues to be Papatuānuku, about whom it is stated that:

from her stem the rivers which in our terms are the mother’s milk for the life blood of her children[who are] us, plants and everything else, and without that natural water life would never exist on earth. This is the spiritual meaning of our rivers, our mountains and [their] significance to us. Rivers have their place in the physical needs of humanity but deeper than that is the pulse of what life means to us (Kaipo 1997: 1).
Kaipo further states that if waters continue to be polluted or used inappropriately and Iwi allow this to continue, it is they (and we) who are failing in the kaitiaki responsibilities to Papatūānuku by permitting the violation of their mother (Kaipo 1997: 1). Tau (1990: 9) also gives his understanding on appropriate water uses for Tuahuriri Kai Tahu in his Te Karanga article. He provides the following whakatauki “Toitū te marae o Tāne, Toitū te marae o Takaroa, Toitū te Iwi: If the world of Tāne survives, If the world of Takaroa survives, The people live on” (R. Tau 1990: 9). The explanation of this whakatauki is that land and water have relevance to Kai Tahu in that upon and within them are all living things the fruits of which are recorded in whakapapa and headed by the appropriate deity (R. Tau 1990: 9). “Resources are bound to people” and through their kupeka whakapapa, Kai Tahu are bound to their landscapes and water sources (R. Tau 1990: 10). Te M Tau et al (1990: 4.12) have stated that:

*... values and controls regarding water are [part of Kai Tahu] beliefs and practices which recognises and reinforces the absolute importance of water quality in relation to both mahika kai and hygiene*

These are the beliefs upon which Kai Tahu ethos is based. Hence, water resources whether fresh or from the sea were paramount to the survival of Kai Tahu, as the harsh southern climate prevented the type of gardening and cultivation as practised by northern Iwi. After the mid 1800 land sales, Kai Tahu were extremely dependent upon kai moana, kai awa and kai roto, since many of their reserves were inadequate for them to grow potatoes and other foods in sufficient amounts to sustain them (taku mōhio; Te M. Tau et al 1990: 4.13). The primary thinking behind such reasoning has to do with protecting and respecting our landscape. If as we argue, our landscape is Papatūānuku, then the deliberate pollution of her waterways by whatever means is seen as no different in our eyes, than a human putting poisons directly into
their own bloodstream. This is conceived of in such a way because as stated throughout the research and most recently in the quote by Kaipo, the waterways of Papatuānuku are viewed by Iwi as her bloodstream. In human terms, if one deliberately poisons with drugs or other noxious substances, the body of another the law of the land punishes such acts. However, there seem to be many loopholes within the law in regard to pollution of the landscape, whether it is of the waters or areas of land. Regardless of whose landscape Te Wāipounenu is thought to be, her care and guardianship are the responsibility of all who are of her as well as those who live upon her.
RENAMING AND REDEFINING NEW ZEALAND'S LANDSCAPE

Every mature nation has its symbolic landscapes. They are part of the iconography of nationhood, part of the shared ideas and memories and feelings which bind a people together (Meinig 1979: 164.).

This chapter examines the ways in which New Zealand became redefined in both naming and the use of landscapes. Since the arrival of Cook, (rather than Tasman), Tauiwi settlers reconstructed and renamed the nation’s landscapes to recreate a national history. The landscapes that had formerly been the ancestors and ancestral images of the Iwi living here became imagined in terms of the incoming settlers. These terms seldom took cognisance of prior Iwi imaginings. Instead, a New Zealand national hegemony and discourse were gradually developed. That national hegemony usually ignored and marginalised the existence of Kā tākata whenua Māori. With the marginalisation of Iwi and the ignoring of their images and imaginings, formerly familiar and familial landscapes became relegated to merely being a part of the discourses discussed and the texts written largely by Tauiwi. Iwi, as original caretakers of the land, seldom featured in these discourses, were not asked to participate in their construction, nor were they often participants in the writing of the texts. That would have required Iwi input into the formation of a national hegemony. In fact Kai Tahu and other Iwi quite quickly came to be thought of as being either so near to extinction or so hybridised that they were regarded as being almost as mythical as the imaginings they held of their landscapes.
The renaming of New Zealand in the seventeenth century by Tasman, “began the long process” of its reinvention (Bell 1996: 3). Following Cook’s initial voyage in the eighteenth century and the subsequent colonisation of Aotearoa and Te Wāipounamu in the nineteenth century, the country “was further invented” as its landscapes were appropriated then redefined as part of a new cultural construction. British agents, settler associations and societies competed with one another for potential migrants (Bell, 1996: 3-4). They offered both an attractive landscape and future prosperity in which these new immigrants would be able to actively participate as they re-created their home landscapes (Bell 1996: 4). Such ideas mirror the earlier analysis of Barnes and Duncan (1992: 5-6) quoted in Chapters 5 and 6, where the sentiments that are attached to peoples’ landscape interpretations as well as the various ways in which landscapes as land are used by different groups are discussed. These landscape uses include: “the economic world of profit and loss [or farming, arable as well as animal]; the political world of ideology [contested Treaty Claims, recommendations over prior rights to land and compensation]; the physical world of natural wonder [tourism and artistic landscape representations; and, the visual world of industrialisation [that often create further contestations over appropriate care of land and seascapes]” (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 5). All of these often contested interpretations or uses when they are part of a nation’s ideology and politics, may assist in a process that sees landscapes reinvented for any of the above purposes. The landscapes then become so re-invented as to be unlike familiar and familial landscapes of Tūpuna. Landscape re-invention continues to be an ongoing process in New Zealand. Its has been re-invented in many forms by agriculturalists, by pastoralists, by tourist promoters and operators, by city planners and landscape architects and even to a much lesser degree, by landscape gardeners and home owners in their gardens (Bell 1996: 160-170). Bell (1996: 168, 171) specifically mentions landscape gardening as one attempt to recreate old style colonial
gardens. This she argues is as much to establish long-term identity and a connection with the past as it is for possible onselling value (Bell 1996: 168; Leach 1983: 139-149). My own personal experience of gardening is that it offers aesthetic pleasure and for many gardeners for whom it is a passion, it more often than not costs more than it returns in measurable value. What it may offer instead is a form of spirituality that for me is related to, though different from the type of tupuna spirituality I experience in certain of my homescapes. Bell also discusses architecturally designed town centres and how even as we were approaching a new millennium, there was still a perceived need by some of our city councils to recreate a “colonial past” theme. Ordinary citizens too through landscaping their properties have often (though not always) done so, with the idea of profit to be made at some future date when selling these properties. As already stated, landscaped gardens may add both aesthetic pleasure and for some, a certain monetary value to them (Bell 1996: 168).

New Zealand landscapes at the time of early Tauiwi arrival though, were represented solely by individuals or companies wishing to encourage settlement here. These representations were of landscapes of sublime arcadia, where fertile land in a temperate climate was abundant and could be acted upon and utilised for material gain made possible, if the settlers cleared and tamed the land (Bell 1996: 4). There were two distinct versions of a romanticised landscape in New Zealand according to Bell (1996:29),

\[\ldots (i) \text{ the beautiful but potentially dangerous: sanctified, visited, enjoyed, photographed (sketched or painted), then left; (ii) the beautiful and beautifully cultivated, a tribute to nature and human efforts of endeavour, through both text then experience.}\]

Just as the first settlers to arrive from East Polynesia ensured their rights to be part of the new landscape through taunahataka and takahi whenua, on the earliest Takata Whenua (since whakapapa suggest an existence of Hawaiiki Nui and present day New Zealand as part
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of it, way before these times), so too did those who settled a thousand or more years later from Britain. From very early in its colonial history, beautiful New Zealand, through human resourcefulness or through the altered use of its natural resources, came to mean exploitable New Zealand: at the same time it was abundantly endowed with consumable vistas which once textualised or artistically portrayed made it "a saleable bit of Arcadia" (Bell 1996: 31, 34).

Hirsch (1995: 11-12) discusses the part that artistic transformation of landscapes played during the colonisation period of the Pacific. How it came to be represented in art and in texts had a substantial impact on how it was then re-presented in paintings as well as novels, both of which were based on experiences of the novelist or of his/her interpretations of others' experiences (Hirsch 1995: 11-12). Hirsch identifies two distinct landscapes that mirror those of Bell that became a part of people's thinking. The first was of passive picturesque landscapes that were bound by rules that were purely for viewing by powerless travellers; the second was of an equally picturesque but much more active landscape, which had been minimally acted upon by Iwi, but could have much greater action undertaken on it by more powerful and technologically advanced British colonists (Hirsch 1995: 11-12). Messages such as these were able to be successfully sent and received over time because of the way in which humans had come to perceive, construct and then re-construct both the meaning of and the actual landscape. Landscapes are always a cultural concept in the first instance, and their definitions and meanings have varied and continue to vary from culture to culture. For the incoming British colonists Kai Tahu landscapes were land under-utilised, while for Kai Tahu they were ancestors who permitted limited use of them. Yet both were the same geographical pieces of land, understood differently by each culture using its own particular epistemology. We therefore need to ask what is it that shapes our landscape perceptions. Is it nature and the

Later, the thesis will present a slightly different interpretation on artistic representation, as Ireland uses text to describe New Zealand artist Colin McCahon's landscapes. He then compares these to actual landscapes and
natural land formations that provide our understandings of landscape, or our cultural understandings of what a landscape may embody? It is a combination of the two?

**WHAT SHAPES THE THINKING ON LANDSCAPE?**

Sauer, in his monograph, criticised the German and French anthropological schools, when he argued that culture shaped the natural landscape to produce a cultural one (Sauer 1963: 343). His belief was that “culture is the agent, the natural area the medium and the cultural landscape is the result” (Sauer 1963: 343). Hirsch (1995: 9) contrasts this argument of Sauer’s with that of the environmental determinism of the German geographer Ratzel and the arguments put forward by the French sociologist, Durkheim. In other words, Hirsch argues that Sauer’s theory was about whether culture determines how the natural environment or the landscape is perceived, or whether the environment in which one is socialised determines how cultures go on to perceive themselves in relation to and in a relationship with their surrounding landscapes. The Kai Tahu perception of landscape and what it embodies is our means of explaining the physical place and our place in it, as well as being a visual representation of our history where the ancestral names were, are and continue to be our survey pegs. Names such as, (but not exclusively), Te Tiritiri o te Moana and other mauka, awa, roto and wāhi whakahirahira (important). This idea of survey pegs is not in the literal sense of the role such pegs play in defining boundaries for proof of ownership. Rather it is our literal sense of who we are in the landscapes of Te Wāipounamu through our whakapapa. Here is what one kaumatua said it means for him:

*The term landscape, there must be something to that, our way of perceiving it, because Aoraki our mountain is part of it. That's only one aspect of it. There are rivers, streams, parts of the ocean, which bear this out - - - and*

contends (as do both Bell and Hirsch), that these act upon people affecting changes in them. Hirsch, on the other hand, has people acting upon landscapes, thereby both effecting and how people are affected.
it's these things we have tried to retain. Everybody knows the mountain [Āoraki] stands there and everybody could relate to that because it's part of our genealogy. We have a closer tie with everything that's around us --- the rivers, the streams, the mountains, the land and we're closer kin to it than the Pākehā. There's a big difference between the way Pākehā see it and the way we see things. We are connected with a huge landscape simply because of Tangaroa the lord of the sea and Tāne the lord of the land. They are both interconnected. Whatever the Pākehā does, that's his and - and it's dollars and cents as far as he's concerned. The Māori looks at it in a different light. And I would certainly say the way that a Māori looks at it [he] thinks it's his and his alone. And the Pākehā has got to come to terms with the way a Māori thinks. And that's in regard to all the elements-- that's throughout the land and so on (J. Reihana 1999: kōrero-ā-waha).

It seems that little has changed in the way many of our elders understand the landscape and their “belonging” to it if this quote is any indication. It is certainly representative of most of my participants in their understandings of landscape connection. This appears so even when it has other names and uses from the ones placed upon it by our Tūpuna. The renaming and reconfiguration of Te Wāipounenui by Tauiwi settlers was a way in which the settlers could become part of this new landscape and make their permanent mark upon it as Bell (1996: 33) clearly states. Since it was a landscape that was very different to the one from which they had emigrated and it was apparently uninhabited, they felt justified in removing all traces of any former use rights of cultural others who did or might lay claim to it. Even so, it was the very same landscape, which had been originally seen as embodying ancestors and was so intimately known to Kai Tahu. The result was, that an existing physical and cultural landscape was reinvented by the establishment of a new one in its place.

New Zealand as it was represented artistically through paintings, texts and sketches was an ideal place to settle. These representations were done in part, to attract tourists to its shores in the mid nineteenth century as well as to bring about successful settlement. In his writings on various artists of New Zealand, Pound (1983: 64-66) considers the work of Hodgkins and others as a means to more accurately portray the scenery of this far-flung British colony. This
strategy was even more successful for tourism when some of these artists wrote as did Hodgkins, that New Zealand held attractions as awesome as many of the greatest in the world, and of the variety that could be consumed in one country. Such messages were particularly aimed at those with either sufficient money or a pioneering spirit, to encourage the emigration of large numbers of these groups as permanent settlers from the British Isles to New Zealand. With tourism advertising, artistic portrayals of wide-open spaces where visitors might pit themselves against the elements were very successful and have remained so. On the other hand, attracting new migrants here during the nineteenth century needed little fancy advertising as the main pre-requisites required were a willingness and an ability to work hard in taming the landscape and the migrants had strong pressure to leave Britain.

Those who organised the migration of settlers to Te Wāipounenu, and to acquire land, saw Iwi as barely civilised (as attested to by sources cited from chapter four below and the novels mentioned later in this chapter) and hardly deserving of these landscapes which they had seemingly under-utilised. Solander’s reply to Lord Monboddo’s of, “No, my Lord, they (Māori) have no tails” (in Tau 1999a: 17), is one such example of how Iwi were viewed in the late eighteenth century, even when Cook and others considered them as better than Australian Aborigines. Evison (1987: 18), Thomas (1983: 194-5) and Daniels (1988: 44) refer to people who do not farm as being considered savage and those who live and work in forests as Iwi did were considered likewise.

These were justifications for alienating the lands from Iwi, considered near-savage occupants. This judgmental attitude of “cultural others” was not reserved for Iwi alone, but was applied to settlers who arrived from places other than Britain; they were also perceived as lesser than the “Pākehā” now occupying large areas of New Zealand (Anon. 1995: hui-a-Iwi). These “cultural others” such as the Dalmatians who settled in the far north of the North Island and the Chinese who arrived in the goldfields of Thames on the East Coast in the North Island

86 See quote from Hodgkins in previous chapter, cited in Pound (1983: 64).
and central Otago and the West Coast in the South were also viewed similarly to Iwi and they too were not invited to be part of the texts and discourses referred to above in helping to define a national hegemony (taku mōhio nō era kōrero-ā-waha). Pearson’s 1990 text discusses in detail many of the reasons for ethnic conflict in New Zealand, especially those to whom I refer above.

Just as there were many ideas contained within the racially ideal settler, so too there were many ideas regarding the term “landscape.” Places and people were conceived of as lesser “cultural others” because they were seen as non-conforming when seemingly not fitting or being permitted to fit into the newly created society and its newly acquired landscapes. The nation which arose from this society and these landscapes went on to create all of the following: the ideal landscape, ideal family, ideal place to live (the country, not the city) the ideal do-it-yourself pioneer; the ideal DIY Kiwi bloke, who was further constructed as the typical Kiwi bloke; and a nation attempted to project all these images as fact. Both Philipps (1987) and Law et al (1999) discuss and analyse the definition and myth that surround the Kiwi bloke. That belief is clung to, even when these largely mythical Kiwi blokes seldom if ever, set foot upon the rural landscapes of the country and certainly not to undertake the types of hard work which the majority of the men and women of the rural farming communities undertake. Yet, when Iwi define themselves as part of their landscapes in terms of how these have always been understood by them, they are said to be speaking of mythical times, of times no longer relevant to present ones (taku mōhio).

87 Sadly, many descendants from the early settlers from Britain have continued to maintain a degree of intolerance for all “cultural others” including Mana whenua, other language Tauiwi, such as Europeans, Asians, Black and coloured Africans and Polynesians.
88 DIY stands for “do-it-yourself.”
DEFINING OUR CULTURAL SELVES AND OUR LANDSCAPE CONNECTIONS, I
MUA, AIANEI, A MURI AKE

Greider and Garkovitch have argued (1994: 2) that the relationship between people, nature and their environment provides understandings of and explanations for “who [they] were, are and hope to be at [that] place and in [that] space.” Entrikin states that traditional narratives in embodying sets of values also denote a group’s identity and its origins, all of which are inseparable and are what constitute a community of people (Entrikin 1991: 66). However, he seems to take this a step further, and nearer to that expressed by Greider and Garkovitch, in a quote he gives from Robert Bellah et al. which states:

\[\text{In order not to forget its past, a community is involved in retelling its story, its constituted narrative.... communities of memory tie us to the past and [take] us towards our future [as they] connect us to future aspirations (Cited in Entrikin 1991: 66).}\]

Entrikin (1991: 66) completes his thesis by arguing that such communities exist in certain geographical landscapes around which they literally centre themselves in a spatial sense. Hirsch (1996: 22) seemed to hold a similar idea when he stated that his theoretical model of landscape is one that is based upon:

\[\ldots\text{ the idea of landscape as a process which relates to a ‘foreground’ of everyday social life (us the way we are), to a ‘background’ potential social existence (us the way we might be).}\]

Viewed from their perspectives, both Entrikin (1991: 66) and Hirsch (1996: 22) relate very closely to the Iwi perception of “kā wā i mua” (times before) and “a muri ake nei” (future
times) in relation to landscape and its connection with whakapapa.\textsuperscript{89} The Māori concept of whakapapa places Iwi within it in three-dimensional terms and times, in the way they view themselves from times present. That is, Iwi seeing landscapes in the present are always aware of “kā wā i mua” (meaning those that have occurred before present times) and those yet to come “a muri ake nei” (as yet unable to be seen, because we are still behind them in time).

These concepts were also referred to in the chapter “Te Tuatahi”, when making a small comparison between the Fijian villagers of Sawaieke and Kai Tahu. In other words Māori, like some Polynesian and some Melanesian peoples, conceptualise all matters of landscape and their identity with it, through whakapapa which are people and time connected in the present to past and future through places or landscapes. Those other Polynesians and Melanesians, who do not have particular whakapapa to place connections, nonetheless connect with certain lands, or islands in the first instance. In common with certain Aboriginal clans and the Fijians of Sawaieke, the Iwi conceive of themselves not only in present time, but also as being connected through their landscape and genealogical ties with it to the past and future.

Entrikin has a three-dimensional aspect to his idea of how communities retell their stories that relate them with a three dimensional time span, while Hirsch has a similar idea, but his is in two-dimensional time. A similar explanation of time in relation to history has been expressed by Hereniko in his article on Pacific cultural identity, written from a Rotuman insider’s perspective (Hereniko 1997: 429). According to Hereniko, the Rotuman idea of time is similar to that of other Pacific peoples in as much as their histories are composed of three separate times: \textit{ao maksul ta} (time of darkness), \textit{ao taf ta} (time of light), and \textit{ao fo’ou ta} (new time) (Hereniko 1997: 429). These times he juxtaposes with European equivalents of “pre-

\textsuperscript{89} The concepts of “mua” and “muri” appear to have a conflict of meaning, though they are quite clearly understood by Iwi from two perceptions. “Mua” in terms of place means “the front, the forepart, before, in front, [or] first;” (b) of time, “the former time, or the past.” “Muri” of place means “the rear, the hind part, behind, [and] backwards of time”, “afterwards, the sequel, the time to come, the future” (H. W. Williams 1844 [1985] 7th edition: 213, 214).
colonial, colonial and post-colonial” (Hereniko 1997: 429). In a group chat several of us had in Hawai‘i in 1999, we all agreed, that as Pacific peoples we also have similarities in our time concepts with and more holistic landscape perceptions understood through identity connections, and, at the same time, we were able to see similarities (ō mātou kōrero-ā-waha, Hawai‘i: 1999). These belief systems are what we as Pacific peoples use to construct for ourselves, our personal and collective identity with our landscapes. By so doing, it was not, in past times, essential for us to be exclusive and therefore individual owners of land or areas of sea to know who we were.

Bell suggests that for some Tauiwi New Zealanders however, there has been a necessity to construct for themselves (and by implication for all New Zealanders), a cultural identity that is dependent upon ownership of land. Hence a particular definition of landscape has evolved in New Zealand that is separate from land ownership and who New Zealanders are. This is now seen as being one of mostly private land ownership with an identity that revolves around this (Bell 1996: 5). Iwi and cultural others are expected to conform to this national identity and landscape definition both of which are based on places; usually though not only owned by individuals, of rugged or scenic attractions, of artistic, painterly ones and of places that will realise profit when marketed correctly.

For many I interviewed or merely spoke with informally, especially but not only Tauiwi, it seemed that the definition of landscape they have or their ancestors formerly had and which they passed down to them, was one which Hirsch (1996: 22) describes as a painterly one. If, as he argues, landscape as defined and understood is kept within such narrow confines though, the result is a “restrictive” one that ignores cultural “others” actual lived experience of a landscape (Hirsch 1996: 22). In other words, many had a relationship with the land that was usually expressed in terms of it having a form of exchange value, of commodity value or alternatively, of it having a less tangible value, that of modern-day sacred places. The last are government department created ones such as the Conservation estate
where limited access or certain rules apply to the rights of the public as governed by legislation. Included in the "many" to whom I referred above, would be the New Zealand Crown as owners of the high-country leased lands and National Parks of Te Wäipounenu. The use values they placed on these landscapes over which they have retained ownership were nearly always for the purposes of monetary gain by attracting tourists, or as a source of rental from farms they leased there. Both these are to do with seeing such landscapes as commodities. Therefore, what the Crown failed or was unable to take cognisance of at the time of the Kai Tahu Waitangi Tribunal hearings was that the high-country lessees' perception of the same landscape was not singular. From the understanding of the lessees according to the view they presented, it was and still is apparently not seen in terms of having only a monetary value. In fact their expert witness stated that they had developed a "culture" of their own as a result of forming an attachment to these landscapes (WAI# 27; Dominy 1990: 11-15). As the lessees interacted with the high-country over time, they are said to have developed a real sense of community and a community perception of the landscapes and their place as part of them. This they did in the manner as described by Entrikin above and according to one of my unofficial informants (Anon 1998: pers. comm.). Yet the lessees could not then think outside of their insular mindset to understand Kai Tahu thinking. Although Kai Tahu had never worked that landscape they have a very special connection with the high-country that was entirely ancestral and not commodity based. Kai Tahu though, were able to understand the attachment the lessees said they had formed for their homeplaces. It can just as easily be argued that most rural communities have developed a similar but not identical culture, which has within its understanding, a sense of belonging to both the place and the community of the areas where they work such landscapes. Levine (1990: 4-6) in fact does state this, in response to Dominy's contention that such feelings were unique to her former

---

90 It should be noted here though, that there are many New Zealanders of all ethnicities who value retention and possession of "national heritage" sites. Persons within the Department of Conservation also aspire to retaining
high-country clients. He argued that this was not unique to them, but the way Māori felt and were connected to their place was very different to what Dominy stated was how it was for her clients (Levine 1990: 4-6).

The last line of the above quote by Entrikin, talks of communities (such as the lessees or any other rural farming one) as having developed a way of connecting their aspirations for themselves with those of the larger whole, through shared memories. Such communities see their individual efforts as part of an overall contribution to the common economic good of both the immediate community and the nation (Entrikin 1991: 66). The lessees and farmers of the South Island high-country attested to similar feelings at the Waitangi Tribunal hearings (1987-9: taku mōhio; WAI# 27).

Taken in this sense, many such communities have developed a culture of their own and sense of identity. Part of this culture also includes an ongoing restructuring of the landscape for the purposes of economic gain (Levine 1990: 4-6). For Kai Tahu, there was a further dimension to the same landscapes: it was, in Tauiwi terms, the personification of our cosmological ancestors (which some define as mythical), who are seen in the landscape. In Kai Tahu terms, our founding Tūpuna Āoraki, and his brothers Rakirua, Rakiroa and Rārakiroa, who accompanied him and foundered with him on Te Waka o Āoraki (the South Island) continue to be thought of as our founding Tūpuna. So, although we too see the high-country as farms and mountains, we also see the mountains in this other dimension. These Tūpuna are visibly represented in the mountains Cook, Dampier, Teichelmann and Silberhorn and have been spoken of in depth in earlier chapters as have those Iwi whakapapa which now constitute Kai Tahu Whānui.

It would then be insular to take one single definition of landscape as a concept since it would thereby deny the existence of all others. To do so would have the effect of limiting landscape “to [perhaps] the painterly artistic one of an outsider,” to a piece of ground whose wildlife areas of natural bush, forest and the likes for all to enjoy. Nonetheless, they are mostly under funded for
value is measured only in its productivity possibilities (Gow 1996: 43), or as a tupuna only. Gow also says, “The eyes that see the colonization frontier as landscapes are eyes structured by a particular kind of visual practice” (Gow 1996: 43). For Kelly Davis, Upoko (head, leader) of Waihao, the term landscape by his definition includes all of the following things:

...everything, lands, sea, water, you name it, it’s there. I often stand in front of the councils or the Conservation Department and say ‘just think of yourself as Papatuanuku, stand there and think about that, then ask yourself how well you want to be tomorrow’. You know? And that’s the only way I can relate it in some way to how the old people looked at it. They looked at the tinana (body) as the whole basis in the formation of relationships to all those elements. If you’d only known my Dad though. He had a whole lot of faith in Papatuanuku. Even to the point that if we went somewhere, we didn’t take sleeping bags, we actually slept in there. Dug a hole and hopped in you know. And that’s one of the things I remembered when I left to go overseas. If you’re bloody cold, at least you can get into Papatuanuku and keep warm. (K. Davis, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

Jacko Reihana added, as he reflected sadly on the loss of understanding and love there is for Papatuanuku (or the landscape):

When DoC said to me, ‘We (meaning all New Zealanders) ought to live closer to the earth,’ I said, ‘We’ve been doing that for hundreds of years.’ The modern day man didn’t need all that [type of knowledge]. It has no value, it has no money value. We’re caught up in this [kind of thinking] and I’m afraid it’s going to be with us for the next hundred years (J. Reihana, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

Conversely, New Zealand’s Tauiwi artistic and textual portrayals initially required a cultural appropriation of landscape. In many instances, it was also expropriation of land that was crucial in order to attract settlers. Interestingly, Bell states that:

the needs they have, in the maintenance of walkways, trails and buildings situated on these landscapes.
A colonising culture claiming land occupied by another culture defines or imagines spaces [landscapes] on its own terms and in its own language in order to conceive of it as terra nullius (Bell. 1996. 33).\textsuperscript{91}

To claim the landscapes, the early British colonisers and settlers recreated its appearance to properly re-present the ways that they understood it. Of course, Iwi had also done this in earlier times.

**RE-PRESENTING TE WĀIPOUNEMU**

Several text including Kai Tahu letters of petition to the various British governors or their representatives, and many New Zealand government Commissions of Inquiry over 150 years show that the understandings of the Treaty of Waitangi by the two peoples who signed it were not the same. The guarantees granted to them by the Treaty of Waitangi as understood by Kai Tahu, were and continue to be, that in exchange for selling certain areas of land to the New Zealand Company in place of the Crown, they as signatories representing hapū and Iwi would be granted one tenth of all the lands sold for their own present and future use and development (taku mōhio; WAI# 27). In addition, there would be other benefits such as schools and hospitals for Kai Tahu and the promise of the tenths’ land grant was made to enable them to develop and compete in the economy on an equal footing with the new arrivals to their shores. Kai Tahu had entered into what they thought was an equal partnership arrangement with the Monarch, through her representatives in New Zealand, and they were now equal under the law as British citizens. They further understood that within that partnership agreement, they would retain all areas of land that were special to them for their

\textsuperscript{91} See also Bell’s (1996: 33-34) citation of W. J. Mitchell in regard to putting a value price on land as well as some aspects of landscape being seen as priceless.
mahika kai and other essential taoka or resources, because of their particular spiritual or other significance. 92

The spiritual significance is seen in the way Kai Tahu define their landscapes through pepehā which are embodiments of our Tūpuna who connect us with themselves as ancestors who have died and to those yet unborn. This is the tātai or taura that nourishes us as it acts like the umbilical cord connecting us to past and future Kai Tahu. We believe that in our recitation of pepehā we continue to nourish ourselves by drawing on the strength that comes to us from those past and future Kai Tahu. Yoon (1986: 48) says that cultural geographers find pepehā (which he calls “motto-maxims”) very interesting in that they provide a most precise and concise description of both the symbolic and practical “aspects of Maori’s special relationship with” their natural landscapes. Davis et al (1990a: 5) state,

*Whole series of names belong together in groups, commemorating journeys of exploration by ancestor[s], myth memory of how the land was made, series of traditional events and people relationships. They also describe the land physically and identify its resources. The names in the landscape were like survey pegs of memory, marking the events that happened, recording aspect[s] or feature[s] of tradition and history of a tribe.*

Te Aue Davis mā (and others) go on to state that through daily usage of these happenings and the connected and landscape names, history was made a visible phenomenon, available to all at all times through knowledge gleaned from the narrations of others within the whānau, hapū or Iwi group (Davis mā 1990a: 5). Therefore, “living and travelling” as Kai Tahu did i nehera (in the ancient past) were what reinforced those elements that made up their history and the intimate knowledge of their landscape (Davis mā 1990a: 5).

Madgewick in his article “Aotea, History of the South Westland Māori” expressed similar ideas. He states that naming landscapes has to do with the whakapapa of the people’s

---

92 Similar interpretations of the Treaty of Waitangi in Article the Second are in Orange (1987); Evison (1993); Kawharu (1986); Durie (1994).
area, in which are also contained the history of those people (Madgewick 1992: 79). Landscape naming is also about rights to inhabiting a landscape and having resource and access rights (H. O'Regan 1995: 20). Hana O'Regan speaks about the importance of landscape names and naming of places as being as much to do with accessing resources as it does to do with ahi kā (ongoing occupation) (H. O'Regan 1995: 20). She also speaks of whakapapa and the names of Tūpuna which were placed upon the landscape. In the transcription from the tapes made during O'Regan's research, one of the participants stated that “whakapapa is tied up in the placenames [which were] carried on to later places” from past ones (Anon. 1995 cited in O'Regan 1995: 40). “It means I belong to the landscape, I belong to the island … it just means that I can trace my relationship to the mountains and the trees” (Te M. Tau 1996 in O'Regan 1997: 119). Such ongoing and all encompassing perspectives of themselves as part of the landscape show their very different ideas of the landscapes that exist within the Kai Tahu rohe, between themselves and others. This is especially so in relation to how landscapes are conceptualised by Kai Tahu, by the first Tauiwi arrivals and now by the present day descendants of both. As Schama (1995: 6-7) states, “nature and human perception are indivisible [so that] before it can ever be a repose for the sense, landscape is the work of the mind.”

Kai Tahu who conceive of their landscape in the terms alluded to above, and in previous chapters, would never have put a price on nor sold their most esteemed ancestors (without a certain amount of duress), who are perceived as actually being the landscapes, and whom they hold dear in a deeply spiritual way. This is so in regard to their founding ancestors, and Āoraki most especially, as was attested to in my interviews. It is also about respecting the landscapes of Papatuānuku. The following example comes from a kōrero between Jacko Reihana and Kelly Davis. Each expresses what many, though by no means all Kai Tahu, think of Āoraki and how we care for him as a result of perceptions of him in relation to ourselves:
...have a look at Aoraki for instance -- the deeding back of him to the Pākehā. Well you see to me that's a loss. As one of the Kaitiaki to that mountain I have no intention of returning it to the Pākehā. Because it's part of my genealogy and no way will. [It is] my whakapapa in other words. And in no way will I give my mountain and my whakapapa to anybody. I want it to remain in my hands (J. Reihana, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999)

And:

Remember that statement we made that day at Twizel Jack, 'You keep taking the korowai off Aoraki he's going to erupt.' Two years later the side fell out off him. For that very same reason (K. Davis, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

Also

We'll have to pay, that's what I've been saying. And outside of that as I pointed out, you have to start with Tangaroa and then you have to come to Tū whenua, turn to Tāne. And by bringing those two together which should've been there all the more... it's there... all the time. (J. Reihana, kōrero-ā-waha: 1999)

Plus

The biggest issue with that is our separation of Tāne and Tangaroa. It has been done because of our belief in Pākehātanga. It's come up through the legislation that has carved up our Papatuanuku. And I'll say it. WE spend, people like us spend all our time trying to fit it back to-bloody-gether again. And we are not only fighting the Pākehā organisations, we're fighting our own [echoed by both Jacko and Kelly] because our own are thinking exactly the same.

Now, that's [become] our kawa. We've got to bring it back, to put Papatuanuku back together again, Tāne and Tangaroa with all those things. Why did we have all these phrases you know? The tawhito kōrero of our tūpuna. Why did we have it? Think about what it says and bring it all back together. But they can't and I think that's a
Many of the first settlers, as already stated saw these landscapes as wild, untamed, and unclaimed land that cleared would have a use value when owned by them. Their kawa believed Te Wāipounenu landscapes were under-utilised and like its native inhabitants, in need of orderliness. Such measures would provide these earliest Tāuiwi settlers and their descendants improved styles of living and vastly altered work practices for Iwi. The settlers saw as non-existent, Kai Tahu kaitiakitaka (guardianship). Yet the protection of particular resources through kaitiakitaka acted as and was similar in outcome to the fences the settlers introduced. Fences ensured settlers’ stock and crops would be made secure while (perhaps unintentionally) ensuring that Kai Tahu resources were not. The settler land use practices meant Kai Tahu resources were removed forever and that the people were separated forever from them. This lack of understanding or care of the “other’s needs” made Kai Tahu like the Highlanders of Scotland, manene i ō mātou whenua (strangers on our lands). The failure to understand was assisted by a misrepresentation to the settlers that the land was not really owned but was simply awaiting their arrival and actions upon it to make it civilised. As a result of this, settlers saw themselves as conquerors, tamers and owners of the environment. Kai Tahu (and no doubt other Iwi) meanwhile believed, that since they had an intrinsic connection with that environment from whom they in fact initially derived as tākata whenua, they would always retain this. The Kai Tahu world view had cultural connections that were very different from those held by their colonisers. Such differing ideas mirror the argument posited by Greider and Garkovitch. They stated that landscapes are never perceived singularly, but are dependent upon the viewers’ perceptions and, more importantly, their

93 In so many texts of the time from pre-colonisation (but post contact), there were combinations of writings that either lamented the extinction of “the maori race”, or rejoiced in its eventuality. See the nineteenth century novels cited in this chapter of the thesis.
intended purposes (Greider and Garkovitch. 1994: 1). Clearly, at contact and since, both Tauiwi and Kai Tahu defined and represented their landscapes that were and are often as not, one and the same, in ways quite distinct from one another.

Tauiwi represented the landscapes of Te Waipounamu in descriptive texts and paintings as stark, harsh, wildly-awesome, yet ready to be taken on by them, or alternatively to be consumed by them and enjoyed in the tourist sense. Artistic representations of these landscapes by Tauiwi artists (and writers), such as those of Nicholas Chevalier, John Gully and William Hodgkins, looked for scenery similar to that of Europe and America: or, alternatively, at the sheer and raw magnificence of this newly discovered, extremely wild landscape according to Pound (1983). On the other hand, southern Iwi artistic representations were confined largely though not exclusively, to those found in Rock Art caves, in carvings of ancestors, in tekoteko (carved figures at the apex of a wharenui) or, where these existed in the south, in whare whakairo. “Nature” was depicted artistically through kowhaiwhai patterns on tāniko boarders, (the woven edges of korowai [cloaks]) and other articles of clothing or painted rafters within wharenui. Iwi had no written texts prior to contact with Tauiwi missionaries, whalers and sealers, though strong use of metaphor described their landscapes and their places and connections with them. Such metaphor was used mostly on ceremonial occasions, through waiata (song or chant), oriori (learning lullabies), pakiwaitara (stories based on history), kōrero pūrākau (talks given by experts in their fields) and whakataukī (proverbs or sayings with a message). Most narratives contain either very clear or extremely subtle kawa messages that may refer to our landscapes. Tauiwi representation of landscape through both text and art, sometimes posed an epistemological and moral dilemma for the authors or painters when they decided to include interpretations of a “cultural other” (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 7) within their representations. This was usually done in a way that was quite removed from the conceptualisation and understanding of that landscape by its indigenous inhabitants. Kai Tahu histories and explanations of their existence and rights to
land from their epistemology of landscapes were portrayed in Tauwi texts as mere mythology, nothing more than fairytale accounts. Two southern authors nonetheless tried to use Kai Tahu perceptions and ideas. They were Robert Carrick in *A Romance of Lake Wakatipu* and Alexander Bathgate in *The Legend of the Wandering Lake*, about Lake Te Anau (J. Thomson 1998 pers. comm.).

**IWI NAMING, ORAL MEMORIES AND METAPHOR VERSUS TAUWI DISCOURSE, ART, AND TEXT**

While aspects of the origins of Iwi history were cosmological, most pertained to real people (their ancestors), events and feats. Therefore, as suggested by Barnes and Duncan (1992: 7), a cultural “other” may have been unable to understand or accurately express these cultural differences in how the landscapes were perceived. These writers ask whether an author or artist has the right to represent another people’s understanding of landscape, whether it be through text, discourse, or art (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 7). Their reading of discourse theory derives from Foucault’s research on “relations between knowledge, discourses, representations and power” (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 9). As a result, such ethnographic or other authorial description often deconstructs then reconstructs subjective perceptions with dominant discourses in relation to “cultural opposites” (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 9). However, they also acknowledge that “particular combinations of narratives, concepts, ideologies and signifying practices [may result in same language people], talking past each other” (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 8). The problems therefore must be even more heightened when the languages and cultural constructs are not understood by those using competing discourses (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 8). The argument is that the use of metaphor and its intended meaning can only help to clarify text if both writer or artist and recipient have
a true understanding of each other; and that without that kind of understanding, such a contention holds little ground for accuracy (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 10).

There are differing descriptions of landscape through Māori oratory and metaphor, and metaphorical texts as used by Tauwi ethnographic and other writers. These vary enormously depending on whether they are literary, academic, media or tourists’ representations. In relation to media texts, how Māori metaphor is interpreted depends whether this involves contestations that might result in a reversal of ownership or the realisation of profit. Two very current examples are available in regard to Kai Tahu: these are the renaming or reintroduction of the original place names of 78 of our areas as part of the settlement negotiations; and, the competing intra-Iwi discourses about these. These were negatively portrayed in the public arena by media discourses which sought opinion from Tauwi who were against the concept, since New Zealanders were used to the names since Cook’s discovery. It was also negatively accepted by many of the participants and other of our Iwi in the various discussions we had over the past year or two. Some of these include Kelly Davis whose view is presented along with those of Tim Rereti and Paul Waaka:

The reality is that the very korero we’re having now, the very korero we’re having now, happened...especially in the Kemp’s purchase area. And in many other places too, but was not recorded, though it was had. And you’re talking about name ... there's that [sic] many names and I don't for the life of me understand why... when they did this name thing that they didn't look at it. There's a map, there's a book, there's the korero that goes with it. Why the hell didn't we use it? Why didn't we use it in terms of the...[settlement] cos it would have highlighted to all the other areas... that even though Murihiku didn't have that recording, there were some sort of recordings down there. It would have induced people to say 'hell look, you know, look at this lot here... we've got as many

94 A friend in the media told me that she was asked to canvas people in a certain area until she found four to five who were against things Māori, particularly any settlement of treaty grievances. Once these people had been found, she was told to ask them if they would be interviewed at some of the areas concerned. She refused but knew that someone else would undertake the work. It is also interesting to see the different emphases given to news items depending on whether they are for the general or Māori news. The latter is less easily understood to non-speakers of Te Reo Māori.
names.' And that would have covered the landscape. What we're saying is the korowai of Papatuanuku for Ngāi Tahu has not been put there (K. Davis kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

Reihana replied,

Well. Exactly. And they should have done the whole lot instead of just those wee few (J. Reihana kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

I mean I could show you the maps, I could show you the kōrero that goes with them cos I've got the whole damned lot. And it was given to them (our negotiators) it was given to the claimants, it was given to them up here at Arowhenua, but it never ever... but that's as far as it got. It got translated It was in Te Reo! It got translated and then it got locked away. And the maps are there. If you'd put that map up there, you can bet that Murihiku would have come in, loaded it up, everyone else... and the whole of Papatuanuku in terms of Ngāi Tahu would have been covered. Then if you wanted to get the whole of Te Wāipounamu you get Te Tau Iho to do the same damned thing (K. Davis kōrero-ā-waha: 1999).

And

Like I say I had only seen Aoraki from a distance and the closest I had ever been was when I was down at Takapō [my spelling used] with the army, but to be up there in his awesomeness, and to be there for 4 nights ... and even at night times he was even magnificent. It was like glowing, it was like trying to clear my mind so I could listen to, just to listen to the whenua. It was sad, not the situation but I felt sad, and I guess that's where I encourage people to look at Maunga. OK, if we have to give to back, that's Kei te pai, we'll give it back in a hundred and 150 years. Then we would look at other options. Then to be told that by my own Uncle as well, my Uncle said, 'See this right hand this is the hand that signed away that Maunga and all the rest of it.' Mum said, 'Well if you were any less that hand would have been chopped off, simple as that.'

And I'm thinking that this isn't about you Uncle Charlie, this isn't about you either Mark Solomon, this is about us, this is about us here today, us who are to come, this ain't about you!
Coming back from the Coast 'Road Show' knowing I'm going to get an earful if I'd said the same thing over there. There was me and Uncle Charlie driving all that way back all the way from the Coast debating, all the way over and all the way back, and that's personal stuff. I'm saying, 'You were a taxi driver before you were a Kaiwhakahaere, Mark Solomon worked in scrap metal, your Kaiwhakahaere role doesn't automatically and instantly give you the expertise in knowledge in order to make decisions.' I guess the road show for me (out of the 1, I went on 2 and that was enough. I'd had enough. I was wanting to say something, I was wanting them (our people) to respond, to respond. I just wanted you to hear what they were saying. It was like a needs analysis that we wanted to achieve, that I was led to believe. Not to have people puffing their chests [and] flapping their wings saying, 'this is what I do,' trying to justify it. We were listening to the wrong thing, rather than listening to the people who had ideas that came from centuries ago, anywhere, who came here anyway. It's about listening to me listen to the land. (T. Rereti korero-ā-waha : 1999).

And finally,

I don't want to be critical of them... BUT... because I believe[d] that at the end of the day they [the negotiators] would do a good job. They are warriors of Tahu, (I will not say Rakaiauatu 'cos some of them aint). They have sold themselves and their people short. Arowhenua has a very good case because we have no nohoaka site. The Opihi, Otipua lagoon, we had kaika there. We had sites there, we had a[n] Urupa where the Pākehā dug up, back in 1817, the remains of one of our people. The remains of this Tupuna was 7 feet!!! So when the negotiators were out negotiating, they should have come to our people and should have asked us about these places. And we would have said 'No' you don't build something there that was a sacred site. There was a Kaika here.

This guy who writes to the newspaper, he's a bit of a loose cannon, E. W. Austin. Any slip up, or any minor issues that happen on the T.V or the paper (every area has one), he jumps on the band wagon. He has been very critical of our cause. But in a lot of cases now, we have asked some of these people to criticise us.

We were given a role by our Tūpuna as Kaitiaki, to look after our people and hopefully I'm doing it. Hopefully you're doing it, there are people out there doing it. But out of that, there are things, these happenings that don't look well... When you're talking 170 odd million, automatically the E. W. Austin and all those guys climb on the bandwagon and we get hammered.

---

55 Where Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu travel both Islands to keep us informed on Iwi matters.
You talk Mahika Kai, you talk those parts of the Settlement, the areas we lost under Kemp’s Deeds of Settlement, you talk about those and these red necks wouldn’t understand. As soon as you put a value to something, ‘It’s those Māori, bludging, taking tax payer money.’ But we have given them that fuel (P. Waaka kōrero-ā-waha : 1999).

The type of news to which Waaka refers depends upon controversy in order to exist and to thrive. Perhaps such negativity occurred over the Kai Tahu settlement because it involved a substantial monetary compensation. Yet as compensation for 150 years of deprivation and the huge area of land involved, the amount is token at best and far from what both Crown and Kai Tahu acknowledge as a realistic and more representative amount. The second example furthered ideas contained within the first, at least as viewed by Kai Tahu negotiators. This involved the creation of exclusive areas of what Kai Tahu call wāhi nohoaka (camp sites), from which should they choose, they could actively participate in the pursuit of mahika kai (special food). The exclusivity in this part of the settlement is to the sites rather than the foods that are able to be accessed by us for a certain period of time in any year. This has upset Tauiwi who believe they have established exclusive use rights to particular areas on rivers where inaka (whitebait) are sourced. As a specialty food for Iwi and a gastronomical delight for Tauiwi, it also has a huge commercial monetary value. Foods for which Tauiwi have no such liking have neither been a media nor recreational fishers’ issue, yet have enormous value to Kai Tahu, both as food sources and Kaihaukai trading commodities. As discussed in chapter five, Mahika Kai and Kaihaukai are practices that were and still are an integral part of how Kai Tahu conceptualise their connectedness with the generosity of Papatuānuku (the earth mother), whose flora adorn her whose fauna (including us) are part of her land and in her seascapes. Arguments relating to sole use rights of nohoaka as they become available (albeit for only a certain period annually) for Kai Tahu exclusive use, can be directly attributed to the way their announcement was portrayed in the media. It created “competing
discourses among opposing interest groups [so that there are] clashes between groups whose presuppositions are based on antagonistic discourses” (Barnes and Duncan 1992: 9). These are also contestations over access to and use of resources. Thus landscapes and their uses continue to be areas of contestation, whether over understanding, meaning or use.

Ireland (1989: 14) states that landscapes are never merely “picture-postcard collection[s] of stunning views,” but also include ideas about the world’s form and people’s feelings about themselves within it. Humans are said by Ireland to have an internal reference point that provides shape and meaning to landscapes (Ireland 1989: 15). These places with which people are intimately associated, and in which they have been nurtured and socialised, result in them defining themselves within these landscapes, and they in turn pass on these definitions to significant others (Ireland 1989: 15). Self-definitions such as these see the landscapes conceived of as belonging to the people who define them and at times the landscapes may become personalised as individuals or internalise these constructions (Ireland 1989: 18). Definitions can be complex, for any culture. In reference to a Colin McCahon painting (such as the well known one of the Otago Peninsula), Ireland argues it is not simply “a view of hills, but is a revelation of how hills feel, a living world with a living response.” He further contends that landscapes are active, because they impose themselves upon people, dominating their lives and changing them (Ireland 1989: 18). In other words, there is nothing passive about such landscapes; they do not simply exist. Instead they cause any number of reactions within or upon people. The idea of active landscapes was portrayed earlier by both Bell (1996: 4) and Hirsch (1995: 11-12), while they and their ideas on people’s self-definitions of themselves within landscapes in turn mirrored the contentions of Greider and Garkovitch’s (1994: 1, 2) and of Schama (1995: 6). Such contentions of landscapes being as much about cultural constructions as geographical areas of land provide an explanation into how different culture groups constructed and represented New Zealand.
OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

The early settlers from England, Scotland and Ireland created for themselves and their successors, a rural idyll, which was largely transposed from their country of origin. As Thomas (1983) and Cosgrove and Daniels (1988) state, painterly and poetic portrayals of their beautifully sublime or awesomely rugged homeplace landscapes had given many a divine element. So also had those from the New Zealand Company that portrayed Te Wāipounenu landscapes both as awesomely sublime and as actively to be tamed. Both of these two views implied the landscapes of Te Wāipounenu were boundless and could be made bounteous.

Differing perceptions of the same landscapes and their optimal utilisation have been expressed in many textual forms since first Tāuiwi contact in Aotearoa and Te Wāipounenu. For example, in some nineteenth-century novels about the land wars in the north, the textual portrayals of landscape that continued to remain in Māori ownership say much about the ideology and thinking of the emerging nation (as well as the values of the novelists). Many would argue that such aspects of this ideology remain in present times, as the media continue to look for news which is more damning than affirming of Iwi misadventures. Yet similar misadventures by the likes of the Bank of New Zealand several years ago were written off by the government of the day. Thus, these novels when read in this context, show the beginnings of what has come to be the hegemonic discourse of New Zealand as stated earlier: white, male and rural. It is for that reason they are referred to as a source, used to inform the reader of this thesis, certain perceptions of settlers and coloizers of the day and how such thoughts may become ingrained as part of a nation’s psyche. The novels which date variously from the 1870s to the 1920s express what would seem to be the views of the majority of non-Māori about how the landscape was perceived, and by whom it should be owned.

Taranaki: A Tale of the War (1873) states that the Church of England missionaries had encouraged a Māori desire for equality although they were “unfit to have either equality or
freedom [because they were] little removed from cannibalism" (Stoney 1873: 2). It says nothing about the way the Governor of the day conspired to alienate the lands of Taranaki by entering an agreement with an inappropriate Rakatira whose whakapapa were not directly of the area concerned. This is excusable only because it is a novel, even one supposedly based on fact. In The Last of the Waikatos: A Sensational Tale of the Province of Auckland (Featon 1873), it is made just as obvious Māori were unfit to own or in any way properly manage the landscapes of the country. John Featon, the novel’s author, wrote under the pseudonym of Comus, publications that were serialised in newspapers in the late 1800s. He had no empathy for Māori whom he viewed as the enemy to be destroyed because they so arrogantly resisted settlement (Featon 1873). “Governor Grey brought proud Waikato to account [and as a result], formerly solitary wastes [became] smiling pastures of wheat in place of useless fern and Tea Tree” (Featon 1873: 10). Tikera or Children of the Queen of Oceania (1877), was written by a Polish author named Wisniowski in 1877. According to Wisniowski, “the country unquestionably belonged to Māori” (Wisniowski 1877: 52). Māori were also known to have fine biceps and were seen as the author’s equal in certain manual work, but were always his racial inferiors. As he stated, 25 years of civilisation “have failed to eradicate vengeful and cruel customs of over six centuries” (Wisniowski 1877: 90-1). Jem Peterkin’s Daughter: An Antipodean Novel (1892) written by J B Churchward (1892: 156), describes Māori as “dirty bludgers [who undertook] frenzied attacks on their own and on innocent” Pākehā, who were brave and gallant, although they sometimes had unprincipled land-sharks in their ranks. Even friendly Māori were described as cruel marauders who accepted money for helping Pākehā acquire the treasured landscapes of other Iwi (Churchward 1892: throughout) and the need to properly utilise all the land that was idle permeates all of the novels. In War to the Knife or Tangata Maori (1899), written by Australian Rolf Boldrewood, a somewhat different point of view is given. Māori are described as vigorous, agricultural, warlike, also of stalwart frames; and the New Zealand Company officials along with British
parliamentarians were said to be out “to rob the poor devils of natives of their tribal lands” (Boldrewood 1899: 79).

A further series of novels written from around the late nineteenth century and into the middle of this century, were about Māori as a dying race and the superiority of the British. These include Where the White Man Treads (1905), by W. M. Baucke, and The New Zealand Wars and the Pioneering Period (1922) by J. Cowan. According to Tom Brooking (1997: pers. comm.) and Lawrence Jones (1997: pers. comm.), the dying race theory was a result of both wishful thinking and a quite real missionary belief. Government officials of New Zealand in almost all these texts were considered as fair minded and impartial in all their and dealings at all times. Even Boldrewood saw progress as being based on Social Darwinism and constantly referred to Māori as savage, barbaric, and revengeful. In the same way that these texts influenced the thinking of their times, so also do contemporary ones, especially when they are accompanied by pictorial presentations.

A contemporary text edited by Coney (1989) has Barber (1989: 130) quoting this caption below on an 1867 Fisher chromolithograph that states,

*The settlers saw the native forest as vacant and unused, and thus lacking ownership, an idea that persisted [in New Zealand] until the resurgence of Maori land claims in the 1970’s.*

This caption is in error when it implies that the land claims only had a resurgence from the 1970’s. Any Iwi would dispute this, as nearly all, including Kai Tahu, have never stopped taking their “take” over these before the Crown. A more accurate caption might have stated that it was not until the 1970s that the nation informed itself of the existence of such claims through the medium of television. It should also be remembered that most Pākehā believed the claims started with the Hikoi led by the late Whina Cooper and the occupation by Ngāti Whātua of Bastion Point. So deep is the nation's amnesia to Iwi loss of mana whenua of their
landscapes, that captions like the one cited might just as easily be a line from the novels referred to above. The writers of these were the contemporaries of the Tauiwi who set about alienating Iwi landscapes, which they proceeded to strip of indigenous flora and fauna species including Iwi.

A deforested landscape in a more developed state was seen through agriculturist and pastoralist eyes. Their understanding was “the only economic rationale which makes land look civilised like the domesticated rural landscapes of Europe and North America” (Gow 1996: 43-44). For Māori though, forests and trees were the children of Tāne and under the protection of Māori kaitiaki like all children of the cosmological parents Papatuānuku and Rakinui. What ultimately developed in New Zealand because of the beliefs of the Tauiwi settlers was, at times, an uneasy relationship between Kai Tahu and the Tauiwi settlers which at certain levels has persisted between their descendants. This arose in the first place over competing perceptions of landscapes and land use particularly when it involved the clearing of native bush from which many Kai Tahu derived food and food-related resources. The landscape and management ideology of Tauiwi and Pākehā became the dominant ones, around which was built a New Zealand capitalistic national identity.

Bell considers that in the first instance, because the settlers had no long standing or familial ties in New Zealand, their identification with its land and landscape “came to be defined through land ownership” (Bell 1996: 5). This seems to fit with Thomas’s contention that part of the reason for planting slow-maturing trees was to establish long-time ownership of landscapes in eighteenth and nineteenth century England. Kai Tahu, like other Iwi, had an identity that saw them conceptualised as emanating from their landscapes. That has further been expressed by T. O’Regan at many public lectures, where he states that Pākehā believe in Darwin’s theory that they are descended from apes: Māori on the other hand, consider that they are descended from the Gods. Though tongue in cheek, the message being conveyed is
clear in relation to those from whom Māori consider they collectively evolved as part of Oceania and as Iwi from Te Wāipounamu and Aotearoa.

A settler inability to construct a collective identity was said to be the result of too few shillings invested in the new country which could be made available to assist in the development of “a national infrastructure” (Bell 1996: 5). Over time, the idea grew that New Zealanders were a rurally based, clean, green, do-it-yourself farming people. As Bell (1996: 8) argues, a self-definition such as this came to be supported through language, education and the various forms of media. The last two were enormously assisted through the use of texts, and Tauiwi historical accounts, most often academic ones.

Various media forms and particularly those since the late sixties, including television advertisements, also promoted the green and rural image, even knowing the majority of the citizens are urban dwellers (Bell 1996: 8). The reason for the television advertisements and locally produced serials that portray rural New Zealand and outdoors nationals as fact, is because modern-day marketing research has shown that such portrayals are what most members of the public prefer as a self-image (Campbell 1997: pers. comm.). Kai Tahu, on the other hand, have had to fight to gain acknowledgement of their preferred self-image, that of an Iwi who have always been part of their landscapes, even when they have not had deeds of ownership to them. Besides the many publicly known historical facts on Kai Tahu as an Iwi, there is their modern role as a major player in the corporate world of commerce. Many still retain their ethos as a separate entity from that commercial aspect since it has not been accepted as being part of the corporate image. Retention of a Kai Tahu-ness can be found in the two contemporary waiata kua waiatatia e mātou i roto i te Whare Paremata i te 29/9/98 “E Hine” me “Tahu Potiki,” the former about how we have felt about our Claim and the latter about who we are in regard to our beginnings as Kai Tahu. It is also found in our whakataukī “E muramura ahi kā ki uta, e muramura ahi kā ki tai, e korakorakia muramura o ahi kā.” Kei a Kai Tahu tonu te mana o ō mātou whenua, ahakoa kua wehea e rātou rā nā ō mātou rikrika,
te nui ka i ēnei whenua ataa hua o Te Wāipounemu inaianei. Thus the mana remains with Kai Tahu and their beautiful landscapes of Te Wāipounemu.
A working landscape is hardly ever a landscape. The very idea of landscape implies separation and observation. [Though] possible to trace internal histories of landscape painting, landscape writing, landscape gardening and landscape architecture, in the final analysis [these histories] relate to the common history of land and society (R Williams 1973: 120).

The founding of New Zealand as a Tauiwi nation came to be as much a mythological tale as the Māori one centuries earlier. Tauiwi existence as part of that nation came with their subsequent colonisation of Te Wāipounemu and Aotearoa. Bell (1996: 9) suggested that Tauiwi settlement “was mythologised as the founding of an harmonious, bicultural New Zealand [in which] Pākehā” chose to remember an imagined history where the country had been peacefully colonised. Others such as Belich (1986) and King (1985: 189) talk similarly of an “historical amnesia” in New Zealand. Historians such as Evison (1993), Parsonson (1986) and Orange (1987), have rewritten the history of the settlement of Aotearoa and Te Wāipounemu, taking cognisance of both Māori and Tauiwi remembrances of a less than idyllic colonisation. Most of the participants interviewed for this thesis have expressed similar views. Those who differed, believed that the settlers from Britain were fair and just since they brought civilisation and a much superior culture to all Iwi. Tauiwi settler ideas of landscape and identity were based on individual ownership of land. These beliefs came to be acceptable in the settler society. However, there were varying degrees of resistance by Iwi, ranging from passive occupation to the taking up of arms.

McLauchlan (1989: 225) states that the New Zealand landscape had, by the 1920s, acquired a “lived in look” as it had by then become both tamed and civilised. He further adds
that the country had also become a pleasant society "in the summer of [its] contentment, culturally featureless, blissfully bland" (McLauchlan 1989: 225). This portrayal of course denies any existence of "cultural others," not only the indigenous or first people of the place, but also of the many other peoples from other than British extraction. Such perceptions sprang, in part, from a conceptualisation that rural living was morally and spiritually superior to urban existence (McLauchlan 1989: 226). Barber (1989: 32) mirrors McLauchlan's thinking and goes on to state that from the nineteenth century, New Zealand created a "rural myth [in which] farmers were judged and judged themselves [to be] the backbone of the nation." However, many Kai Tahu who farmed in a manner different from Taueri were perceived as less than ideal farmers, while their methods of farming were looked down upon by Taueri in the two districts studied in the thesis (Anon. 1998: korero-a-waha). Their lifestyle was thought of as not matching up to non-Iwi ideas of what farming and country life were all about. Kai Tahu, like many other Iwi, were considered as useful labourers or shearers to be engaged by Taueri farmers. On the other hand, the lifestyle led by the Taueri rural people was allegedly a simple, no-frills existence, in tune with nature and superior in every way to a lifestyle which was urban centred (Barber 1989: 32). The New Zealand wage structure was stated as reflecting the most classless society in the modern world, where from truck drivers to medical doctors, the opportunity to earn a similar weekly wage was possible (Anon. 1998: pers. comm.). However this was not necessarily an accurate portrayal of New Zealand society. Hamish Keith (1989: 242) contended that New Zealanders of the 1950s, wanted neither changes nor challenges to the dominant hegemony in a nation which had achieved a "seamless society" which did not want to consider troublesome questions such as identity and place, or the burden of its founding history. In the same way that New Zealand
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96 This source told me that because wages were much nearer in value at that time of our being much more egalitarian, so too the "tall poppy" syndrome argued that if a "truckie" and a university lecturer were able to earn similar amounts, their work was of equal value and university educated people ought not to have been so "toffy-nosed" (Anon. 1998: pers.comm.). This ignores the gender-based discrimination so evident in the wage structure since the early twentieth century.
mythologised itself as a classless society, it continued to mythologise its supposed harmonious race relations.

A continuation of these beliefs along with those of idyllic rurality have been referred to in Bell (1996: 10), especially when she cites Hirschberg’s 1993 research. Student participants in Hirschberg’s study were aware of an idealised New Zealand; here was a national image of wide-open spaces that were clean and green and within whose borders were contained friendly nationals. The actuality is often far removed from such an idyllic portrayal. We have pollution problems and our share of national monetary and racial tensions, both of which are reflected in crimes of violence and ethnic intolerance. Rural versus urban differences are constantly alluded to through the various forms of media. One of Bell’s own student interviewees remarked during the research she herself conducted in 1995 that, “I am from the country and I understand that is the ‘real New Zealand’[rural]. Most of the population lives in the city, but [that] is [seldom] promoted as true New Zealand” (Bell. 1996: 10; emphasis added).

It might therefore be concluded that both the so-called national identity and definitions of what constitute “our” landscapes are a symbolic construction of what ought to exist as opposed to what actually does exist. Many Tauiwi farmers do not define their work places as landscapes per se, but seem rather to separate areas upon which they work from those which are enjoyed as consumable tourist-type areas. Nonetheless, a number of farmers throughout the country actively participate in the tourist industry as hosts for visitors wishing to experience farm-stays, while others have shearing displays, targeted for the tourism market. Many did this to survive the loss of subsidies and an enormous amount of female labour now goes into this. It was also not the first choice of most on the land and for some farmers whose wives were to become the main or sole income earner, it was “soul destroying” (Anon. 1998: pers. comm.). The more usual separation of farmscape from landscape, however, is borne out by another great Kiwi myth: farmers are the backbone of the nation (perhaps true), who live
more closely to and are therefore more in tune with nature (somewhat doubtful). The latter is stated and believed as fact, regardless of its accuracy and the former regarding farming being our nation’s backbone, is presently very accurate since the global collapse of the New Zealand dollar. Such mythologising over nature and farmers’ closeness to it has also affected the ways in which Iwi perceive their landscapes.

Norton (1989: 119) discussed the ideas of people mythologising landscapes and their treatment of them, in two separate chapters of his text. He cites the 1978 statement of Terry that, “Perceptual or vernacular [landscape] regions are those perceived to exist by their inhabitants and other members of the population at large.” Such landscapes are given a positive affirmation of their existence through texts, photographic portrayals and tourist brochures. The use of these types of representations via the medium of television cements such beliefs within the psyche of the majority. Thus by similar mythologising, symbolic representations of New Zealand landscapes have come to be accepted as factual. The medium of television has contributed much to a national myth of ideal landscapes and consumption of rural New Zealand. Many portrayals of typical Tauiwi and Iwi New Zealanders in the written, audio and visual media, are, like those of the nation’s landscapes and identity, symbolic representations.

Television, through locally grown programmes such as *Heartland*, also reinforces a national hegemonic image of land and landscape connection, which now largely constitutes Tauiwi New Zealanders’ ideas of their identity and themselves within that world (Bell 1996: 11). *Heartland* visited small suburban and rural communities looking for typical though often eccentric/alternative “life-stylers”, who supposedly represent New Zealand’s true heartlanders. Their contributions to the nation are given equal recognition with those of the farming community. A second type of programme with the same front person (Gary McCormack) and titled *McCormack* also travelled the country interviewing the nation’s so called “famous,” who represent the wealthy and the not so wealthy in the areas of arts,
commerce and business. Often they are urban dwellers (though not exclusively so). The difference is that the *McCormack* group are sought because they are Kiwis who are supposedly exceptions to the rule --“tall poppies” or success stories--whilst those featured in *Heartland* are portrayed as the largely unrecognised people of the nation’s heartland. The *Heartland* programme has even featured two Māori communities. Programmes such as some of those mentioned here appear to have been modelled upon similar ones which I was able to view in Britain in early 1998. It could therefore be contended, that despite New Zealand having supposedly cut itself free from a “mother England” syndrome and British settler perceptions of landscape and identity, there is still British influence on the way New Zealand is textually/visually portrayed in the late twentieth century, which would seem to show a lack of creativity of TV writers here.

The above examples closely reflect the idea posited by Greider and Garkovitch (1994:8) where they state that cultural groups “use [symbolic representations of themselves] to define the everyday, taken-for-granted worlds within which they organise relationships,” within their various environmental landscapes. Debates within the *Anth. 419 Rural anthropology* lectures at Otago University in 1997 mirrored these arguments, especially so in relation to the critical analysis and discussion based around particular television advertisements (and programmes such as *Heartland*) in their portrayals of “rural” and urban New Zealand.

Television representation of Māori in advertisements has seldom featured them positively, the DB (a brand of beer) series being the exception. Neither have the majority of those represented in *Heartland* appeared to truly represent Tauiwi as a cohesive group, which is what is often being suggested: Namely that there exists, a typical “Kiwi bloke.” Landscape and national identity, nonetheless, are favoured within the concept of a rural, agricultural and pastoral New Zealand, where drink driving is presented as the nation’s darker side of the rural idyll, along with news items which sensationalise Iwi grievances and predict an inevitable
mismanagement of compensations awarded to them. This is suggested rather than boldly stated as fact.

Sensational media hype of this type was, according to Kai Tahu interviewees, a definite contributor to the reaction by high-country farmers in relation to Te Kereeme (the Claim) before the Waitangi Tribunal and the over reaction of many Pākehā New Zealand groups even now. Some were equally convinced that the perceived loss of power from the hands of others into the hands of Kai Tahu was also of enormous significance to the nation. The interviewees argued that this sensationalising of Iwi matters has continued into the present in regard to the long awaited settlement of the Kai Tahu Claim as well as an investigative report into how Tainui are using their monetary compensation. Nonetheless on the actual day of September 29th 1998, in which the Bill having passed its third reading in parliament was enacted into law, the amount of positive media coverage was minimal. On the Saturday immediately following that great celebratory day for Kai Tahu and the Crown, who were equally keen to have Te Kereeme settled, the editorial in the Otago Daily Times (ODT) of October 3rd 1998, was scathing of Kai Tahu, whom the writer blamed for all wrongs between Kai Tahu and the Crown for the past 148 years (ODT Editorial Oct. 3 1998). The writer saw nothing positive in the outcome between the two parties, each of whom gained a new understanding of how the other fits within the national identity.

KAI TAHU IN THE NATIONAL IDENTITY

While still living as hapū units, we Kai Tahu learned by our mistakes over the centuries to manage our landscapes in a quite different way to Tauiwi. When Te Waipounemumu was in our proprietorship, we hunted and gathered as well as deliberately managed many of the resources in the foothills, forests, valleys and coastal areas as well as from the sea. We also travelled certain areas of the high-country usually as pathways from the East coast to the West coast to trade in and transport our pounemu (greenstone) to our takiwā (places) on the east. Later, we maintained (and continue to maintain) that we never sold our mountains who were and are our tupuna ·and founding ancestors (T. O'Regan, Hui of 12/10/97: kōrero-ā-waha). As Kai Tahu Tūpuna understood the sales, the areas sold went from the foothills to the coasts, but excluded Te Tiritiriri o te Moana (the mountain tops of the Southern Alps) and
Piopiotahi (Whiwhiotahi, Fiordland), according to Charles Crofts (1998: 4; see also Evison 1988: 23-25). In the South Island's high-country and in Fiordland are situated many of the sacred areas referred to in the Kai Tahu pepeha as well as being landscapes to which we whakapapa.

In Te Kereeme and the negotiations surrounding it, Kai Tahu aspired to the return of these special landscape areas from Crown ownership into our management. Since the laws of the nation did not recognise that for us to care for the land, we did not need to own it, we now do need, if not such ownership, at least recognition of the meaning it held for us, to more appropriately exercise the kaitiaki responsibilities we inherited alongside our whakapapa. The Claim hearings did not mean the removal of lessees or other high-country farmers, or indeed anyone, from lands which they owned or cared for, whether for spiritual or monetary reasons. Nor did Kai Tahu recommend the closing of access to trampers in the Greenstone valley or the Fiordland National Park. Kai Tahu definitions of the landscapes “sold” by them to Kemp, Mantell and others acting on behalf of the Governor last century, were deliberately misunderstood by Tauiwi. The initial representations made to the Governor were said by various recorders of the transactions, to have been ambiguously represented. In fact the quote in Evison of Mantell's words is worth reproducing in full:

"The understanding between the Native sellers and myself as Crown agent when the purchase was made, was that they were (in addition to purchase money, the pas or places of residence, and the mahinga kais which were then and there reserved or guaranteed to them), to receive ample reserves from which in course of time, they might derive considerable rents as a means towards their securing permanently the comforts, and necessaries of civilised life. I am also bound to say, that without these promises the cession of the land would have been delayed, if not withheld, for an indefinite period of time" (Evison 1988: 23, 24).

Mantell, after marking out minimum amounts of ground for Kai Tahu reserves went on, for the first time, to “produce a map” whose area defined the Kemp’s purchase (Evison 1988:
25). It was only at this stage that Kai Tahu saw the extent of the sale’s boundaries: these extended from the east coast to the west coast, not merely the foothills, and took in from Maungaaterere (Maukatere) to Maungaatua (Maukaatua), virtually from just south of Kaikōura to south-west of Dunedin. As a result, the “hole in the middle” as described by Crofts in his article, passed out of Kai Tahu ownership with the Kemp purchase of 1848. Such ambiguities in dealings and ambiguities in meanings are not confined only to these landscape definitions and areas.

Barnes and Duncan (1992: 4), quoting Daniels and Cosgrove, note that the use of the term “landscape” is somewhat ambiguous. It is an appropriate statement to make, given the number of definitions of what constitutes landscape and how it is perceived that have been examined within this thesis. Cosgrove and Daniels have stated amongst other definitions of landscape that it is “a cultural image, a pictorial way of representing, structuring or symbolising surroundings” (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988: 1). It is equally appropriate when nearing the end of this thesis, to consider the view of Barnes and Duncan (1992: 4):

... landscapes may be represented in a variety of materials and on many surfaces—in paint on canvas, in writing on paper, in earth, stone, water and vegetation on the ground. A landscape park is more palpable but no more real, nor less imaginary, than a landscape painting or poem.

The representations of New Zealand’s landscapes, especially those of Kai Tahu and Te Wāipounamu in general have been no less ambiguous. The cultural construction of an environment is said by Tilley to be “both ‘prelude’ and ‘epilogue’ not necessarily involv[ing] ‘explication’ or ‘discourse’” (Tilley 1994: 24). As a result of early post-Treaty conceptualisations, the many descendants of the early Tauiwi settlers and those of Kai Tahu, have represented their understandings of the same landscapes in vastly different ways at
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97 See maps in earlier chapters of the disputed sales areas, Tiritiri o te Moana (the high-country/mountain tops
times, but also in remarkably similar ways at others. They have also had land use ideas occasionally in common, but more often at odds with one another. Many of the first Tauiwi settlers felt that Kai Tahu under-utilised their landscapes and, according to two of the Tauiwi research interviewees, some Kai Tahu both here and elsewhere, continue to under-utilise or mismanage their farmscapes and animals. Such differing perceptions have been examined throughout the thesis, as have the origins of those perceptions. However, it has been clearly noted by the many theorists and texts cited, and demonstrated to varying degrees by the interviewed participants, that landscape is a cultural concept which is symbolically constructed as opposed to a blank geographical environmental slate. As James states, “for those outsiders or those who have a different experience, it is difficult to ‘see’ the landscapes of a cultural other” and how they may choose to use it (James 1997: 6). Societies which had been hunter-gatherers did not, then, conceive of their landscapes as mere backdrops upon which they may or may not have chosen to act. Rather, the landscapes were conceptualised in such a way as to imbue them with human qualities. Tilley argues, “Humanized places become fashioned out of the landscape through recognition of significant qualities in culturally produced [rocks, rivers, trees and ]landscapes by association with current use, past social or mythological actions” (Tilley 1994: 24).

The last of the groups to arrive in and colonise Te Wāipounenu were far more technologically advanced than the resident Kai Tahu and, besides renaming the landscapes, these incomers redefined them and how they would be used. Their ideas purported a visual ideology that veiled intentions of exploitation and alienation. The main reason for their differing perceptions of the same landscape and its ideal use stems from the way in which they viewed land use, ownership and the claiming through naming of it.

Kai Tahu have not had a single view in the definitions and understandings of landscape use and what it means for them any more than have Tauiwi. Therefore it is not necessarily

and Piopiotahi (Fiordland), reproduced from Evison (1988: 24, 30).
only ethnicity which has dictated people's understandings and belief systems on landscape. From the form of research that used the interview as chat processes, it would appear that gender, as much as ethnicity, has influenced some of the thinking on landscape use in particular. However, the sample group in the areas covered may have been too small to successfully argue this point conclusively.

Moreover, as stated in the "Introduction," there are multiple understandings about landscape not examined here, but which could lead to further research that would include comparative studies of landscape perceptions in other countries between the descendants of both the indigenous and the colonisers. This research has been primarily about how we as Kai Tahu define ourselves and our landscapes as part of one another. One instance that would be worth pursuing at another time would be research on how Aboriginal and white Australians view landscape compared with Iwi and Tauwi New Zealanders. Peter Read's (2000) work is seminal for Aborigines and settlers in Australia.

Such research, if extended even further than these two groups, might reveal in both countries, whether newer New Zealand and Australian citizens of European or Asian origins have different ideas of landscape, and whether subsequent generations after the first one to migrate identify more with their present landscapes than with the homeplaces of their parents. The landscape conceptualisations may be quite different depending which European nations the immigrants came from and vary according to the type of work in which people are engaged.

Perhaps all Tauwi need to read the thoughts of Ta (Sir) Tipene O'Regan in his article in our Iwi magazine. Amongst other things he talks of how he feels in certain of our landscapes here compared with others with whom we are connected or with those where we have no affiliation through shared whakapapa:
When I come to a place within our huge Ngai Tahu domain and I think about its name and those who named it, I’m not playing Tipene the scholar and dwelling on the systems and the categorisations of the New Zealand Geographic Board. I’m much more likely to be thinking about how that name has been shifted through the Pacific over centuries, of the minds that carried and replanted it in this remote place, of the association with my ancestors, of the battles, the marriages, the deaths and the lovemaking. The former hunger they knew and how they coped with heat and cold. I know that Awarua is the capital of Rarotonga and that the small island outside my Awarua is called Rarotoka. This is only a passing interest. What is important is that my grandparents and my uncles are buried on the hilltop above the port and my mother’s people lived there and left annually from here to go to the island still further south and my cousins are [there] now mutton-birding. (T O'Regan, 1999: 13-14).

He also talks about degrees of connectedness and belonging with certain landscapes and of passing on what he knows of these created by the Gods “and of the ancestors who dreamed them into place” (O'Regan 1999: 14). He asks then how Kai Tahu will walk through this ancient landscape in this century. He states that as long as we have knowledge of all those old memories and lock our identity to them with “chains of whakapapa,” that ability will be possible as a result of previous generations including his own, having successfully passed on the “memories and whakapapa” (O'Regan 1999. 14). That has been much of the life work of him and many others, to ensure that those of us here now and those of us yet to be born, will have, and treasure, those whakapapa memories. Though there will always be differences in understandings there will also hopefully be a unifying bond that binds us together in whakapapa, that of our Kai Tahu identity as descendants and literally part of the landscape of Te Waipounenu. What we most need to be comfortable with is that there will always be differences in understandings and contestations of landscape understandings within and outside of our iwi. Differences are fine and contestations will always be part of the human condition as this research has shown.
DIFFERENCES IN WORK AND UNDERSTANDING

In this research, not all those engaged in the work of farming were of a single mindset on what constitutes wise landscape use, whether Kai Tahu or Tauiwi. Opinions differed, depending on whether the farms were expected to provide the only form of income, were being worked on behalf of Iwi, or were whānau wakawaka that were allowed to more or less manage themselves with as little human intervention as possible. There were differences between the work practices of male Tauiwi participants, between Tauiwi and Kai Tahu, and between Kai Tahu and Kai Tahu. There were similar differences in their spiritual belief systems about the landscapes on which they live and work. The taha wairua or spirituality has not at all times been due solely to ethnically- or religiously-based definitions of these concepts. One Tauiwi farmer was deeply attached to the landscape and had spiritual experiences similar to, if not the same as two of the female and one of the male Kai Tahu participants. But although he interpreted this through a Kai Tahu understanding of taha wairua, and believed he was working the land in a way that was acceptable to the Tūpuna, his farming was of a kind considered by Kai Tahu farmers as aggressive.

Another Kai Tahu participant experienced these types of taha wairua experiences on his personal, whānau, and hapū landscapes yet had a quite different type of spiritual experience when travelling in his work capacity. The experiences that resulted from his work away from his more familiar everyday landscapes, were described more as awe-inspiring types of spiritual experience, which was how Edward Ellison had described his understanding of the high-country lessee's spirituality. It was perhaps a lack of intimate knowledge of those landscapes away from his homeplaces that contributed to the differences in feeling.
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98 The term "ki waho" for hui denotes those hui held by Kai Tahu for Kai Tahu outside of their rohe which includes areas in the northern parts of Te Wāipounamu and Aotearoa.
A relative of his did not express any interest in hearing many of the Kai Tahu matters being spoken of and was somewhat disdainful of others’ interest in “these Māori things” (E. Ellison kōrero-ā-waha: 1998). However, others who live far away from Te Wāipounenu or their homeplaces, have in some way retained a connection with them. As earlier stated, the late Aunties Kuini Te Tau and Leah Wineera, the late Ted Parata and the still-living Aunty Flo Reiri had maintained similar attachments to homeplace even though some had lived away for as long as seventy years. Aunty Kuini, like Aunty Flo followed and attended many of the Tribunal hearings in Te Wāipounenu. These Aunties like our late Aunt Magda here at home, were our source of knowledge. Whenever it was possible, many of us visited with them on trips north, even though it often meant making a diversion. The Tāua maintained throughout their lives strong connections with their landscapes of home, their Kai Tahu belief systems and ethos which with whakapapa kept them as part of our Tahu landscapes. These Tāua and Poua (including my Dad) are the basis for much of what I understand and believe and have remained so for me during their lives, as was my father for me and other Kai Tahu. This has been so, for many of those who have participated in this research and others who have not been part of it directly. The knowledge has continued to be available to those of us who sought it, even though large tracts of the former lands and landscape are not. There are some who deliberately have not sought certain areas of knowledge, believing that these belong with the past. Such attitudes, from my perspective, demonstrate a lack in their total education and commitment to accepting the whole of what being part of the Kai Tahu landscape could mean for them.

For Kai Tahu, the issue of ownership is not the pre-requisite to maintaining Mana whenua status over our landscapes. However, those of us who still have whānau wakawaka, and continue to work whānau awaawa (fishing grounds) and manu, appear to have more than those whose whānau for whatever reasons, have sold or have had to sell (before their time), the places that were part of their being, their “place to stand” or turakawaewae. The term
turakawaewae is one of the terms used by T. Wesley to define his understanding of landscape (T. Wesley 1998: kōrero a waha). Some of those seemingly most disadvantaged by separation have clung to their beliefs of identity with their landscapes, while others believe it all to be a bit of old-fashioned myth. Whether this is due to pragmatism or not, only they can truly say and I have no wish to enter such an argument here. However, even those who consider some of us to be old fashioned or almost superstitious in our thinking still return to whānau, hapū and Iwi gatherings on their landscapes for a variety of reasons. These may range from pure love of place to pure love of possible payouts and almost everything in between and kei a rātou te mana rā.

From all of the discussions throughout this thesis, it is clear that landscape has been a driving force in Kai Tahu history, as well as in Tauiwi history, and in human history generally, although in many different ways. From the earliest days, now, and in the future, perceptions of landscape have played and will play a large part in motivating many of the actions of Kai Tahu, significant or otherwise. Even though the great majority of people, Māori and Tauiwi, now live in urban surroundings, and often away from their first homeplaces, the landscapes of Te Wāipounamu will continue to impact on them in ways as diverse as their original cultures.

Kai Tahu gather to discuss or make decisions concerning our landscapes, the resources on them, owning a taha Tahu. This demonstrates the degree to which we define and perceive of ourselves as part of the landscape. From the landscape is derived whakapapa and the right to be of Kai Tahu Whānui. Whakapapa is derived from the landscape and since we are people of the land or takata whenua, into and across whose landscape our tupuna transplanted their tupuna, we are of both land and landscape since we are of them and their places.

For Kai Tahu as for many others alluded to within this project, the concept of landscape also includes the domain of Takaroa, the sea. Derived from all of the above (especially whakapapa) that we have individually and collectively inherited by birth, and, the important
knowledge of all that this inheritance means or includes as handed down from our tupuna is, personal mana as well as Mana whenua. Both forms of mana are what go to make up our being Kai Tahu and it is these and other shared understandings that have seen us take the Western concept of "landscape" and redefine it for ourselves. To return one last time to Ta Tipene's article:

*The statutory provision, the protections in the planning law, the right to be consulted by Parliament, the right to fish in a given place to eat titi in season and the recognition of Treaty rights—all those things that we ground out of the power culture in my generation. All will be residue with no meaning if we have failed to ensure (our uri) have the capacity to walk the coast and the mountains of our island, to fly over its chiefly cloak of snow and look upon our place and know and care that that is the womb from which we spring as people. That this is the source of who and what we are—Ngai Tahu (T O'Regan 1999: 15).*

Ta (Sir) Tipene ends by noting that if those who have led us have failed in their efforts to pass on such knowledge as a treasure, we will still be people and possibly even content in who we are. Even if we will have all that the nation's laws can impart to us as a legally recognised Iwi, culturally we will not have anything on which to base all this and will “not be possessed by [our] whakapapa to the” landscape in any special way, and the loss of all these taoka tukuiho means we will no longer be Kai Tahu in the sense it has been described by O'Regan and within this research (O'Regan 1999: 15). That is why it has been stated by O'Regan and others, that to not access our stories as told by us who are the landscape since we are our whakapapa, i mua, aianei a muri ake, is unthinkable. This thesis has argued that to ignore these stories and the knowledge of who we are in the landscape we have for so long, fought to retain, would be to lose the identity we have as uri of these landscapes. This thesis which has merely been written by my hand is our story told by us who are the landscape since we are our whakapapa, i mua, aianei, a muri ake.
No reira, ki a koutou i hapaitia e au i te whaikia i ēnei kōrero whakahirahira tā Kai Tahu, tēnā ano tātou. Ā, ki a Papatuānuku ki raro, ki a Rakinui ki ruka me ā kōrua tamariki katoa, ahakoa ko wai, ahakoa ko hea, ahakoa no hea ahakoa kei hea rānei, mauri ora ki a tātou.
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