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Kāi Tahu (also known as Ngāi Tahu) is the predominant Māori tribe from the South Island of New Zealand. As with Ngāpuhi in the northern North Island, Kāi Tahu, especially in the southern South Island, were pulled into the expanding maritime frontier of New South Wales in the first decade of the nineteenth century. In this chapter, we examine some of the initial travels of Kāi Tahu people to Australia, focusing on the earliest periods of encounter with Europeans and Euro-Americans—collectively known as tākata pora (ship men or boat people). We do this to explore how this travel reflected Kāi Tahu worldviews, social structures and economic priorities. Shedding light on features of Kāi Tahu epistemologies of movement, we highlight how cultures of mobility and strategic responses to the historical circumstances they were operating within shaped Kāi Tahu decisions to travel to the Australian continent. We focus on Kāi Tahu people ‘Jacky Snapper’ and Tokitoki, and their takata pora companion, James Caddell, who first ventured to Sydney in 1822 from Foveaux Strait, as well as two young men, ‘Chief Attay’ and ‘Quolla’, believed to have been taken as hostages to Sydney in 1834. These young chiefs from Ōtākou are believed to have arrived in Sydney after having been kidnapped by the Sydney owners of an Ōtākou-based whaling station after increasing tensions with local Kāi Tahu. We also outline the longer history of travel to New South

---

1 We use the spelling Kāi Tahu rather than Ngāi Tahu in accordance with the southern dialect of te reo Māori in which a k is used in place of ng.
Wales of the Kāi Tahu chief Karetai, whose travel to Australia was shaped by hostilities between Kāi Tahu and Ngāti Toa, a tribe based in the southern North Island. For these two tribes, and several others, the consequences of travel to and connection with Australia were violent conflict, shifting tribal boundaries, forced migration and population decline.

From the beginning of British colonisation in Australia to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, which signalled the formal colonisation of New Zealand, British relationships with the archipelago and with iwi (tribes, people, nations) were centred on economic relationships. Māori connections with Australian-based British colonists were founded on labour and trade, as Māori engaged with British extractive industries that looked to New Zealand resources for profit. As Standfield has noted elsewhere:

> From the outset … the New South Wales colony … sought to exploit resources from New Zealand to defray the costs of the penal settlement and contribute important commodities to the empire at the same time as they colonized Aboriginal land.²

James Belich has explained how:

> Sydney has long been one of New Zealand’s most important cities, and for a century New Zealand was one of Sydney’s most important hinterlands. Much European influence on New Zealand was strained through Sydney first. Most Europeans living in New Zealand before 1840 had done time in New South Wales; it was also the most popular overseas destination for Māori.³

New Zealand thus held significant interest for Australian Government and private commercial interests as a source of profit to support the colony. In this sense, Australian colonisation and its economic prosperity prior to the Treaty of Waitangi was engaged with Māori (and other Pacific peoples’) labour at the same time as it was dispossessing Aboriginal peoples of their lands. These varied relationships, drawn out of different aspects of Australian coloniality but all having, at their foundation, the buttressing and extension of British colonial power and presence in the region, grew out of, and in turn further extended, different forms of recognition and rights. As Mark Hickford has argued, Māori ‘propensity and capacity to
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² Standfield, Race and Identity, 5.
³ Belich, Making Peoples, 134.
engage in transactional conduct’, 4 as well as trade and labour relations, were vital aspects of this, as were European notions of Māori relations to land. As Standfield has argued elsewhere, these varied but related colonial projects in the region shaped racial discourses and created and reiterated racial hierarchies. 5 In summary, Māori labour and trade was a key plank of the British colonisation of Australia and New Zealand.

Within this broader framework of colonial history, we argue that travel and movement to Australia operated as an extension of Kāi Tahu life and culture that was deeply shaped by cycles of movement and histories of travel into and within Te Waipounamu, the South Island of New Zealand. We outline our approach to tracing Kāi Tahu travel and our methodologies in engaging with archives but aim to do more than this by bringing these into conversation with Kāi Tahu community understandings; we wish to construct a history that affirms the connections between and across generations that have journeyed across the Tasman in ‘pursuit of mana’ (power, authority, prestige). 6

This chapter comes out of a nascent research project being undertaken by Rachel Standfield from the Monash Indigenous Studies Centre and Michael Stevens from Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, the Kāi Tahu tribal council. 7 The project looks to explore long histories of travel and migration to Australia by Kāi Tahu whānau (family groups). This westward movement, which began for Kāi Tahu in the 1820s, brought diverse travellers to Kāi Tahu territory, some as sojourners and some to stay, from as early as 1810. It also meant that Kāi Tahu moved beyond their own borders, both within the New Zealand archipelago and beyond it. Within this history of Kāi Tahu mobility, Australia looms large as a destination.

Māori travel goes almost entirely unrecognised in Australian histories of early colonisation. As Cassandra Pybus in Black Founders has shown, Australian history is overwhelmingly structured by narratives of the entanglement of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, in which racial signifiers are read as ‘non-Aboriginal’/white and ‘Aboriginal’/black. 8 Pybus complicates this reading with careful historical research of the ‘black founders’ who left the United States, Britain and Europe before

4 Hickford, ‘Vague Native Rights to Land’, 177.
5 Standfield, Race and Identity.
6 Parsonson, ‘The Pursuit of Mana’.
7 Formed by private statute in 1996 to replace the Ngāi Tahu Maori Trust Board.
8 Pybus, Black Founders.
heading to Australia. She argues that silence around these stories is framed by twentieth-century histories of the operation of the ‘White Australia’ policy. It also shows the central importance of relations between Aboriginal people and British settlers at the heart of Australian colonialism. Yet, Māori presence in the Australian colonies still struggles to find a place in early colonial histories; likewise, discussions of imperial relationships with New Zealand are absent or obscured. As Grace Karskens pointed out in her significant work *The Colony*, Australian historians are still breaking out of the ‘Great Australian Silence’. She states that if readers are ‘surprised’ by the fact that half her book is devoted to the Aboriginal people of the Sydney region, and think ‘this is out of proportion. I assure you it is not: it reflects historical reality’. Historians of Australia, then, are still attempting to make the nation recognise and respect the place of Aboriginal people as active agents in Australian history.

We further argue that a history of Australian colonisation without Māori, including Kāi Tahu from the 1820s, is incomplete. Māori histories in Australia complicate the bifurcated narrative of Aboriginal and European. They demonstrate how British hunger for Aboriginal land lay at the very foundation of relationships with Aboriginal people from the initiation of European invasion. Māori and other visiting peoples to New South Wales were treated differently by colonial authorities, were courted for their resources, and were drawn into relationships with colonial authorities in Australia as workers and as owners of valuable resources. We agree with Fred Cahir and Ian Clarke who, in beginning to uncover Māori presence in Victoria, emphasise the importance of comparison in establishing assumptions about race, as eighteenth- and nineteenth-century racialised discourses used comparison between racialised ‘others’ to develop the hierarchies that underpinned colonial power relationships. As Mackay and Guinness point out in this volume, Australian historiography reflects a broader strand of Australian thought that does not easily recognise its relationship to its Pacific neighbours and role in labour relations in the region. Like Mackay and Guinness, we want to trace a long history of labour relations between peoples of the region and interrogate the ways these relations were underpinned by, and helped to create, racialised hierarchies that continue to shape the colonial present. To understand this is to further destabilise ideas about race, emphasise just how constructed

racialised thinking is, unpack the relationship between racial ideas and European desires for land or natural resources, and complicate racialised representations of labour and supposed indigenous capacity or interest in work.

We hope that our project will begin to redress this gap in the Australian scholarship while also complicating New Zealand historical scholarship of Māori travel. A number of significant Ngāpuhi leaders, their travels and their time in Australia have become well-known names and moments in New Zealand history. Thanks to the work of scholars such as Judith Binney and Anne Salmond, these travellers are relatively well-known, at least historiographically.11 Binney and Salmond’s work, which drew on narratives of specific Māori travel, have been woven more broadly into histories of early New Zealand. This reaffirms New Zealand historical scholarship’s strong focus on Māori in the north of the North Island and, specifically, Ngāpuhi experiences in New Zealand’s pre-colonial period. In so doing, it under-appreciates the experiences of other iwi.12 After the ‘firsts’ that Binney and Salmond focus on, wider Māori mobility, which took place a number of years later, tends to fade into the background. For example, initial Kāi Tahu engagements with Sydney are rarely recounted outside of the tribe itself. Instead of offering a generic history of Māori travel, in which the experiences of people from the more populous North Island, especially the Bay of Islands region, stand in for the whole of Māori experience, our project is a specifically Kāi Tahu–centred history. It traces Kāi Tahu individuals through public, private and tribal archives.

Central to this work is recognition of the place that Australia plays within Kāi Tahu experience and identities. Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu has its core focus on the tribe’s traditional heartland villages, but is also invested in Kāi Tahu households located outside its tribal catchment—in other parts of New Zealand and, increasingly, Australia. In other words, the Australian continent looms large in the Kāi Tahu past, but also the Kāi Tahu present and future. Since the 1960s, Australia has become a major destination for Māori immigration. This more recent movement is the subject of scholarly interest for the significant effect it has on Māori communities

12  See, for example, O’Malley, The Meeting Place. Quite recently, for example, Vincent O’Malley’s monograph has been published, which, despite a statement that the work will engage with the history of the South, has an overwhelming focus on the history of the North, accounting for approximately 250 pages compared to 2.5 pages. This continues a trajectory whereby the specific history of the north of the North Island comes to stand for all.
and economic life, as well on New Zealand society and economics more generally. \(^{13}\) Scholarship has examined the effect of this immigration on aspects of contemporary culture and also language. \(^{14}\)

However, this phenomenon has a long history. Indeed, Kāi Tahu kaumātua (elder) Sir Tipene O’Regan states that, for Kāi Tahu, ‘the voyage west has always been more attractive … than the journey north’. He explains:

> Since the early nineteenth century when we first learnt about muskets, potatoes and whaleboats and that fabled place Poi Hakena—Port Jackson—Ngai Tahu have been crossing the Tasman to trade, to settle and to marry. \(^{15}\)

O’Regan’s emphasis on the voyage is no accident; it reflects the centrality of the sea voyage to the identity and life of the people concerned. Kāi Tahu are, and have always been, a sea people, and it is this relationship between Kāi Tahu and the sea that has shaped engagement with Australia. \(^{16}\) While most now travel to Australia by plane, the relationship and strength of the connection continues. As O’Regan outlined 15 years ago: ‘There are now some 5,000 Ngai Tahu living in Australia from a total census population of some 30,000. The old pattern continues stronger than ever.’ \(^{17}\)

There are now almost 60,000 registered members of the Kāi Tahu iwi and 10 per cent live in Australia. However, this is a smaller proportion of registered iwi members living in Australia than for other iwi. Significant numbers of Kāi Tahu people attended Australian roadshows organised by Te Rūnanga to mark the twentieth anniversary of the tribe’s constitutional property settlement, negotiated with the New Zealand Government in 1998, and this has produced an upswing of enrolment. These points suggest that the 10 per cent figure may under-represent the actual number of Australian Kāi Tahu. Indeed, the fact that Te Rūnanga has been holding roadshows on both sides of the Tasman Sea is further evidence of the importance of Australia in Kāi Tahu life. Hence, our project is working to trace a long history and to engage with contemporary concerns vis-à-vis


\(^{15}\) O’Regan, ‘The Dimension of Kinship’, 36.

\(^{16}\) Stevens, ‘Māori History as Maritime History: A View from The Bluff’.

\(^{17}\) O’Regan, ‘The Dimension of Kinship’, 37.
the way that people in Australia identify as Kāi Tahu, how they express their Kāi Tahu identity in Australia and the important role played by Australian Kāi Tahu in being Kāi Tahu as a whole.

Kāi Tahu Mobilities, Māori Histories and Aboriginal Sovereignty

Our approach reflects a broader methodology for those who write Māori histories to engage with Māori approaches to organising the past. As Danny Keenan argues in his introduction to the edited collection Ngā Tāhuhu Kōrero—Huia Histories of Māori, there is considerable work now among Māori researchers, scholars and historians to bring the ‘silences and invisibilities’ of the Māori past to light. This involves ‘utilising differing narrative styles, shaped by a range of customary or theoretical frameworks, to unravel essential Māori stories’.

Histories that are iwi specific and explore the diversity of particular communities align with the historical narratives of Māori kin groups, who tell their stories for the purposes of their own people, as Te Maire Tau argues. Discussing Māori and specifically Kāi Tahu epistemology, Tau, a senior Kāi Tahu scholar, contemplated whether Māori historical narratives are ‘history’ in the Western sense:

The past is recalled and retained by the community because it matters to the community. The truisms of the community will remain if judged authentic by the standards of that community.

Within this style of historical narrative there is an emphasis on histories told to meet the needs of a community itself. This accepts—in fact, it assumes—that there will be more than one story; indeed, that there will be a multiplicity of perspectives. Each of these foregrounds and highlights

20 Tau, ‘Matauranga Maori as an Epistemology’, 64.
the deeds, events or places that are important to that community or particular families within it.\textsuperscript{21} Being informed by Māori historical narratives means utilising whakapapa (genealogy) as a central organising principle of Māori life, as we set out later in this chapter. We are also cognisant of the role that histories play in contemporary identity-making. Some Kāi Tahu have long family histories in Australia, but newer migrants can undertake border crossings earlier conducted by their ancestors. Our aim is to open up access to these experiences in a way that contributes to historical scholarship, but also supports Kāi Tahu people to know that their travel, or that of their ancestors, has its own specifically Kāi Tahu aspect, which is part of a wider epistemology of movement.

Kāi Tahu people who have a long history in Australia, or indeed in any place out of their tribal territory, remain Kāi Tahu. Melissa Williams, in her exploration of Tē Rarawa migration from and between Panguru and Auckland in the post–World War II period, makes this point beautifully:

\begin{quote}
The people who migrated out of Panguru did not migrate out of their whakapapa and, by extension, their connection to the whenua [land]. Tribal connections were not cut by geographical space, state policy or academic theory. You remain part of a tribal story regardless of where you live or the degree of knowledge or interaction you may have with your whanaunga [kin] and tribal homeland.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

In tracing histories of Kāi Tahu engagement with Australia, and sitting alongside histories of Aboriginal and other Pacific Islander mobilities for labour, it is important to engage with the complex place of Māori generally and Kāi Tahu specifically—as peoples neither indigenous to Australia nor, as popularly imagined, as ‘Pacific peoples’.

As mobile peoples encountering Australia and, for some people, long-term migrants making their home in Australia, Kāi Tahu are living on Aboriginal land. Although they are tāngata whenua (people of the land) in their own tribal territory, they are not this in Australia. Kāi Tahu and other Māori people’s experiences in Australia are facilitated by colonisation and dispossession, like every other person who is not Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander who lives in or visits Australia. For the authors, this creates another area of investigation, one that may or may
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not be able to be adequately answered or understood, but which remains conceptually vital: how to understand the experiences of one distinct indigenous community travelling to and living on other indigenous peoples’ land/territories. When thinking about Kāi Tahu specifically or Māori experience more generally in Australia, it is vital to examine the relationship between Māori experiences and Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander sovereignties and experiences of colonisation, and the varied imperial and colonial projects pursued by colonists in the region and their local geographical variations and how these have changed over time. Did Kāi Tahu recognise Aboriginal sovereignty when travelling to or within early colonial New South Wales? Did Kāi Tahu people who met or worked with Aboriginal people recognise them as tāngata whenua in their own territories? What sort of recognition might there have been of shared experience by indigenous peoples in the region? While archival evidence for these sorts of discussions appears slight at best, there are moments when these shared recognitions seem to have been captured in the archive. For example, in 1814, on the eve of Samuel Marsden’s trip to establish the first New Zealand mission, Judith Binney argues that Ngāpuhi chief Ruatara displayed ‘sullenness’ and ‘ambivalence’ towards the mission after being warned by a ‘gentleman’ in Sydney who:

Bid him look at the conduct of our countrymen in New South Wales, where, on their first arrival, they despoiled the inhabitants of all their possessions, and shot the greater number of them.23

On 12 February 1840, during a meeting to discuss signing the Treaty of Waitangi, Te Taonui, chief of the Ngāpuhi hapū Te Popoto, stated:

We are glad to see the Govr let him come to be a Govr to the Pakias [now rendered as Pākehā, meaning fair-skinned, or in contemporary New Zealand, a New Zealander of European descent], as for us we want no Govr, we will be our own Govr. How do the Pakias behave to the black Fellows at Port Jackson? They treat them like Dogs … We are not willing to give up our land.24

Certainly, in common with Indigenous nations in Australia, Māori generally, and Kāi Tahu in particular, have been subjected to processes of dispossession, economic marginalisation and erosion of their sovereignty. In a New Zealand context, colonial processes are ones that have worked to disconnect people from connection with other Pacific peoples. As with

Māori generally, Kāi Tahu are not viewed as ‘Pacific’ people, despite their East Polynesian origins. As such, Māori are denied the associations that entails—of movement, encounter and perceiving the sea as ‘home’. Having settled the largest landmass in Polynesia, and then having been colonised by a settler colonial state, Māori are primarily seen as land-based and land-bound. Moreover, as peoples indigenous in a settler colonial state, īwi have been positioned, and, of course, have had to position themselves, to retain or regain some rights to land. Māori are literally tāngata whenu: ‘people of the land’. Consequently, as Alice Te Punga Somerville has argued, Māori are not readily viewed as being ‘tangata o le moana (people of the ocean)’, which their origins would otherwise suggest. However, if the Māori relationship with Oceania and all the peoples who inhabit that vast space is prioritised, the racist logic of the settler colonial nation state can, to some extent, be bypassed.25

As with indigenous peoples in other settler societies, there is a general assumption in national histories that Māori were principally fixed and static: that the people were and are bound to the land. While home places are important—and tūrangawaewae (place to stand) and hau-kainga (home, home people) are key Māori concepts—the sense of fixity framed by settler culture barely aligns with how Māori communities and individuals live their everyday lives. The insights afforded by Pacific studies, and the seminal work of Pacific scholars and theorists such as Epeli Hau‘ofa, are important for interrogating these assumptions of fixity, yet they are rarely applied to New Zealand and Māori histories.26 This is despite the fact that, in terms of cultures, longer-term and contemporary patterns of migration and the creation of diasporic communities, Māori and other Pacific Islander populations have much in common. Hau‘ofa’s work places mobility at the heart of Pacific cultural and community life, speaking back to the limiting Eurocentric views of Pacific Islands as ‘tiny’ by calling for a return to embracing the Pacific as a ‘sea of islands’. Movement is not an exceptional occurrence, but an everyday outcome of culture, economics and social organisation.27 Hau‘ofa states that the “world enlargement”

26  Hau‘ofa, ‘Our Sea of Islands’, 2–16. It is not surprising that Damon Salesa is an exception to the lack of application of Pacific methodologies to New Zealand histories, as he is a scholar whose work and life crosses the boundary between Pacific and New Zealand viewpoints. His call to place New Zealand histories within the Pacific has yet to be incorporated into the general trajectory of national histories. See, for example, Salesa, ‘New Zealand’s Pacific’, 149–72. See also Stevens, ‘A Defining Characteristic of the Southern People’.
27  Hau‘ofa, ‘Our Sea of Islands’.
carried out by tens of thousands of ordinary Pacific Islanders, which is an amplification of traditional patterns, makes ‘nonsense of all national and economic boundaries’. In drawing attention to the effect of these traditional patterns and specific meanings shaping Kāi Tahu travel, we agree with Ruth Faleolo’s arguments in her chapter in this volume that Pasifika mobility for labour is shaped by specifically Pacific cultural and social concepts, and that these concepts shape and support mobility even in precarious situations. Since 2001, New Zealand citizens, while they continue to have unrestricted access to travel and life in Australia, must apply for, and meet, the requirements for permanent residency if they wish to access social welfare provisions, including social welfare payments and support with tertiary fees (see Faleolo’s chapter in this volume for details of the treatment of New Zealand citizens migrating to Australia). Māori continue to travel to Australia despite this vulnerability and precarity. This migration to Australia, as Stevens’ previous work shows, is shaped by the position of Māori generally and Kāi Tahu specifically in relation to the New Zealand settler colonial state. Kāi Tahu and members of other iwi travel for labour in ways that are fundamentally shaped by their position as indigenous people in New Zealand, including long histories of dispossession from their tribal territories and racialised marginalisation within the New Zealand’s labour market.29

Economics and Mobility in Epistemology

Our research is not simply designed to uncover Kāi Tahu experience for its own sake but is informed by the specific epistemological, ontological and, indeed, axiological basis for Kāi Tahu identity in which mobility is central to life. Movement is often critical to resource exploitation and mobility was intrinsic to Kāi Tahu economic life and, within this, to labour histories. Living in an environment too cold for kumara cultivation south of Kaiapoi, mobility was (and is) central to economic life for Kāi Tahu; which is to say that much of Kāi Tahu territory was traditionally used in an exclusively hunter-gatherer way. Kāi Tahu are also primarily coastal people and have long used the sea as a vital mode of travel. Kāi Tahu movement thus occurred—and still occurs—over both relatively short and long distances, and in land- and sea-based contexts. While occupying

29 Husband, ‘Brian Easton’.
a ‘huge territory’, Kāi Tahu ‘settlements were mainly concentrated along the east coast’. Resource rights were ‘exploited largely through continual mobility. People travelled constantly, accessing widely scattered resources and attending to the complex requirements of marriage, social networks and tribal politics’. The longest seasonal migration for many people was travel for the annual tītī or mutton-bird harvest in autumn, conducted on the islands of the Foveaux Strait, which for Kāi Tahu from Kaikōura, meant a round trip of 1,500 kilometres by sea. Resources also travelled constantly, and trade over time and place was central to Māori life. Two of the most important resources in the entire New Zealand archipelago were Kāi Tahu–owned: pounamu (nephrite jade) and preserved tītī (juvenile sooty shearwaters/muttonbirds). Tribal communities were connected throughout the islands of New Zealand to trade for these commodities and still very much are.

Movement is central to Māori histories of first discovery of Aotearoa and Te Wāipounamu through the waka (canoe) traditions by which all iwi trace their migration to those islands from Hawaiiki. Migration is also central to the particular Kāi Tahu experience of successive waves of southern migration and adaptation to cooler Te Wāipounamu. Strategies for managing the tākata pora who came to Kāi Tahu shores in the early nineteenth century, and subsequent travel of Kāi Tahu people to Australia, were thus arguably extensions of ways that Kāi Tahu communities had been formed in earlier generations. Stevens sums up the histories of the three peoples who came together to form Kāi Tahu:

Ngāi Tahu whānui is the collective of individuals who descend from Waitaha, Ngāti Māmoe and Ngāi Tahu. These three tribal ascriptions broadly represent the successive groups of people who migrated to Te Wāipounamu and became genealogically and politically interwoven.

Waitaha is used as a collective label for all pre-Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Māmoe tribes, as well as more specifically for the descendants of Rākaihautū. Waitaha are said to have arrived in Te Wāipounamu on the waka Uruao. Waitaha whakapapa, place names and creation stories are still with us.

30  Anderson, ‘Introduction 2: A Migration History’, 34–35. Stevens’ work on the tītī harvest is important for understanding the phenomenon, and derives from his lived experience of tītī harvesting, a form of work that is central to Kai Tahu experience and life.
31  Taonui, ‘Ngā Waeae Tāpu’.
The community that is now known as Kāi Tahu had long histories of movement, migration and the subsequent drawing together of communities. Kāti Māmoe and Kāi Tahu travelled south from their territories in the North Island, using ‘warfare, diplomacy and marriage’ to establish themselves in the South Island. Kāti Māmoe undertook the initial wave of migration from the North Island being ‘closely succeeded’ by Kāi Tahu groups, repeating the pattern as they moved further south within the South Island. The nature of this migration, and the combining of the communities means that the Waitaha whakapapa continues in the South Island. Thus Tē Maire Tau describes how Kāi Tahu whānau at Temuka and Moeraki are ‘strongholds of Waitaha whakapapa’. The migration process, then, is not a straightforward one of transplanting or replacing an original group of people but one of warfare combined with alliances and strategic marriage, in which hostility coexists with connection in the formation of new communities.

These marriages allow the joining together of whakapapa from different groups to increase mana and cement relationships between new groups and property rights. As Tau outlines:

> For Māori, the preferred custom in claiming land was always through descent lines from the original occupants. Consequently, even though subsequent tribes would base their claim on conquest, the leading chiefs always married into the earlier tribes so that their descendants could claim descent from them as well.

Tau provides a Waitaha/Ngāi Tahu whakapapa, which is:

> Important because it illustrates the preference for claiming a right to land in the South Island through ancestral links that could be traced to Waitaha. Among the conquering tribes that followed, the leading chiefs always took wives who could claim Waitaha ancestry.

---

33 Stevens, ‘Ngāi Tahu Whānui’, 12.
34 Tau and Anderson, Ngai Tahu: A Migration History, 45.
Marriage and diplomacy are deliberately used to combine peoples and, at key moments, to bring about an end of hostilities and cement a lasting peace. As tensions between Kāti Māmoe and Kāi Tahu continued into the late eighteenth century, ‘key figures brokered a peace agreement and a series of high-ranking marriages’.

Atholl Anderson, a pre-eminent archaeologist and demographer of Māori, himself Kāi Tahu, suggests that these waves of migration from the North Island may have occurred more recently than is generally understood. Anderson’s analysis suggests that ‘the entire migration sequence’ culminating in the truce between Kāti Māmoe and Kāi Tahu in about 1790 may have occurred within ‘two adult lifetimes’ or, depending on the overlapping of generations of people, ‘might even have been slightly shorter than that’. While this view is not uncontested, it nonetheless has, in Anderson’s words, ‘important historical implications’ for documented Kāi Tahu histories shared with Pākehā historians in the nineteenth century. In exploring Kāi Tahu engagement with Australia, it is possible that Kāi Tahu people who made the first journeys across the Tasman Sea may have been the immediate descendants of those who settled in the lower South Island.

To understand Kāi Tahu (and, more generally, Māori) motivations for travel and for crossing the sea to Australia, one needs to understand the notion and operation of mana as a driving force within Māori culture, and the ways that this is connected to both mobility and economics. When Europeans began to arrive on the northern shores of the North Island and southern shores of the South Island, especially from the early 1820s, the tāngata whenua/moana in each region were presented with an opportunity to pursue mana, at both individual and community levels. The ‘pursuit of mana’ is central to Māori life and leadership, and an important aspect of this was achieved through economic life—the ability to provide for the community as a whole and to demonstrate the affluence of the community through the provision of food as gifts and during feasts. Indeed, in setting out the requirements of Māori leaders, the Ngāti Rangiwewehi leader and scholar Te Rangikaihikaheke—who is particularly known for teaching Māori culture to New Zealand Governor Sir George Grey in the late 1840s and 1850s—emphasised skill...
in warfare, economic security and hospitality.\textsuperscript{40} In 1850, Te Rangikaheke wrote ‘Te Tikanga o Tenei Mea te Rangatiratanga o te Tangata Maori’ (‘The Principles of Chieftainship of Maori Society’) to educate Grey.\textsuperscript{41} This document set out the ‘eight talents or pumanawa’, and emphasised the twin requirements of prowess in war and the ability to procure food for the community as central to Māori leaders, as well as three talents that encompass hospitality to visitors: ‘restraining the departure of visiting parties’, the ability to ‘welcome guests’ and ‘looking after visitors small or large’.\textsuperscript{42} Raymond Firth, in his classic work of Māori anthropology, noted that leaders and ‘people of no particular rank’ all worked.\textsuperscript{43} Firth described how ‘work had a distinct social value’ and ‘was regarded as honourable’:

> Even a chief lost no prestige by carrying on such a manual task as the hewing-out of a canoe … [or] working side by side with his people in the cultivations, and took a prominent part in the labours of fishing or the snaring of birds. Competent participation in economic pursuits was in fact a distinct asset in increasing his influence and authority with his people.\textsuperscript{44}

It is no surprise then that \textit{manaaki} (support, hospitality), mobility, migration and offers of labour characterise the ways that Kāi Tahu leaders systematically engaged with \textit{tākata pora}.\textsuperscript{45} To be clear, the \textit{rakatira} described in our examples below were not simply travelling for the sake of travel. They were using mobility, the labour of their communities, and tribal resources and trade goods, to shape kin wealth, bolster personal \textit{mana} and consolidate Kāi Tahu power in relation to other tribal communities. Honekai is believed to be the chief who moved his people to Ruapuke Island in the far south of Tē Waipounamu by 1820 to connect with ‘sealers and sailors from all corners of the world’, the majority coming from Sydney or Hobart. Honekai’s son, Te Whakataupuka:

> Extended his father’s work by enabling sealers and Ngāi Tahu women to establish a community at Whenua Hou, an island west of Rakiura. Many present-day Ngāi Tahu people descend from at least one of [these unions].\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{40} Curnow, ‘Te Rangikaheke, Wiremu Maihi’.  
\textsuperscript{41} Mead et al., \textit{Maori Leadership in Governance}, 7.  
\textsuperscript{42} Mead et al., \textit{Maori Leadership in Governance}, 8.  
\textsuperscript{43} Firth, \textit{Economics of the New Zealand Maori}, 177.  
\textsuperscript{44} Firth, \textit{Economics of the New Zealand Maori}, 176.  
\textsuperscript{45} Stevens, ‘Ngāi Tahu Whānui’, 13.  
\textsuperscript{46} Stevens, ‘Ngāi Tahu Whānui’, 13.
Thus, intermarriage has been a key aspect of the Kāi Tahu experience of engaging with newcomers, and has created *whānau* that were, over the longer period of Australian and New Zealand imperial and colonial histories, very likely to have connections with Australia. The Kāi Tahu practice of strategic intermarriage with Europeans to formalise, through kinship, the sharing of experiences and resources, meant that communities of mixed-descent peoples were, and are, central to Kāi Tahu *whakapapa*. As O’Regan explains:

> It was from Sydney and Hobart that many of our first Pakeha came as whalers, sealers and traders—our first agents of globalisation. Particularly in the far south—my mother’s home—many of our Ngai Tahu families root back to that early contact period with Australia.⁴⁷

Stevens also outlines how this intermarriage influences the shape of the contemporary Kāi Tahu community:

> These interracial unions, which were a feature of whaling stations throughout southern New Zealand, led to the surnames of Pākehā whalers becoming identifiably Kāi Tahu names and many of them now function like hapū names. I refer here to names like Stirling, Spencer, Anglem, Palmer, Brown, Bragg, Newton, Joss, Haberfield, Acker, Wixon, Ashwell, Gilroy, Goomes, Ryan, Howell, Bates and Wybrow, which sit alongside tūturu names like Topi, Whaitiri, Kareatai, Taiaora, Te Au, Kini and Te Koeti.⁴⁸

The role of intermarriage and the place it plays in engagement with Australia is exemplified by an early example of Kāi Tahu travel to Australia, that of Tokitoki to Sydney, who accompanied her ‘Pākehā-Māori’ partner, James Caddell. In late 1822, the New South Wales Government contracted Captain Edwardson to take the *Snapper*, a 29-ton colonial sloop, to southern New Zealand and secure samples of dressed harakeke (New Zealand ‘flax’) or ‘hemp’ and gather information about it.⁴⁹ Arriving in the far south of New Zealand, Edwardson managed to get 300 pounds of this product and also ‘shipped a large quantity of potatoes for Sydney’, all produced by Kāi Tahu. He also visited Awarua/Bluff where he met with the chief Te Wera. As a result of their cordial meeting, Edwardson took one of the chief’s ‘relatives’ back to Port Jackson. It is likely that this person, referred to as ‘Jacky Snapper’, was Tūhawaiki—the

---

⁴⁷ O’Regan, ‘The Dimension of Kinship’, 36.
⁴⁸ Stevens, ‘Māori History as Maritime History’.
pre-eminent Kāi Tahu rakatira from the mid-1830s until his untimely drowning in 1844.\textsuperscript{50} The Snapper also carried Caddell and his Kāi Tahu wife Tokitoki on board. The vessel arrived in Sydney on 28 March 1823 after five months absence. The Sydney Gazette reported that it brought ‘about a ton of prepared flax from New Zealand, which is supposed to surpass any in the known world, for its amazing strength’.\textsuperscript{51} Of more interest, though, were its passengers: ‘Jacky Snapper’, Tokitoki and her husband, James Caddell. The party were described as ‘two chiefs, one of whom is accompanied by his wife’; the chiefs were said to be aged about 16 and 30. James Cadell, ‘an Englishman by birth’, had been living with southern Kāi Tahu for about a decade, after violence between the crew of his sealing vessel and Kāi Tahu left his crewmates dead. Having been ‘allied’ to a chief’s daughter, Tokitoki, whose brother was also a chief, for nine years, Caddell was described as ‘a prince of no small influence’.\textsuperscript{52} Tokitoki was also an important visitor in her own right, not only because of her social status but also for her knowledge of flax preparation, the vital commodity that had initiated the journey in the first place.\textsuperscript{53} This was not the end of the association that these three Kāi Tahu people had with Australia. Kāi Tahu narratives assert that Tokitoki returned to Australia with Caddell and her brother. The ethnographer, Herries Beattie, who collected a rich archive of oral history from Kāi Tahu in the late nineteenth century, was told that Tokitoki ‘married Jimmy, and went over to Sydney with her husband. Te Pahi [i.e. her brother Te Pai or Te Pae] went over later, and both died in Parramatta, and thus ended that branch’.\textsuperscript{54} Caddell appears to have travelled between Sydney and Foveaux Strait a number of times, making a subsequent trip with a group of Kāi Tahu, mostly women, to demonstrate flax dressing. Caddell returns to the archival record when interviewed by the first New Zealand Company agricultural superintendent in 1826, after which he ‘fades from view’.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{50} Boultbee, Journal of a Rambler, 78–79.
\textsuperscript{51} ‘Ship News’, The Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser, 3 April 1823, 2(b).
\textsuperscript{52} McNab, Murihiku, 316.
\textsuperscript{53} The first Māori captured by Australian colonists, Tūki and Huru, had been kidnapped from the north of the North Island in 1793 for their assumed knowledge of flax preparation. When taken to Norfolk Island to teach convicts to dress flax, they declared they could not assist as flax preparation was women’s work. See Binney, ‘Tūki’s Universe’, 215–32; Standfield, Race and Identity.
\textsuperscript{54} Beattie, ‘Traditions and Legends Collected from the Natives of Murihiku’, 158–59. O’Regan describes Beattie’s ‘extraordinary industry’ in collecting Kai Tahu narratives as ‘one of our great taoka, one of our great treasures’. O’Regan, New Myths and Old Politics, 25.
Perhaps Caddell, Tokitoki and Te Pai went back to Sydney sometime after 1826 and never returned, which would explain the information provided to Beattie by later Kāi Tahu narrators.

If Jacky Snapper was Tūhawaiki, then he also continued to have a close association with Australia, making ‘several trips to Sydney from the 1820s’. For Tūhawaiki, this was a logical extension of his maritime life in which he:

Led armed flotilla against Ngāti Toa in the 1830s, signed a copy of the Treaty of Waitangi on board HMS Herald at Ruapuke in June 1840 and used his own vessel, the Perseverance, to ferry Bishop George Selwyn around southern New Zealand in 1843.56

Mobility, sea travel and leadership were deeply connected in his life, in the defence of the iwi, in his actions to sign the treaty and in his travel to Australia. For Tūhawaiki and other Kāi Tahu leaders, extending their maritime lives helped them to secure a much sought-after new commodity: muskets. The desire for muskets, indeed the need for muskets, was an important driver of mobility and labour to ensure the survival of the various hapū that, at this time, were consolidating into the iwi of Kāi Tahu. The introduction of muskets through engagement with Europeans and travel to Australia and further afield is central to general Māori experience in this period of history. Ngāpuhi, through their engagement and trade with European missionaries, and their desire to seek revenge for previous tensions between and within communities, began a series of battles with neighbouring peoples.57 The resulting wars began a chain of dislocation that resulted in people throughout New Zealand being moved and displaced. This conflict also rewrote several tribal boundaries. There was an intensification of ‘warfare-induced mobility’ throughout the country as muskets were introduced and began to be deliberately sought out.58 Manahuría Barcham has concluded that:

The period of the early nineteenth century was … characterized by extremely high levels of mobility for Māori as large numbers of people were displaced as they attempted to escape the various conflicts that raged over the country during this period.59
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56 Stevens, ‘Māori History as Maritime History’. See also Anderson, ‘Tūhawaiki, Hone’.
59 Barcham ‘The Politics of Māori Mobility’, 163–64.
Ngāti Toa _rakatira_ under Te Rauparaha, themselves pushed off tribal land in the Kawhia region, launched musket attacks into the south from their new Kapiti Island base from 1828–29. Ngāti Toa’s ‘first mover advantage’ in terms of muskets had serious consequences for Kāi Tahu. Ngāti Toa travelling to Australia and arming themselves with muskets for their southern raids seriously threatened the survival of Kāi Tahu, and shaped the trajectory of its history in the lead-up to large-scale European settlement. Ngāti Toa could only be held off if Kāi Tahu also acquired muskets and more boats. Hence, Kāi Tahu leaders engaged, we surmise, in more travel to Australia, and chose greater entanglement with Europeans visiting and staying on Kāi Tahu land, for trade to acquire muskets and other objects that would secure their position against Ngāti Toa.

Kāi Tahu were thus attempting to take control of journeying, and their economic relationship with early colonial Australia, to secure the future of the tribe. An example of this might be seen in the activities undertaken by Karetai, a senior Ōtākou _rakatira_, whose life and chieftainship coincide with the first arrivals of _tākata pora_. The nature of his interaction shows the continuation of Kāi Tahu cultures of mobility, the centrality of economics and work for chiefs intent on maintaining their _mana_. Harry Evison’s biography of Karetai pays respect to Karetai as a leader and his decision to negotiate the new influences he confronted, including his ‘astute’ dealings with Europeans. Evison notes that large boats or sealing boats were an ‘integral part’ of the land deals Karetai conducted with Europeans, ‘as they were popular with Ngāi Tahu who wished to continue coastal trade’.60 Large boats were also becoming vital to warfare with other _iwi_, and ‘Karetai commanded four of the twenty boats in the final expedition of Tūhawaiki against Te Rauparaha’.61 Boats, highly prized when Kāi Tahu engaged with Europeans, met multiple needs of the community: to confront and engage with Ngāti Toa, to engage with Europeans and to secure food for the community. Anderson has described how, in the immediate pre-treaty period, the importance of the sea for Kāi Tahu travel seemed to intensify. New boat technologies meant that, by the 1840s, ‘parts of the main east coast trail were overgrown’ as sea travel dominated Kāi Tahu movement.62 The desire for sealing boats may show an intensification of maritime lifeways as well as the association of sea travel with the _mana_ of chiefs. Sealing boats, like muskets, had vital

61 Evison, ‘Karetai’, 100.
practical purposes in terms of warfare and food procurement, which, as noted previously, was an important basis of chiefly mana. For a leader to secure and command large boats was a visible symbol of mana and, in this respect, continued the deep association between Kāi Tahu leaders and canoes, in which a canoe would be cut and placed upright in the ground as a memorial marking where a rakatira was buried. This made boats significant and highly desired objects, important for travel, warfare, economic pursuits and as symbols of the wealth of the community.

However, this is not to suggest that Kāi Tahu were always mobile of their own volition or able to entirely control the terms of trade with Europeans. We have recently uncovered copies of images of two young Kāi Tahu chiefs, one of whom may be Karetai, in the Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales. These young people were drawn by the Sydney-based, ex-convict artist Charles Rodius, and included in an album among images of Aboriginal chiefs of the Sydney region. It is possible that they are young men from Ōtākou who arrived in Sydney after seemingly having been kidnapped by Captain Anglem of the Lucy Ann. Captain Anglem gave his version of events to the Sydney Herald, describing how ‘a very large body of natives, about five hundred’ had arrived from Cloudy Bay where they had been engaged in battles with Ngāti Toa:

They treated the residents with much insolence, and struck Mr. Weller repeatedly, and assaulted Captain Hayward, and most of the gentlemen there. They took the pipes out of the mouths of the servants, and went into the houses and broke open the boxes, taking whatever they thought proper from them.
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63 Peter Entwisle suggests that one of the men kidnapped was Karetai. He bases this conclusion on a letter that George Weller penned to his brother the following year. Entwisle, Behold the Moon, footnote 480. However, Harry Evison in Tāngata Ngāi Tahu identifies that Karetai had been invited to Sydney to stay with Samuel Marsden and was given Christian instruction. Evison, ‘Karetai’, 99. Certainly Karetai was being detained in Sydney at this time, see Church, Gaining a Foothold, 200.

64 Rodius, [Copies of Charcoal Drawings of NSW Aborigines]. Image 17 is described in the catalogue as ‘[?] Chief of Otargo New Zealand by Chs Rodius 12 Decem 1834 Sydney’ (the name of the person is unable to be deciphered) and Number 18 is ‘qualla from Otargo’. The Mitchell Library holds copies of the original album, which is held at the British Library.

65 Just weeks after we uncovered these images, the Hocken Library in Dunedin purchased another image, this one marked more clearly ‘Chief Attay’ on the drawing, which is another version of Image 17, Roduis, [Copies of Charcoal Drawings of NSW Aborigines]. The Hocken image is dated a few months later and is also drawn by Charles Rodius. The subjects and pose of the portraits are the same, suggesting that Rodius may have made another version of his first portrait. It may well be that the young man identified as ‘Chief Attay’ is Karetai.

66 ‘Ship News’, The Sydney Herald, 18 August 1834, 3. Frequently spelt ‘Anglim’ in archival sources. However, its current form within the iwi, and also in placenames, is ‘Anglem’. For example, Mount Anglem/Hananui the tallest mountain on Rakiura.
When the child of a chief died ‘which, under some superstitious impression, they attributed to the visit of the *Lucy Ann*’, the Kāi Tahu group decided to take the boat and, Anglem stated, kill all the Europeans. Alerted to the plan ‘by one of the native boys’, Anglem prepared the ship for ‘defence’. The group realised they would not be able to take the ship, Anglem wrote, and when he ‘persuaded’ two *rakatira* to come on board, he ‘set sail for Sydney in the most secret manner, and kept the natives as hostages for the good conduct of their tribe during the absence of the *Lucy Ann*’. Rodius’s images of the (possibly kidnapped) men highlight the ways that violence, coercion and the increasing European desire for control over resources and, soon to be, territory in southern New Zealand, was beginning to affect Kāi Tahu communities.

In this early period, Kāi Tahu labour at home was also increasingly connected to European Australia. Kāi Tahu women and men laboured to supply visiting ships with potatoes and flax, and, later, seal skins and whale bone, and their labour connected them to shipping and trade interests in Australia and the wider world. This labour was part of a regional imperialism and colonialism that drew Māori into trading relationships with Europeans who were working to consolidate and expand their colonisation of Aboriginal lands in Australia and to secure Aboriginal dispossession. Kāi Tahu people also joined sealing crews, whaling stations and whaling ships, labouring in maritime environments as their families had before them and would after; many Kāi Tahu continue such practices through deep-sea fishing and oil and gas exploration. These processes also brought Kāi Tahu, and Māori more generally, into connection with Aboriginal people, including Aboriginal people who travelled to southern New Zealand. The most well-known of these is Tommy Chaseland, whose parents were an Aboriginal woman from the Hawkesbury and a European convict. Chaseland became a sailor from 1817, working with people from many different ethnic backgrounds including Pacific and Māori people. Later, as a sealer, he travelled to Tonga and New Caledonia before settling in the southern South Island from 1824. He went on to become a central figure in southern Kāi Tahu life as a whaler of renown and a husband of Puna, a Kāi Tahu woman of chiefly status, until his death in 1869.

68 See, for example, Mike Stevens’ discussion of his family’s relationship to the maritime environment and labour in maritime industries: Stevens, ‘Māori History as Maritime History’.
69 His name is also rendered as Chasling and Chasland.
70 Russell, “‘A New Holland Half-Caste’”, 08.1–08.15.
As Kāi Tahu engaged more with Europeans and their labour turned increasingly to maritime or at least coastal pursuits, people began to live more permanently in coastal settlements, facing the sea both literally and in terms of identities and perspective on the world. As colonisation progressed and wholesale dispossession began for Kāi Tahu, communities clung to coastal settlements, which are the contemporary tribe’s heartland villages and the basis of its governance structures.71

Archives and Methodologies

The nature of Kāi Tahu interaction with Australia was somewhat different in form to the earliest Māori travel to Australia, and this has shaped the way it is imprinted in the archival record. As foreshadowed earlier, the first Māori travellers to Australia—those people whose stories are more often recognised (at least in New Zealand historiography)—hailed from the northern North Island, and their travel sparked intense interest from Australian colonial authorities as well as missionaries. This travel consolidated both trading and missionary interest in this region, and initiated relationships with mission and evangelical figures, of which significant archival records remain.72 Thus, it is relatively easy to access descriptions of travel and the meanings attributed to it by Europeans, though these do not necessarily reflect the motivations of the travellers themselves.

Early Kāi Tahu travel, which began a little later, but was also closely connected to commercial interests and labour, has not been captured in the archival record in the same way or to the same extent as the ‘archetypal’ early travels most often referred to in academic histories. By the time Kāi Tahu were venturing to Port Jackson, Māori were relatively well-known in the developing colonial town. Kāi Tahu travelled with Europeans who were less likely to leave detailed written records, such as ships’ captains, sealers and whalers. Hence, their stories are not captured to the same extent as other travellers who journeyed with missionaries or encountered

72  See, for example, Jones and Jenkins, He Kōrero; Salmond, Between Worlds; O’Malley, The Meeting Place.
colonial authorities. Stevens has described his ‘tākata-pora forebears … like their Kāi Tahu wives … [as] little more than ghosts in the colonial archive’. Our nascent project thus also takes seriously the call issued by Robert Warrior for indigenous studies to engage with theories of the subaltern, ‘because there’s just so much subalternity in the Native world that needs somehow to be addressed’.

This creates a particular style of methodology for us. Uncovering Kāi Tahu experience in the archives effectively needs to be a whakapapa-based project. Individuals must be traced, if they can be traced at all, through their names and knowledge of their connection to their kin and communities. In doing this, we are using the process that Te Rūnanga employs as part of its everyday work to connect Australian Kāi Tahu back to their communities in Te Waipounamu. These people may have been disconnected from their families and whakapapa for entire lifetimes, even multiple generations. We hope we can support this work by offering insights from our archival work.

This methodology is not simply expedient. It is also of real importance for writing histories that are meaningful to Māori communities and respectful of Māori forms of history. As O’Regan writes, whakapapa is central to Māori history-making:

> Whakapapa can be stated to demonstrate a direct line of descent from an ancestor … [and also illustrate] the network of lateral relationships involved … an understanding of whakapapa can illuminate, or become, the vehicle of history. It is the relationships between people and the way in which the whakapapa links them and stores that information that is the critical element in the study of traditional history. The point is that in Māori tradition one requires the skeletal framework of whakapapa to authenticate the historical tradition.

In the documentation of Tokitoki, James Caddell and Jacky Snapper provided in *The Sydney Gazette*, it is the story of the tākata pora man that dominates the newspaper account. However, with Kāi Tahu whakapapa
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73 See, for example, the type of information included in ‘Ship News’, *The Sydney Gazette*, 21 August 1823, 2, on the return of the ship Mermaid from southern New Zealand: ‘Friday last returned from a three months’ cruise to New Zealand, His Majesty’s cutter Mermaid, Mr. Wm. Kent commander. Four of the natives are visitors by this trip.’
74 Stevens, ‘‘The Ocean is Our Only Highway’’, 157.
75 Warrior, ‘The Subaltern Can Dance’, 90.
76 O’Regan, *New Myths and Old Politics*, 24.
and narratives, it is women like Tokitoki and the other Kāi Tahu women who married sealers, and later whalers, who are central. The relationships between these Kāi Tahu women and tākata pora men often drew those men into broader Kāi Tahu social formations allowing children to maintain Kāi Tahu culture and lifeways. While Tokitoki may hardly figure in the archival sources that historians rely on, she has a prominent place in the tribe’s genealogical tapestry. Other Kāi Tahu women like her, especially those with descendants, are deeply respected and remembered with love for their role in creating the Kāi Tahu community as it is today. For example, on Te Rau Aroha Marae in Bluff, striking carvings of the ancestors adorn the marae and watch over the people. These display large depictions of women proudly in the foreground, with much smaller figures of the sealing and whaling tākata pora men sitting behind, flanking and supporting the women.

Kāi Tahu perspectives such as these complicate and should cause us to interrogate the nature of our archival sources, in which the ‘European’ man (although it is debatable whether James Caddell was culturally European or Kāi Tahu at this point in his life) is almost always accorded the central role within the archival depiction. By contrast, indigenous people play only minor roles in the European documentary evidence; Jacky Snapper and Tokitoki are represented as simply ‘accompanying’ Caddell. If we are to recognise Kāi Tahu whakapapa and narrative, it is the mobility of all members of the travelling group—Cadell, Tokitoki and Jacky Snapper together—that should be traced in the archive, no matter how small or subtle the fragments that remain.

At the symposium on which this edited collection is based, Tracey Banivanua Mar offered an important methodological strategy for recognising and respecting subaltern subjects barely noticed in archives. She suggested that, while the voices of Indigenous Australian or Pacific Islander people, including Māori, tend not to be recorded in written documents, their actions often are recorded. Thus, it is important that we recognise Kāi Tahu ancestors, by birth or through marriage, in the archive wherever we can find them. We can highlight their actions and try to fill in their stories, and attempt to explain their lives within the context of the historical circumstances they faced and within the framework of their own epistemologies. We can think through the importance of their stories for their descendants, and the ways that their actions reverberate through the actions of Kāi Tahu people who walk in their footsteps in the present-day.
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