

# **Tourism and Maori Development in Westland**

**Frانيا Kanara Zygadlo**

(Ngati Porou)

Research Assistant

Centre for Maori and Indigenous Planning and Development,  
Environmental Management and Design Division, Lincoln University

**Hirini Paerangi Matunga**

(Ngai Tahu, Ngati Porou Ngati Kahungunu)

Associate Professor,

Centre for Maori and Indigenous Planning and Development,  
Environmental Management and Design Division, Lincoln University  
matungah@lincoln.ac.nz

**David G Simmons**

Professor of Tourism,

Human Sciences Division, Lincoln University

dsimmons@lincoln.ac.nz

**John R Fairweather**

Principal Research Officer in the Agribusiness and Economics

Research Unit, Lincoln University

fairweat@lincoln.ac.nz

**July 2001**

**ISSN 1175-5385**

**Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC)**

**Report No. 25**

**Lincoln University**



# Contents

CONTENTS.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
MAORI GLOSSARY.....	vii
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Research Aims and Objectives.....	1
1.2 Kaupapa Maori Research Approach.....	1
1.3 Definition of ‘Maori tourism’ and ‘Maori participation in tourism’.....	4
1.4 Study Area.....	4
1.5 Assumption and Limitation.....	4
1.6 Chapter Outlines.....	4
CHAPTER 2 MAORI AND TOURISM – A THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDING.....	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Historical Outline of Maori Identity in Tourism.....	7
2.3 Contemporary Analysis of Maori Culture and Tourism.....	9
2.4 Summary.....	11
CHAPTER 3 BACKGROUND TO THE WESTLAND AREA.....	13
3.1 Introduction.....	13
3.2 A History of Westland.....	13
3.3 Population and Employment.....	14
3.4 Physical Description.....	14
3.5 Management of the Tourism Industry in New Zealand and Maori Representation.....	15
3.6 Historical Account and Current State of Maori Participation in Tourism in Westland.....	16
3.7 Current Use of Maori Culture as a Tourist Attraction.....	17
3.8 Summary.....	18
CHAPTER 4 MAORI TOURISM FOR WESTLAND - MAORI PREFERENCES FOR FUTURE MAORI TOURISM DEVELOPMENT.....	19
4.1 Introduction.....	19
4.2 Maori Perceptions of Tourism.....	19
4.3 Tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland.....	20
4.4 Summary.....	23

CHAPTER 5	TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY MAORI IN WESTLAND .....	25
5.1	Introduction .....	25
5.2	Barriers to Developing Maori Tourism .....	25
5.3	Inappropriate Use of Maori Culture in Pakeha Tourism and Maori Control of Authenticity.....	30
5.4	Lack of an Effective Partnership in the Management of the Natural Environment .....	33
5.5	Summary.....	34
CHAPTER 6	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	37
6.1	Introduction .....	37
6.2	Overall Summary.....	37
6.3	Recommendations .....	39
REFERENCES	.....	42
APPENDIX 1	.....	47

## **Acknowledgements**

This research was funded by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology; Tourism Strategic Portfolio Output. This report forms part of a series of eight constituent reports on Tourism in Westland, which in turn is one of four case studies in the programme 'Improved Management of Tourist Flows and Effects' (Contracts: LIN 504, LIN 602, LIN X0004).

Ethical approval for the overall research programme was provided under Lincoln University Human Research Subjects Ethics Committee's ethical approval (Ref: HSEC 97/21) and verified for this case study.

Kia ora koutou katoa, we wish to thank all who participated in the production of this report. Special thanks to Ray Kingi and Brenda Kingi for your support, particularly during the initial stages of the project, identifying contacts, overseeing distribution and collection of relevant information, setting up interviews and meetings both with the Maori community and others with an interest in Maori tourism. Your support was invaluable. Thanks also to all of the 'research whanau of interest' who kindly participated in the project and agreed to be interviewed. Particular thanks go to Jimmy Russell, Paul Wilson, Helen Rasmussen, Bevan Climo and Bill Doland for your invaluable insights into tourism development and the potential for Maori tourism development on the Coast. Nga mihi nui kia koutou.

Finally, we acknowledge the considerable typing and formatting efforts of Michelle Collings, the TRREC Project Administrator.



## Maori Glossary

Most of the meanings of these Maori words/terms have been derived from the Maori glossary of “Kaitiakitanga and Local Government: Tangata Whenua participation in Environmental Management”, (PCE, 1998, p.132) and from “The Reed Dictionary of Modern Maori” (Ryan, 2001).

<b>Aotearoa</b>	New Zealand
<b>hapu</b>	sub-tribe
<b>hui</b>	meeting, gather
<b>iwi</b>	tribal groups
<b>kai</b>	food
<b>kaitiaki</b>	iwi, hapu or whanau group with the responsibilities of kaitiakitanga
<b>kaitiakitanga</b>	the responsibilities and kaupapa, passed down from ancestors, for tangata whenua to take care of the places, natural resources and other taonga in their area
<b>kaumatua</b>	elder
<b>kaupapa</b>	plan, strategy, tactics, methods, fundamental principles
<b>mahinga kai</b>	places where food and other resources are traditionally gathered
<b>mana</b>	respect, dignity, status, influence, power
<b>mana whenua</b>	traditional status, rights and responsibilities of hapu as residents in their area
<b>manaakitanga</b>	respect given to visitors, sharing and caring
<b>manuhiri</b>	visitors
<b>marae</b>	local community and its meeting places and buildings
<b>matawaka</b>	Maori residing outside tribal area
<b>matauranga</b>	information, knowledge
<b>ngahere</b>	forest
<b>pakeha</b>	non Maori New Zealanders – most generally referring to European New Zealanders
<b>paptipu runanga</b>	Ngai Tahu regional collective bodies
<b>pounamu</b>	greenstone
<b>rohe</b>	territory, area
<b>rongoa</b>	medicine, healing drug
<b>runanga</b>	committee of senior decision-makers of an iwi or hapu
<b>taiaha</b>	long club
<b>takaroa</b>	guardian of the sea
<b>tangata whenua</b>	people of the land, Maori people
<b>taonga</b>	valued resources, assets, prized possessions both material and non-material
<b>tapu</b>	sacredness, spiritual power or protective force
<b>tikanga</b>	meaning, custom, obligations
<b>tiki (hei tiki)</b>	neck pendant
<b>tino rangatiratanga</b>	self-determination

<b>tipuna</b>	ancestor, grandparent
<b>tukutuku</b>	ornamental panels
<b>wahi tapu</b>	special and sacred places
<b>wairua</b>	spirit, attitude
<b>waka</b>	canoe
<b>whakapapa</b>	genealogy, cultural identity
<b>whanau</b>	extended family
<b>whanaunatanga</b>	relationship, kinship
<b>whanui</b>	wider family groupings based on both blood ties and chosen relationships

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

<b>AMTF</b>	Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation
<b>DoC</b>	Department of Conservation
<b>NTHC</b>	Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation
<b>NZTB</b>	New Zealand Tourism Board
<b>OTSP</b>	Office of Tourism and Sport
<b>PCE</b>	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
<b>RMA</b>	Resource Management Act 1991
<b>TNZ</b>	Tourism New Zealand
<b>TPK</b>	Te Puni Kokiri
<b>TRONT</b>	Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
<b>TSG</b>	Tourism Strategy Group
<b>U.N</b>	United Nations



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Research Aims and Objectives

The main aim of this report is to provide an understanding of Maori tourism in order to enhance the ability of both new and established Maori tourist operators, their organisations and the wider Maori community to develop Maori tourism in ways that sustain Maori culture in a manner acceptable to Maori.

To achieve this aim, the report has the following objectives:

- to document accurately the current state of Maori involvement in the tourism industry;
- to describe and interpret the perceptions that Maori have of tourism and how these have changed over time;
- to identify the current use of Maori culture as attractions;
- to record Maori responses to the changes in the relationship between themselves and the natural environment;
- to identify barriers to Maori tourism development.

These objectives represent the broader goals of the FoRST Research Programme (LINX004) 'Planning For Tourism Development' refined to address the specific situation of tourism in Westland.

A Kaupapa<sup>1</sup> Maori Research approach was needed to achieve the objectives. It is critical that research on Maori issues are carried out within a Maori framework to gain an understanding from a Maori perspective. This approach which includes the methods used is described below.

### 1.2 Kaupapa Maori Research Approach

A Kaupapa Maori research approach was used in this report. This approach was largely guided by Linda Tuhiwai Smith's book on 'Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples', (1999). One central feature of the approach was to frame the research according to aspects of Maori philosophy, values and practices. Tuakana Nepe argues that "Kaupapa Maori is derived from very different epistemological and metaphysical foundations and it is these which give Kaupapa Maori Research its distinctiveness from Western philosophies" (Nepe, 1991, in Smith, 1999, p.187). This epistemological foundation "frames the way we see the world, the way we organize ourselves in it, the questions we ask and the solutions which we seek" (Smith, 1999, p.188).

---

1 A glossary of Maori terms appears on page vii.

In this report Maori epistemology is expressed through a conceptual framework to structure a strategy for Maori tourism development in Westland. The framework was structured according to Maori principles and practices of 'Kaitiaki', 'Taonga' and 'Tikanga' (Matunga, 1993, pp. 21-28). It also effectively provided a proactive approach to help improve the current condition of 'Maori Tourism' instead of limiting the research to deconstructing the situation.

Maori epistemology was also expressed in the use of Maori processes to gathering the data. A qualitative research approach was used with personal interviews providing the data supplemented with reference to the feminist politics of difference literature and publications on Maori tourism.

A Maori process based on the whanau principle was used in this research to structure how the group interviewing the participants was organised. This involved incorporating Maori people with expertise to be part of the group or what Bishop refers to as 'research whanau of interest' (Bishop, 1994, in Smith, 1999, p.185). A Maori kaumatua in Westland helped select key people to interview and he conducted about half of the interviews himself. The rest of the interviews were conducted by the researchers of the report particularly the first author. This provided "the intersection where research meets Maori, or Maori meets research, on equalising terms" (Ibid). It meant that the researchers shared their control of the research by maximizing the participation and interest of Maori (Smith, 1999, p.191).

The research also effectively incorporated Maori processes such as networking and connecting. Establishing the 'research whanau' was about establishing good relationships and connecting. Networking is based on the principles of relationships and connecting. The 'research whanau of interest' enabled a more effective process of ensuring that a cross section of the Maori community involved in tourism and key members of the Maori community were interviewed. Contacts were passed on through this networking system. In total 22 people were interviewed. The interviewees were mainly (79%) held with members of the local runanga in Westland - Te Runanga o Makaawhio and Te Runaka o Katiwaewae. However, other local Maori from other iwi were also interviewed. Key people from Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (TRONT) were also interviewed to place the runanga within the iwi context. The interviews were conducted between November, 2000 and May, 2001.

The whanau concept also involves the principle of reciprocity. In the research this was expressed through incorporating procedures which report the results of the research back to the community. Copies of the draft report were personally delivered to key runanga members by the Maori kaumatua for comment, and copies of the conclusions of the draft report were posted to all other interviewees for their comments. While a hui would have been ideal this was not practically possible.

The way the interviews were conducted was determined by preferred Maori forms of communication. The communication of Maori knowledge by Maori is traditionally characterised by oral narrative or storytelling. As a research tool, storytelling is a culturally appropriate way participants can represent to the researcher the diversities of truth within which the storyteller, rather than the researcher, retain control (Smith, 1999, p.144). Storytelling became an integral part of how most of the interviewees chose to convey knowledge and information to the

researcher. Thus while there were interview questions (Appendix 1), these were structured in an open way to allow for storytelling. While the interviews were not tape recorded, as this was seen to disrupt the flow of the storytelling, extensive notes were taken. The data from the interviews were structured according to the objectives of the report. Storytelling gave a good picture of the situation, where the researcher acquired a clear sense of the issues.

The Kaupapa Maori Research approach used in this report was critical in that it focused on power relations. Integral to Kaupapa Maori Research is the ethical responsibility of the researchers to provide an understanding of the deeper issues in any discussion of Maori issues (i.e., an examination of power relations between Maori and Pakeha). This approach is reflected by the following:

....intrinsic to Kaupapa Maori theory is an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities. Kaupapa Maori theory therefore aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist in society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of 'common sense' and 'facts' to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and continued oppression of Maori people

Pihama (1993), in Smith, 1999, p.185-6

The critical approach in this report was mainly informed by feminist theory on the contemporary politics of difference. This theory provided an analysis of the differences between Maori and Pakeha in tourism development. Kaupapa Maori Research in this report therefore incorporates Western theory. Some ways of doing Kaupapa Maori Research disagree with this approach and are strictly framed within a Maori world view. However, this report argues that using Western theory is strategically important for Maori to help understand the situation. This reflects the view that contemporary Maori culture is a dynamic process influenced by many factors including Western knowledge. As Smith (1999, p. 191) argues:

Kaupapa Maori Research is a social project in that it weaves in and out of Maori cultural beliefs and values, Western ways of knowing, Maori histories and experiences under colonialism, ...Maori aspirations and socio-economic needs, and Western economics and global politics

This approach also reflects indigenous research that use approaches of "reframing" and "intervening" (Smith, 1999, p.153). 'Reframing' is related to how the issues or problem are framed or defined. It is about taking much greater control over the ways in which indigenous issues are discussed (Ibid.). 'Intervening' is directed not at changing indigenous peoples to the structures (Ibid, p.147) as previous research on Maori has tended not to serve Maori interests by maintaining the status quo of unequal power relations.

The approach in this report also involves critically engaging in the way Maori knowledge has been constructed by Maori and Pakeha. Specifically the report examines the construction of Maori identity in tourism by drawing upon the feminist politics of difference. Kaupapa Maori is not just about Maori knowledge and epistemology. "The concept of *kaupapa* implies a way of framing and structuring how we think about those ideas and practices" (Smith, 1999, p.188). Significantly, "this does not deny the existence or fundamental legitimacy to Maori people of Maori forms of knowledge" (Ibid).

### **1.3 Definition of ‘Maori tourism’ and ‘Maori involvement/participation in tourism’**

This report makes a clear distinction between the term ‘Maori involvement/participation in tourism’ and ‘Maori tourism’. ‘Maori involvement/participation in tourism’ is defined as including any participation of Maori in the tourism sector as a whole from service roles such as laundry work in a motel to owner/operated tourism businesses. Whereas ‘Maori tourism’ is specifically about tourism that is defined by Maori and that sustains the integrity of Maori culture. Several guidelines are identified in Chapter 4 as characterising ‘Maori tourism’ in Westland, such as runanga-based development and an expression of Maori culture. This report argues that distinction between the terms is significant as while an outline of Maori participation in tourism in Westland is provided, understanding ‘Maori tourism’ to enhance its development is the aim of the research.

### **1.4 Study Area**

The study area of Hokitika to Haast is part of the Westland District. The Westland District, which covers the area from Otira to Big Bay (south of Haast), closely corresponds to the study area. For the purposes of this report the study area will be referred to as ‘Westland’. However, it needs to be acknowledged that the study area is also part of the Te Tai Poutini region. Te Tai Poutini covers a larger area than Westland (i.e., from Kahurangi Point to Piopiotahi (Milford Sound)). Therefore it was not seen to be correct to refer to the study area as Te Tai Poutini. However, in acknowledgment of Maori history/culture there is some reference to the study area as Te Tai Poutini by a few interviewees. Furthermore, there is reference to Poutini Ngai Tahu, the two runanga of the study area. Maori preferences for future Maori tourism development’ is specifically aimed at Poutini Ngai Tahu.

### **1.5 Assumptions and Limitations**

The report assumes that the theoretical framework borrowed from the ‘feminist politics of difference’ provides a just and inclusive theoretical approach for addressing the issue of ‘difference’. The report acknowledges the limitation of drawing conclusions about Maori and tourism in Westland mainly from information of a limited number of individual interviews in a one-to-one context. The resulting information may not portray the full diversity and depth of belief, as a larger number of interviews and a hui to discuss the issues in a group situation is advocated as an important extension of the research.

### **1.6 Chapter Outlines**

Chapter 2 provides a historical outline of how Maori identity in tourism was shaped by historical and political factors. The politics of difference helps analyse the underlying assumptions of how Maori identity/culture has been constructed. Key issues are identified which provide a useful understanding of Maori tourism in Westland.

Chapter 3 outlines the background to the Westland area. It includes a history of Westland, a physical description of the area, the management of the tourism industry and Maori representation, a brief historical account of Maori participation in Westland and current use of Maori culture as a tourist attraction.

Chapter 4 describes Maori preferences for future tourism development in Westland. This provides a proactive approach. A Kaupapa Maori Research method is used to structure this section. The key components of the model are Kaitiaki, Taonga and Tikanga.

Chapter 5 identifies the concerns expressed by interviewees towards Maori tourism development in Westland. The politics of difference is applied to help understand these issues.

Chapter 6 includes conclusions from the report and recommendations to improve Maori tourism development including the issue of representation of Maori culture in tourism.



## **Chapter 2**

### **Maori and Tourism – A Theoretical Understanding**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

Since the earliest days, the tourism industry in New Zealand has focused primarily on two things: natural heritage and Maori culture (Taylor, 1998, p.7). In this case study of the interface between Maori and tourism it is necessary to provide a deeper understanding of the issues of Maori tourism development and representation in tourism before useful discussion can take place. Firstly, a historical outline of how Maori identity in tourism was shaped by key historical and political factors will be described. This will be followed by drawing upon the feminist politics of difference to help analyse the underlying assumptions of how Maori identity/culture has been constructed in tourism over time. This will identify some key issues to address when analysing Maori culture and tourism in Westland.

#### **2.2 Historical Outline of Maori Identity in Tourism**

Identities in contemporary societies are a result of the political and ideological issues dominating at that time (Taylor, 1998, p.21). Therefore the construction of Maori identity in tourism will be examined under two significant historical and political periods in Aotearoa: the early ‘colonial’ period and the post-World War II period (1950s -1980s). In this report the early ‘colonial’ period is defined from 1840 until World War II. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 officially sanctioned the beginning of white settler colonisation. This involved the imposition of English laws and structures on Maori. The post-World War II period is noted for Maori political resurgence that challenged colonisation.

During the early colonial period, colonialism defined Pakeha culture as civilised or ‘modern’ whereas Maori culture was attributed with essentialised features associated with nature. As noted by Taylor (1998, p.21), “Maori were stamped with a romanticised identity based on pacified sensuality and harmony with nature; bound to traditions”. This view reflects the idea that the Maori indigenous identity, ethnicity or “culture” was defined according to biogenetic ideas of “race” (Ibid, p.25).

Until World War II colonial tourism mirrored the early colonial identity of Maori as ‘close to Nature’ to create an authentic object of the Maori. Maori were being defined by colonial promoters and image makers in terms of opposition to the ‘modern’... “...the separation of the modern colonial tourist from the primitive/traditionalist Maori...” (Ibid.). In some ways “this image was taken to fetishistic extremes by the tourism-related industries in a proliferation of photographic prints depicting Maori “Maids”, “Belles”, “Chiefs” and “Warriors”; objects of fantasy defined within specifically Western gender stereotypes” (Taylor, 1998, p.21).

It is important to note that Maori did not take an entirely passive role in this process. For example, the Maori women guides at Rotorua were positioned as both “native” but also used these images for personal gain. They used the representation of the Maori “to place themselves

in a powerful position over the tourist commodity” (Taylor, 1998, p.23). As Te Awekotuku points out, “the images of Maori women in colonial photography reflect both the assumed expectations of the tourist and the extent of Maori participation in this type of tourism” (Te Awekotuku, 1991, p.91).

In the post- World War II period the Maori image in tourism significantly changed in contrast to the early colonial period. There were two key socio-political factors in Aotearoa that had a significant influence and shaped Maori identity between the 1950s to the 1980s. These influences are the Pakeha notion of integrating Maori into the modern Pakeha world and Maori cultural and political resurgence.

During the 1950s and the 1960s the government promoted the notion of integration, in which New Zealand was ‘one nation, two cultures’ (Taylor, 1998, p.26). Maori were promoted as fully integrated and modernised citizens (Ibid.). One underlying reason for this new way of thinking was a change in the understanding of ‘culture’. In contrast to the pre-war period, culture in this milieu was beginning to be perceived as something independent from the body and its associative term race (Ibid.). Culture was seen as a non-biological set of social norms (Ibid.). In reality the notion of integration and the modernisation of Maori meant that Pakeha culture was perceived as the norm and Maori “culture” was viewed as unchanging and “traditional” - “as a valuable survival of the past but inappropriate in the modern world” (Ibid.). The prevailing attitude was that Maori culture was allowed to exist but in a limited form where what remains “is the mythological and exotic fare of tourism...stories and legends, songs etc” (Ibid, p.28).

During the 1960s and 1970s Maori asserted a pan-Maori identity referred to as the ‘Maori renaissance’ to promote a shared cultural heritage and experience. This Maori identity embodied “attributes such as an inner holistic spirituality and ties to the extended family/tribe and the land” (Wall, 1995, p.70). The traditional Maori world view was promoted whereby Maori were defined as having a close affinity and wholistic approach to the natural environment. As such Maori were perceived as being conservationists *par excellence* (White, 1994, p.32). A significant feature of the representations of Maori culture was that these specific features of the past were articulated in the form of a fixed, coherent and timeless ‘tradition’ (Ibid, p.44).

One reason for the growth of a Maori identity was the fear of culture decay with the large scale urbanisation during the 1950s. Maori identity was therefore also expressed through the revival of “arts and crafts” (e.g., carving, tukutuku weaving, songs, dances). These Maori cultural activities were increasingly institutionalised (White, 1994 , p.32).

Another significant reason for the Maori renaissance is that it was a political strategy by Maori in response to the political, social and economic and cultural oppression of Maori. The pan-Maori identity gave Maori unity and therefore a source of legitimacy and political strength to seek claims and demands for political, social and economic change (Hall, 1995, p.70). Smith (1999) observes that indigenous people claim essential characteristics of their identity “as a strategy as anything else, because it about claiming human rights and indigenous rights” (p.74).

Closely linked to Maori identity is the value and meaning of ‘authenticity’. This can also be viewed in terms of a political strategy. As Smith explains, “colonised indigenous peoples view the term ‘authenticity’ in ways which invoke simultaneous meanings; it does appeal to an idealised past when there was no coloniser, to our strengths surviving thus far, to our language as uninterrupted link to our histories, to the ownership of our lands, ...to our authentic selves as a people...although they may seem overly idealised, these symbolic appeals remain *strategically important* in political struggles” (Smith, 1999, p.73). This is particularly critical to the issue of indigenous intellectual property rights. Indigenous peoples have to defend and seek to protect indigenous knowledge and cultures by proving authenticity over their own forms of knowledge (Hinch, McIntosh and Ingram, 1999, p.4).

The dominant Pakeha view of Maori culture as traditions of the past, along with the revival of Maori culture groups and art forms, fitted the tourism industry’s need for a visually consumable product. Therefore the representation of Maori culture in mainstream tourism focused on traditional art and performances of the past. Culture and tradition were seen as fragments from the Maori past served up by “modern Maori” performers (Taylor, 1998, p.27). Maori culture was portrayed as though it was a concrete object untouched by contemporary Maori life. This fitted the tourists’ demand for experiencing an authentic cultural performance or buying an authentic Maori product. Time in this sense has since become of central importance to the tourism industry, most importantly as a mode of objectification and authentication (Ibid, p.28). It suited the industry’s marketing criteria of an unified, clear image of Maori culture (Ibid.).

### **2.3 Contemporary Analysis of Maori Culture and Tourism**

The above representation of Maori culture in tourism has proven problematic. Since the 1980s Maori have voiced their strong disapproval at the prevailing system of representation of Maori in tourism (Taylor, 1998, p.39). This has resulted in homogenising Maori culture and promoting negative stereotypes of Maori. As the result of a Manaakitanga Hui held in Rotorua in 1985, the Maori Tourism Task Force Report (1987, p.25) criticised the use and abuse of Maori culture in tourism reporting that:

Maori are critical of the way they are stereotyped into guides, entertainers, carvers and as components of the natural scenery. This has been without consultation, and with little commercial benefit to the Maori people. This means that the industry must rethink its present tendency to stereotype the Maori role in tourism.

The recommendations of the Maori Tourism Task Force Report (1987, p.47) also stated that:

...at all costs any attempt to homogenise Maori culture in the name of tourist consistency must be resisted. The great danger is the creation of the well beaten Maori trail that has culled out any tribal diversity

Lack of Maori tourism development was also an issue in the report. However, despite these criticisms mainstream tourism still continues to stereotype and homogenise Maori culture. This needs to be examined in further depth to identify key issues. These issues are analysed according to the feminist politics of difference.

The 'feminist politics of difference' framework focuses on the theoretical and political implications of recognizing difference, on the basis of gender and many other dimensions (McDowell, 1999, p.215). The theoretical development was in response to the shortcomings of a feminism that focused on equality with men rather than placing more value on women and their experiences, on acknowledging their difference.

As a framework, the feminist politics of difference can give a deeper understanding of the issue of the 'homogenising of Maori culture in tourism'. Some feminist theorists who ascribe to this framework recognise the danger of essentialising the qualities and characteristics identified with race, gender, class etc. There is the tendency to interpret qualities as applying and characteristic to *all* members of a race etc. (Women and Geography Study Group, 1997, p.70). Therefore, while the Maori renaissance essentialised Maori culture for political reasons there was the danger of assuming all Maori had the same qualities.

To counter this problem some theorists of the politics of difference have begun to acknowledge differences within categories (Larner, 1993, p.86). It was seen important to confront the diverse experiences contained within categories by allowing for the diverse complexity within the categories or groups. Therefore it is important to acknowledge and allow for tribal and contemporary differences within Maori. There is also diversity within iwi, including different values and different ways of expressing rangatiratanga. This means that the representation of Maori culture in tourism must allow for the complex diversity of Maori identity to avoid misrepresenting Maori as a homogenous group.

Furthermore, the approach to essentialise Maori identity means that Maori culture has been represented by one voice: that of the reconstructed quintessential Maori (Wall, 1995, p.70). This does not allow for different views and ways of participating in tourism by Maori. For example, the 'Maori as conservationist' stereotype can restrict Maori from developing resources as this would be seen as holding a non-Maori view. Maoridom cannot be defined solely in terms of their traditional world view (White, 1996, p.62). There needs a greater understanding of the complexity and diversity that constitutes Maori society, of which participation in the market economy is a significant factor.

The representation of Maori identity in tourism as negative stereotypes and the inappropriate use of Maori culture can also be examined using ideas from the feminist politics of difference. There is danger in essentialising the qualities of a group as these qualities may come to be seen as fixed properties which transcend socialisation. The construction of Maori culture tends to interpret the qualities and characteristics associated with Maori culture as fixed and unchanging over time (Wall, 1995, p.70). Tourist demand for an 'authentic experience' fitted in with the idea of an temporally fixed view of culture. Tourism promoted Maori culture as being an authentic product from the past. Thus Maori culture is narrowly represented by performances of the past and traditional art forms. This creates negative stereotypes of Maori culture/identity (e.g., in tourist advertising Maori are still depicted as warriors in grass skirts). Implicit in this view of Maori culture is the assumption that to represent Maori culture contrary to this stereotype is not portraying authentic Maori culture. "At heart of such a view is that indigenous cultures cannot change, cannot recreate themselves and still claim to be indigenous" (Smith, 1999, p.72).

Therefore, a critical point is that the representation of Maori culture in tourism must reflect contemporary Maori culture. This has implications as to what is considered authentic by the tourist industry and by Maori today. White states that “authenticity is entirely dependent upon the acceptance of particular articulations by Maori - ultimately they themselves define who and what they are” (White, 1996, p.33). The inappropriate use of Maori culture in tourism also reflects this issue whereby Maori need to define what is authentic Maori culture.

Beyond the issue of the representation of Maori culture is the impact of structural inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. The lack of Maori tourism development in tourism can be understood by how Maori identity was reconstructed. Maori identity/culture promoted by Maori renaissance was “primarily rested upon those previously defined in the colonial period, which persist as the staple in a menu served up by tourism advertisers today” (Taylor, 1998, p.27). Maori identity was therefore reconstructed *within* the “stereotypical colonial construction of Maori identity” (Wall, 1995, p.70). Pakeha culture was perceived as the norm and Maori culture as the ‘other’.

Feminist theorists on the politics of difference identify the above process of “othering” as structuring difference within oppositional structures. Within such a conceptual structure, the first of the terms (the dominant one) defines the terrain of the “other”, placing it in a position of subordination or secondariness (Genew, 1990, p.93). The politics of difference points out the inadequacy of merely giving the “other” a positive valence, as this does not address the “structure” of difference. As stated by Veijola and Jokinen (1994, p.130):

when solely adoring the Difference or Differences, but not realising that one should investigate the structure of it - who differs from whom, who has defined the difference... - one only reinforces the muteness and subordination of the Other.

Therefore, while the Maori renaissance may have given Maori identity a positive valence, it failed to address the ‘structural’ inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. Maori identity was valorised under the same conditions in which they were colonised. In other words, the reconstruction of Maori identity maintained the power relations that failed to acknowledge the socio-economic inequality in contemporary Maori society. “The reinvention of Maori identity in this manner only serves to decontextualize current issues affecting Maori as a marginalised group” (Wall, 1995, p.70). Thus the lack of Maori tourism development is the result of structural inequalities between Maori and Pakeha.

## 2.4 Summary

The history of Maori identity and tourism shows that the early colonial period stereotyped Maori identity in tourism as being ‘close to Nature’ and biologically based. In contrast, in the post-World War II period, tourism portrayed Maori culture as traditions of the past untouched by contemporary Maori life. This was shaped by the Pakeha notion of integrating Maori, which defined Maori culture as being separate from their bodies and restricted to traditions of the past and Maori asserting their culture/identity which idealised the traditional Maori world view. However, this representation of Maori culture was problematic. Since the 1980s, Maori have

voiced their disapproval at the portrayal of Maori identity in negative stereotypes, the inappropriate use of Maori culture, the homogenising of Maori culture and the lack of Maori tourism development. The politics of difference has provided an explanation of the underlying causes of these concerns. These included that the complex diversity/difference within Maori culture in tourism is not acknowledged, that Maori culture in tourism is promoted as static and not a contemporary culture, and that the construction of Maori identity in tourism does not address the structural inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. An awareness of these political issues provides for better understanding of the issues of tourism for Maori in Westland.

## **Chapter 3**

### **Background to the Westland Area**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter will give a general background to the case study area. The topics covered include: a history of Westland, Maori population and employment statistics, a physical description of the area (including landuse activities and settlement patterns), the management of the tourism industry and Maori representation, a brief historical account of Maori participation in tourism in Westland and the current use of Maori culture as a tourist attraction in Westland.

#### **3.2 A History of Westland**

Westland has a long history of Maori occupation. The tenth century is probably the latest date that Maori people settled on Te Tai Poutini, the greenstone coast. According to legend, Ngahue, an ancestral Polynesian figure was pursued by the green fish Poutini, a son of Takaroa, sent after him by a deserted wife (Hulme, 1987, p.77). Ngahue took back to his homeland Poutini's flesh, pounamu (greenstone), to make the archaic and wondrous adzes that helped construct the great canoes which brought the Maori to Aotearoa (Ibid.).

Before 1800, successive waves of tribes and hapu arrived to Te Tai Poutini (McKinnon, 1997). The first grouping of tribes was collectively described as Waitaha (Ibid). However, it was Ngai Tahu that was to become dominant (Ibid.). There was a high level of inter-marriage between these tribes. Poutini Ngai Tahu were established as tangata whenua of Te Tai Poutini. The beauty and durability of pounamu were quickly recognised and exploited (Hulme, 1987, p.77). Pounamu was worked into slab adzes or finished ornaments, weapons, or tools (Ibid.). Extensive pounamu trade is evident with northern tribes.

The Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840. The Arahura land purchase (1860) covered 2.8 million hectares of the West Coast, of which the crown set aside a mere 2,721 hectares for reserves for Ngai Tahu. This was 5,650 hectares less than requested by Ngai Tahu. Some reserves were removed from Ngai Tahu by 1887 by the government because of they were areas of gold mining development (Te Karaka, 1998). By 1860 Maori occupation of the Southwest was limited. Pakeha population numbers peaked with the gold rush. Migrants arrived at Okarito and places further south. There were still substantial Maori settlements at Makawhio and Here-taniwha but less of a presence than there had ever been before (Ibid.). Dispossessed Ngai Tahu were suffering from poverty due to loss of land and access to mahinga kai. In 1998 the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act redressed these grievances. Along with cultural redress such as "Management Input", economic redress also allows for Ngai Tahu to have access to funds for economic development. Under the Ngai Tahu (Pounamu Vesting) Act 1997 the Crown returned the ownership of pounamu to Ngai Tahu.

Poutini Ngai Tahu consists of two Papatipu Runanga namely Te Runanga o Makaawhio Runanga and Te Runaka o Katiwaewae. They are two of the eighteen Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui and are kaitiaki of Westland. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (TRONT) is recognised as the iwi authority of Ngai Tahu Whanui under the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. The boundary for Te Runanga o Makaawhio is from Abottshead to Piopiotahi (Milford Sound) and the boundary of Te Runaka o Katiwaewae covers the land between the North Bank of Hokitika River to Kahurangi Point. The two runanga share land between Harihari and Hokitika. Therefore, Te Runanga o Makaawhio are the main runanga of the study area or Westland.

### **3.3 Population and Employment**

The Westland District supports just over 9,200 people, of whom approximately 40 per cent live in Hokitika (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3). In 1996 the Maori population of the West Coast region, of which Westland is one of three districts, was 2,832 (Te Tari Tatau/Statistics NZ, 1996 Census). Census respondents in Westland District identifying themselves as Maori is 2.7 per cent, with a further 4.1 per cent identifying as Maori/European (Ibid). This is 0.54 per cent of the total Maori population in New Zealand (Ibid.).

The majority of Maori people aged 15 years and over in the Westland District work in agriculture and fishing occupations (Te Tari Tatau/Statistics NZ, 1996 Census). The unemployment rate for Maori in the Westland District is 12.1 per cent compared with 17.5 per cent for all Maori in New Zealand (Ibid). However, the unemployment rate for the total population in Westland is 5.4 per cent (Ibid).

### **3.4 Physical Description**

Westland is nationally and internationally renowned for its outstanding and relatively unmodified natural landscapes and pristine water environments (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3). Some of the most extensive lowland ecosystems are found in the District including the great kahikatea forest at Hunts Beach (Ibid). Lowland beech and rimu forests are also plentiful. Upland forests include southern rata, kamahi and silver and mountain beech (Ibid). The forests are habitats for rare flora and fauna (Ibid).

The geography of Westland ranges from the coastline to the majestic Ka Tiritiri o te Moana (Southern Alps) and wetlands and lakes spread along the coastal plains (DoC, 2001). Glaciers are a feature of the District - the most notable being Te Moeka o Tuawae and Ka Roimata o Hine Hukatere (Fox Glacier and Franz Josef Glacier) (Ibid). The coastal environment in Westland is a significant resource forming the western boundary of the district (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3). At the widest point the distance between the coast and the mountains is only just over 50 km (Ibid.).

The internationally recognised Te Waipounamu World Heritage Area (South West New Zealand World Heritage Area) is, for a large part, contained within the District, as are Westland, Arthurs Pass and Mt. Aspiring National Parks, numerous wilderness and protected areas (DoC, 2001).

Consequently some 86 per cent of the District's land area is managed by the Department of Conservation covering the vast majority of lands with significant conservation values (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3).

The Westland District's unique natural landscape provides a special appeal for the growing tourism industry. Individual elements of this landscape, such as the glaciers, lakes, and wildlife attract significant visitor numbers (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3).

The productive land resource in Westland is limited by the dominance of steep bush and mountainous areas (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3). The dominant agricultural activities in Westland are dairying and beef farming, with other types of productive land use including sheep, deer, and mixed livestock farming and forestry (Ibid).

Hokitika is the major settlement, with 40 per cent of the population resident there (Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3). The rest of the District is characterised by small, geographically isolated communities generally centred on farming and more recently on tourism (Ibid). Tourism has become an integral part of the viability of a number of small communities in the District such as Fox, Franz Josef (Waiiau) and Haast (Ibid).

### **3.5 Management of the Tourism Industry in New Zealand and Maori Representation**

The key central government agencies responsible for the management of the tourism industry are the Office of Tourism and Sport (OTSP), Tourism New Zealand (TNZ) and the Department of Conservation (DoC).

The OTSP has responsibility for tourism policy and advice to the government. It also forms liaisons with the private sector tourism groups (e.g., the New Zealand Tourism Industry Association) (Dolheguy, 1999, p.41). TNZ focuses primarily on international marketing activities. However, TNZ has published a Maori Information and Image Kit to help promote Maori tourism.

The Department of Conservation has responsibilities for both policy and operational matters relating to the land it administers (PCE, 1997). The Conservation Act 1987 provides for the establishment of the DoC to manage public conservation lands. The functions of DoC include:

To the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of the natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism (Conservation Act, 1987, s 6(e)). Section 4 of the Conservation Act requires that the Act be interpreted and administered so as to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Te Puni Kokiri ( the Ministry of Maori Development) has a secondary role in the tourism industry. Te Puni Kokiri provides analysis and policy advice to increase Maori achievement within the tourism industry and focuses on removing the disparities between Maori and non-Maori in the tourism sector (PCE, 1997). It also monitors other agencies delivery of outcomes

for Maori (Ibid). Te Puni Koriki also has the role of facilitating consultation, where required, between Maori tourism organisations, iwi and the Crown (PCE, 1997). They have developed a “Three Year Strategic Plan, 1999-2002” to improve economic development for Maori through the provision of advice on the development of business opportunities and employment in the tourism sector (Te Puni Koriki, 1999, p.3).

At the local government level, regional and local authorities have a primary role under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) in the management of the environmental effects associated with tourism and the decision-making role on resource applications for tourism developments. The RMA must also take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and have particular regard to kaitiakitanga.

There is currently no national Maori tourism organisation. The Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation was a national body that was disbanded due to lack of funding. This was established in response to a Manaakitanga Hui held in Rotorua, 1985. The hui also set up a Task Force to report to the Minister of Maori Affairs and Minister of Tourism on the issues for Maori participation within the tourism industry. There are several regional Maori tourism agencies, however there exists no such organisation for Westland. There are no runanga representatives on the board of the regional tourism organisation - “Tourism West Coast” (Tourism West Coast, pers.comm., 2001).

### **3.6 Historical Account and Current State of Maori Participation in Tourism in Westland**

There has been very little Maori participation in tourism in Westland before the 1970s. According to the interviewees Maori participation has mainly occurred in the last 10 years. The first evidence of this participation observed by interviewees included: glass blowing by a Maori operator, pounamu carving, pounamu craft store and Guide Rangi on the glacier.

In comparison to other areas such as Rotorua and Kaikoura<sup>2</sup>, there is the perception by the interviewees that the current state of Maori involvement in tourism in Westland is low. This is reflected in comments such as “there is very little Maori involvement in Westland”, “not really (any Maori involvement)”, and “not any (involvement), although there could be”. The interviewees perception is also affirmed by the observation of the West Coast tourism organisation, Tourism West Coast, that there is a lack of Maori participation in tourism, as according to their list of 400 registered tourist operators none were identified as Maori (Tourism West Coast, pers.comm., 2001). However, data from this research identified 11 out of 19 interviewees from Westland involved in tourism. Of those identified four were Maori owner/operated tourist operators, another three were listed in the Maori Tourism Directory (TPK, 1998). This highlights the problem of the lack of accurate statistical data available to determine whether the proportion of Maori involved in tourism is lower than for the Maori population. Therefore, it is difficult to quantify accurately the perception of low Maori participation due to

---

2 Rotorua (Tahana et. al., 2000) and Kaikoura (Poharama et. al., 1998) are parallel case studies in the same research programme.

lack of accurate statistical data on Maori employment in tourism. This problem is pointed out in the “New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (Tourism Strategy Group (TSG), 2001).

The large geographical study area, from Hokitika to Haast, also means that Maori participation in tourism is dispersed. The one main tourist centre is Hokitika where there are numerous shops selling jade or pounamu to the tourists. Only one outlet, ‘Mountain Jade’ was part Maori owned and operated. However, another Maori owned and operated gold jewellery shop which is relocating soon will also sell carved pounamu. ‘Mountain Jade’ has pounamu carvers working on-site for tourists to view and sells the carved pounamu on the premises. Maori are employed to serve the customers (due to customer demand) and some of the carvers are Ngai Tahu. Young Ngai Tahu are taken on as trainee carvers and taught the art under the guidance of the Maori owner. A glass studio which sells directly to the public is also Maori owned and operated. Some Maori are employed in other shops serving customers. A few local Maori carvers are based in Hokitika and sell their products from their home.

Further south, the Franz Josef glacier guiding company currently employs three Maori guides for a specific Maori perspective. ‘Guide Rangi’ of Franz Josef, while now retired, gained a reputation as a famous Maori glacier guide in the last 20 years. The Fox glacier guiding company does not currently employ any Maori guides however they did last year. Kamahi Tours at Franz Josef employs a Maori guide for guided bush trips to explain Maori traditional knowledge of the native forest to the tourists. Maori are also employed at Franz Josef tourism adventure centres in serving customers.

Accommodation such as a bed and breakfast unit at Franz Josef and a motel at Lake Paringa are owned and operated by Maori who promote traditional Maori knowledge about the bush as part of the experience of the place. Maori also work for hotels at Franz Josef and Haast in the laundry and catering.

Other tourism ventures owned and operated by Maori include an Arts and Crafts Gallery at Whataroa which displays work predominantly from Maori artists and a helicopter tour service at Haast.

In sum, several Maori owned and operated tourism businesses exist in Westland. However, most Maori participation in the tourism industry seems to be in the service and interpretation roles (e.g., guides). These positions are mostly part time and seasonal.

The above outline of Maori involvement in tourism is restricted to the knowledge gained through the interviews and may exclude other participation.

### **3.7 Current Use of Maori Culture as a Tourist Attraction**

The perception that Maori culture *is* used as a tourist attraction in Westland was affirmed by half of the interviewees. Pounamu was the predominant example. Maori designs were also mentioned along with Maori crafts. Apart from this, there is a lack of use of Maori culture as a tourism attraction. The towns mainly lack any evidence of Maori culture. It is interesting to

note that the main road signs into Hokitika fail to promote the tourist attractions in terms of Maori culture (Matunga, pers.comm., 2001). The signs include: “Welcome to Jade Country”, “Heritage Area”, “Greenstone” without any mention of ‘pounamu’ or ‘Maori’. While there is the use of Maori knowledge on the guided trips, this is not promoted in the advertising of the tourist ventures. It is an added extra rather than the focus. The lack of a marae at Hokitika in which to attract tourists adds to the current low use of Maori culture.

However, from the stories told by interviewees, their understanding is that the natural environment, which is a significant part of their culture, is the main use of Maori culture. Tourists come mainly to see the natural environment on the coast. While it is not promoted, experiencing the natural environment is experiencing Maori culture. This is seen as different to other tourist areas where Maori culture is defined in a more arts and performance sense.

Maori perceptions of the use of Maori culture in tourism and the definition of Maori culture will be discussed later in this report.

### **3.8 Summary**

A historical account of the development of Maori involvement in tourism showed that there had been very little Maori involvement in Westland. Pounamu carving and glacier guiding were the first forms of Maori participation observed by interviewees. The interviewees also perceive that there is currently low Maori involvement in tourism. Maori tourist owner/operators include a pounamu tourist outlet, a gold jewellery shop, a glass studio, a Maori art gallery, accommodation and helicopter tours. However, most Maori participation in the tourism industry appear to be in the service and interpretation roles such as guiding. Pounamu carving was identified as the main use of Maori culture as a tourist attraction in Westland. Apart from this, there is a lack of use of Maori culture. However, for some interviewees the natural environment, which is a significant part of their culture, was seen as a major use of Maori culture as a tourist attraction.

## **Chapter 4**

# **Maori Tourism For Westland - Maori Preferences For Future Maori Tourism Development**

### **4.1 Introduction**

A Kaupapa Maori research method was employed to structure the data in this section of the case study. This method is based on a research model developed by Blackford and Matunga (1993). It enabled Maori tourism to be articulated according to kaupapa Maori. The key components of the model are Kaitiaki, Taonga and Tikanga, in which each is inter-dependent on the other. The components of this model are not to be treated as concrete absolutes as this falls into the trap of essentialising Maori and Maori culture. They are instead to be regarded as signposts. This recognises the distinctness of Maori culture but at the same time acknowledges that Maori culture is fluid and evolves within the context of the socio-economic influences of a Pakeha world. Each component will be discussed in terms of what would it might mean for Maori tourism in Westland. This sets out a proactive approach.

This section is specifically aimed at tourism development for Poutini Ngai Tahu - Te Runanga o Makaawhio and Te Runaka o Katiwaewae. These runanga have manawhenua and kaitiaki status in the study area. It is therefore appropriate to focus closely on runanga-based tourism development for Poutini Ngai Tahu. The strong indication in the interviews that tourism development should be runanga-based supports this view. Poutini Ngai Tahu represented a significant number (79%) of the interviewees.

Firstly, Maori perceptions of tourism in general will be summarised before a specific tourism ‘strategy’ for Poutini Ngai Tahu is outlined. These results are based on the responses given to two questions: ‘the perceptions Maori have of tourism’, and the ‘Maori responses and coping strategies to tourism development’. Direct quotes from the interviewees are given in italics.

### **4.2 Maori Perceptions of Tourism**

There is a positive overall response by all the interviewees to tourism in general in Westland (the negative aspects will be discussed later under ‘issues’). There is a strong expression for more development of Maori tourism.

The reasons for developing Maori tourism are based on questions regarding their ‘perceptions of tourism’ and include:

- employment opportunities (*Very good growth area for Te Tai Poutini. The market to be in. Excellent business to be in if you have the right idea. The main industry of the future. I believe there is a real niche market for Maori tourism*).
- to determine authenticity of their culture.

- runanga/community development (*OK, good for the community if everyone that participates benefits. We need to utilize what we have in our region*).
- cultural pride and revival (*Beneficial from a cultural view -tourists come to see Maori. To share our culture with tourism which can give us positive pride*).

The main theme about Maori tourism is the recognition of their culture. This is indicated by the following observations:

It has given Maori the opportunity to value their culture where the world has been able to value it as well. Actual acknowledgment of our culture. The Maori culture has become known to the world. Brought out Maori culture out. Unique opportunity which exists for Maori exclusively.

In sum, Maori in Westland view tourism as a good business opportunity that is beneficial for the community and for their culture. There is a strong expression of wanting more development of Maori tourism from all the interviewees. The next section will look at what Maori tourism might mean for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland.

### **4.3 Tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland**

Below is an outline of tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland based on the interviewees response to their ‘perceptions of tourism’. In the words of an interviewee, *Maori tourism is everywhere on the West Coast, it just needs to be harnessed and developed for all to enjoy*. The key components of tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland are Kaitiaki, Taonga and Tikanga.

#### Kaitiaki

Kaitiaki can be translated as a guardian (Roberts et al., 1994, p.7). As guardians, kaitiaki must protect the mauri or life-force of their taonga. The physical kaitiaki system is based on whakapapa (Ibid, p.9). Only those with manawhenua status can be kaitiaki. In terms of tourism, kaitiaki is about recognising the hapu/ whanau/ iwi differences. According to a member of Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation (NTHC), “Ngai Tahu tourism needs to be defined at hapu/ whanau/ iwi levels as they may differ” (Tau, pers.comm., 2001). This is also asserted by the Maori Task Force Report (1987, p.47) which warns of the:

...danger of simplifying the Maori experience and therefore it’s delivery. This means that it will vary from tribe to tribe and this diversity needs to be positively encouraged. At all costs any attempt to homogenise Maori culture in the name of tourist consistency is to be resisted... This is why it will become very necessary for each Maori group and each marae to think through what type of tourism they want to encourage ...

Te Runanga o Makaawhio and Te Runaka o Katiwaewae are the kaitiaki of the case study area. In the interviews, they expressed their response to tourism development and voiced what type of tourism they wanted to encourage in Westland. Both runanga generally had the same view of tourism development however it differed in terms of the specific tourism activities reflecting the geographical boundaries of the two runanga. Sharing their history and knowledge with tourists would also reflect the regional diversity of their different local histories and tikanga.

#### Taonga

Taonga are the tangible and intangible valued resources of Maori culture. 'Taonga' in this report outlines resources valued by Poutini Ngai Tahu and how tourism could promote and protect taonga and financially benefit their community. Their cultural heritage and natural environment were strongly promoted as taonga. This involved information/knowledge regarding taonga.

The ways in which tourism might promote their taonga was mainly perceived as sharing their knowledge about the natural environment and their cultural heritage to tourists. As summed up by one interviewee, "*Maori tourism is our culture and the natural environment*". Below is a list of specific areas of this type of cultural eco-tourism identified by the interviewees.

#### Guided walks/trips to:

- pounamu sources/trails
- the native forest
- significant historical sites
- Arahura Pa

#### Explaining/telling stories about:

- traditional kai
- the meaning of pounamu and how precious it is to Maori people
- local Maori history
- what some of the ngahere is used for in rongoa and what is edible/nonedible, herbal lore
- the meaning of the environment and plants from a Maori perspective
- the use of pounamu

A future approach of Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation is to promote 'stand alone' operations such as the bungee jump and the shot-over jet rides along with a cultural experience as one package. An eco-tourism/cultural tourism package (Tau, pers.comm., 2001) This may be one angle that the runanga could develop.

#### Tikanga

All interviewees mentioned that it was important for Maori tourism be run according to tikanga Maori. Tikanga Maori is about the right or appropriate way to carry out an activity. The sense of "having things carried out correctly" is important as the consequences of not doing so may be far reaching, such as failing to ensure the cultural integrity of Maori in tourism. It involves a wide range of cultural skills and sensitivities (Smith, 1999, p.24). For the purposes of this report this process involves the following values: manaakitanga, whanaunatanga, rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. Each value will be discussed in terms of tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu. As noted by an interviewee "*tikanga Maori is part and parcel of a Maori tourist operating venture*". It is interesting to note that in the recent 'New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010' the vision for tourism in New Zealand is that all sector participants will embrace the values of manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga (Tourism Strategy Group (TSG), 2001, p.ii).

### Manaakitanga

Manaakitanga is about the respect given to manuhuri (visitors), sometimes described as “sharing and caring” (Sharp, 1990, p. 53) and being hospitable. This would be extended to the visitor/host relationship in tourism. Manaakitanga also has elements of reciprocity which creates a relationship between the tourist and host that goes beyond a commercial exchange. This involves an expectation from the host that the visitor has a responsibility to be a respectful and an active participant, to part of an interactive experience.

Manaakitanga was seen by the interviewees as one key element for the way Maori should conduct or engage themselves with tourists. This was expressed as:

Maori being able to share their culture with other cultures. Showing Maori culture and experiences. Showing everyone about Maori history. Giving tourists an experience of Maori.

The ideal situation for tourists to experience manaakitanga is on the marae. The need for a marae at Hokitika was mentioned by several interviewees.

### Whanaunatanga

The notion of whanaunatanga is about community growth and development. The principle “is important because it provides a support structure which has inbuilt responsibilities and obligations” (Smith, 1999, p.26). It is an organisational principle, a way of structuring and maintaining social relations within the whanau (Ibid). In terms of tourism, whanaunatanga would ensure the involvement, support and development of the local runanga.

Whanaunatanga was strongly expressed as a necessary component of tourism by the interviewees. When asked how could the development of Maori tourism happen, most mentioned the support of the local runanga and iwi and the educational and commercial development of its members as important. For example:

Involvement in local development with runanga support and TRONT support. Tourism run by local iwi with a cultural flavour. Tourism could start Maori doing things for their iwi. Everyone to work together as a whole ....the runanga needs to work as a team. To help runanga to further their skills. Local Maori need to be educated in local Maori history.

At the time that the interviewees were conducted there were a few runanga-based tourism ventures in the development stage. One involved an integrated approach to the pounamu industry. This involved the local runanga collecting the pounamu, carving the stone and selling it to the tourists. Another was the proposal for runanga to be part owners of a guiding company on Te Moeka o Tuawae (Fox glacier). The guiding would be conducted according to a Maori perspective. A plan to establish a Maori cultural centre in Hokitika is also in the process. The centre would include Maori performances, pounamu carving, a training centre for young Ngai Tahu carvers and selling of authentic pounamu carving.

### Rangatiratanga.

The concept of rangatiratanga is about the self determination of Maori people, to the control over their resources, culture, social and economic well being. This involves control over decision making processes. In relation to the case study, when the interviewees were asked would they like more control over tourism development, all interviewees responded affirmatively. Most interviewees stated that Maori tourism ventures should remain in the hands of Maori (i.e., runanga owned and operated). One interviewee clarified that where this was not possible “*the runanga must have control over decision making that ensures the integrity of the culture*”.

Rangatiratanga in this sense would mean that Maori were in control of determining the authenticity of the product or practice. As expressed by an interviewee in relation to pounamu carving “*only Maori know the whakapapa and they have the wairua ...this makes the product authentic*”. Stories on guided trips were also seen as requiring runanga approval:

Any information about Maori given to tourists need to be correct. Don't make a mockery out of a culture.

### Kaitiakitanga

Kaitiakitanga is defined as the “responsibilities and kaupapa, passed down from the ancestors, for tangata whenua to take care of the places, natural resources and other taonga in their rohe, and the mauri of those places, resources and taonga” (PCE, 1997, p. 132). All the interviewees perceived their relationship with the natural environment as important and as such a significant taonga. The ethic of kaitiakitanga is embodied within the interviewees responses about the natural environment:

The natural environment is what makes it (the Coast) unique. One of total respect. It is part of who I am. Our natural environment is there for our benefit, for generations, if it is dealt with the respect it deserves. Look after it and manage it. Wise use of our resources. My life, true conservation.

For a few interviewees ‘pounamu’ was the key aspect about the natural environment that they related to. For example, pounamu is the “*Connection to the land. Window to Tipuna*”.

Most potential tourism ventures described by interviewees link tangata whenua with the land. This reinforces their role as kaitiaki of the natural environment. A critical issue for Poutini Ngai Tahu is that tourism must not compromise the role of the kaitiaki in caring for the natural environment. Positive examples of how tourism has already affected this responsibility included:

More awareness ...respect. Realised that my local knowledge of bush is not shared by all people.

## **4.4 Summary**

Framing what tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland might mean revealed that when Maori become the tourism owners the type of tourism could be transformed. Maori culture is framed differently and Maori tourism is defined differently compared with Pakeha tourism. Key factors

are identified as characterising tourism for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland. These could be used as guidelines for defining other Maori Tourism. The factors are:

- Maori owned and managed
- Maori participation in delivery
- Maori determination of an authentic Maori tourism 'product'
- According to Maori tikanga
- Runanga based development
- Expression of Maori culture.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Tourism Development Concerns Expressed by Maori in Westland**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

The general response from the interviewees towards tourism was positive, however there were a few crucial issues that were identified. This section will discuss these issues. Data based on survey questions relating to ‘Maori responses and coping strategies to tourism’ and ‘Maori perceptions of tourism’, along with interviews with key people from Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (TRONT) form the basis of this discussion. The feminist politics of difference will be drawn upon to help explain the issues at a deeper level.

The main concerns are:

- barriers to developing Maori tourism;
- inappropriate use of Maori culture in Pakeha tourism and Maori control of authenticity;
- lack of an effective partnership in the management of the natural environment in relation to tourism.

Each concern is addressed below. In addition, other sources are used to confirm the observations reported here.

#### **5.2 Barriers to Developing Maori Tourism**

Most interviewees expressed a strong willingness to developing Maori tourism. This willingness has occurred mostly during the last five to ten years, particularly with opportunities of eco-tourism. However, ‘structural’ constraints to the development of Maori tourism were identified as a critical issue.

These constraints were not ranked in terms of which was the most significant. The inter-relationship of the barriers made ranking difficult, for example, the lack of opportunities to market Maori culture is closely tied to the lack of a partnership with the Department of Conservation (DoC) and the lack of effective representation on mainstream tourism organisations.

The theoretical understanding in Chapter 2 helps explain this situation. Maori identity was “reconstructed *within* the colonial construction of Maori identity as the ‘Other’ “ (Wall, 1995, p.70). The construction of Maori identity as the ‘Other’ failed to recognise and address the political, social and economic inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. This process of ‘Othering’ places Maori in a position of subordination. This subordination means that there are structural constraints to participation in society. This process extends to Maori development in the tourism sector. Listed below are a number of areas where barriers to Maori tourism occur. Relevant comments from the interviews are provided in italics to give a fuller picture of the issues.

### Lack of effective representation on mainstream tourism organisations

*Not represented effectively on mainstream tourism agencies.*

Lack of effective representation is reflected in government reports. A report by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) (1997) on the management of environmental effects associated with the tourism sector noted that “there has been insufficient opportunity for tangata whenua to participate in policy and decision-making for the tourism sector” (PCE, 1997, p.111). According to a Te Puni Kokiri (TPK) report there still remains “low levels of Maori representation in decision-making levels of the tourism industry” (TPK, 1999, p.1). Up until now there has been minimal representation of Maori in Tourism New Zealand, however, with the recommendations of the ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010’ (TSG, 2001) there will be a major structural overhaul of Tourism New Zealand which will hopefully address this. At the regional level, the West Coast Tourism organisation lacks Maori representation on its board (Tourism West Coast, pers.comm., 2001). The lack of Maori regional representation will potentially be addressed by the ‘New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010’ (TSG, 2001) with recommendations for the creation of representative Maori tourism bodies (or structures within existing bodies) at the regional level.

### Lack of Maori tourism agencies

*TPK no action...espouse to but whether happens or not. No Maori tourism agencies to support us.*

The lack of Maori tourism agencies was noted. While Te Puni Kokiri is not a specific Maori tourism organisation it has provided the government with a report entitled “Strategic Plan for Maori Tourism Development, 1999-2002” (TPK, 1999). However, the Ministry’s role is to provide policy advice and as such it perhaps lacks teeth in terms of implementing any real improvements in Maori tourism. Although, under the current government this role appears to have “moved to a greater operational focus through such programmes as the Capacity Building Fund and Maori Facilitation Service” (Lowe, pers.comm., 2001) and other recent initiatives such as the “New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (TSG, 2001).

At the present there is no national Maori tourism organisation. A national body, Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation (AMTF) set up in response to the Manaakitanga Hui held in Rotorua in 1985 has been disbanded. It published a few important reports: “A Report on the Current Market Position of Maori Tourism Product” (AMTF, 1996), “An Investigation into a Mark of Authenticity for Maori Tourism Products and Services” (AMTF, 1997) and “The Protection of Cultural And Intellectual Property Rights of Maori within the Tourism Industry” (AMTF, 1994). It appears that these reports were not adequately supported by the government. However, the recent “New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (TSG, 2001) recommends the establishment of a National Maori Tourism Organisation.

There are several regional Maori organisations such as Nga Whenua Rahui and Tuwharetoa Tourism, however there is no regional Maori tourism organisation for Westland. As mentioned above under ‘lack of Maori representation’ this may be addressed with the recent “New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (TSG, 2001) which recommends the creation of representative Maori tourism bodies (or structures within existing bodies) at a regional level.

### Lack of education/training

*Lack of being taught business skills. Bringing people up to speed in the world. More involvement by educating and training people that wish to be involved. Business skills needed. Local Maori need educated in local Maori history. Keen to learn more. To help Maori awareness and further their skills etc. Need business skills. Lack of knowledge-mostly Pakeha developments. Probably lack of understanding.*

The lack of education in general, but particularly in local Maori history and business skills, was identified as a key constraint to developing Maori tourism. To address this, there are a couple of iwi and local runanga training initiatives in the planning stage. One idea that has been discussed within Ngai Tahu is to set up iwi based interpretation trainees so that Ngai Tahu whanui can fill positions as interpretation guides for tourism companies (Puentener, pers.comm., 2001). Even better would be Ngai Tahu runanga based tourism companies offering this service (Ibid). This would ensure that the information conveyed to tourists is authentic and provide skills for Ngai Tahu. Another idea was suggested by a Maori owner of 'Mountain Jade' at Hokitika to run a runanga-based arts training centre at the premises. This would specialise in pounamu carving. It would offer more of a "mentorship" training than that provided by polytechnics. However, there is still the need for greater representation of Maori in management and decision-making roles as there is "a low level of Maori representation in professional employment in the tourism industry" (TPK, 1999, p.1).

### Lack of capital and lack of control over land

*Lack of resourcing. Lack of assistance/funding. Need money. More resources to people. Maori should have more control over their land...pakeha control it.*

The lack of capital and control over land was described as additional constraints. This has recently been addressed to some extent by the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998. With regaining ancestral lands and compensation through the Waitangi Tribunal claim, tourism has now become a possible financial option for Poutini Ngai Tahu. Also the return of the ownership of pounamu under the Ngai Tahu (Pounamu Vesting) Act 1997 has given Ngai Tahu control over their resource. This control promotes Poutini Ngai Tahu tourism development, as highlighted by the following comments from interviewees:

- pounamu ownership has given us tino rangatiratanga
- a start to acknowledging Maori culture
- it effects our mana so that we can "hold our heads up high"
- it enables opportunities for runanga on Westland to develop an integrated pounamu industry whereby the runanga will collect, carve and sell pounamu to the tourists

However, major inequalities in land ownership and access to capital still remain after 160 years of colonisation. For example, the native forest, a significant taonga for Ngai Tahu is mostly under DoC control where Ngai Tahu have a limited role in the management of this natural resource and limited access for development.

### Attitudinal reasons stemming from racist attitudes

*Lack of confidence because of slagging Maori. If too many obstacles pull out. Get behind the times or too scared to bite the bullet. Unless you have a focus and the will and drive to do such*

*things for tourism, the Pakeha will take over us and the true Maori culture may never be exposed to the full. Because changeover from acknowledging Maori culture. Maori culture hasn't been recognised. Waitangi Tribunal claims...start of acknowledgment of Maori by government departments. Effects of colonisation.*

The interviewees said that the effects of colonisation and the lack of acknowledgment of their culture significantly affected their confidence to develop tourism businesses. This is a deep seated issue that affects all other concerns. The Waitangi Tribunal claim was seen to give Ngai Tahu back some of their mana.

#### Lack of opportunities in tourism to market Maori culture

*Reason why Maori culture hasn't been used by tourism is that there is a lack of recognition of Maori culture. There is a changeover from not acknowledging Maori culture...with Waitangi Tribunal claims...start of acknowledgment by government departments. Opportunities for Maori tourism need developing. Need to be asked by tourism groups (for Maori perspective). I believe Maori are still grappling with the concept of tourism and how you can package and make a business out of your culture while maintaining traditional values.*

The general lack of recognition of Maori culture by the government is identified as impacting on the lack of opportunities to market Maori culture in tourism. While recent Waitangi Tribunal settlements have improved the overall situation there is still a significant lack of acknowledgment of Maori culture. This is reflected in the tourism industry.

This issue is also identified in the "Strategic Plan for Maori Tourism Development for the Ministry of Maori Development, 1999-2002" (TPK, 1999). One of their objectives is to "assist with the marketing of Maori tourism products". This was to be achieved by "promoting the marketing of Maori tourism through the New Zealand Tourism Board" and "assisting with the establishment of a Maori Tourism Marketing Network through the NZTB".

Developing opportunities to market Maori tourism that ensure that cultural integrity is maintained is also an issue. A model is being developed at the iwi level by the commercial arm of TRONT- Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation. Cultural integrity is the aim of their tourism policy (Tau, pers.comm, 2001). It involves a diversified strategy whereby market opportunities for Maori tourism is one of several areas of tourism investment (Ibid). Packaging eco-tourism with cultural tourism is one major approach being developed. The 'Ngai Tahu Tourism Group', a sub-group of Ngai Tahu Holdings, indirectly supports runanga-based tourism as part of this strategy (Ibid). This may open up opportunities for runanga-based cultural - eco-tourism to develop in Westland.

The lack of opportunities to market Maori tourism also reflects the lack of research on tourist demand for cultural tourism in Aotearoa and in particular in Westland.

#### Issue of relationship with Department of Conservation (DoC)

*DoC treats us like another interest group. Need to get through hurdles with DoC over problems with concessions to set up Maori guiding on Fox Glacier. Lack of consultation on things Maori.* Some interviewees that DoC treats them like an interest group rather than a Treaty partner in relation to a proposed runanga-based glacier guiding business. This reflects the wider issue of implementing the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi under the Conservation Act.

It is argued by some members of the runanga that DoC needs to allow for ‘cultural interpretation opportunities’ in the Westland - Tai Poutini National Park Draft Management Plan (1999) to offer a cultural experience for visitors. The plan has been through the public process and is in the final stages of approval from the New Zealand Conservation Authority. It seeks to recommend to the Minister of Conservation that there be an upper limit of 300 daily visitors per glacier and that there be no more than two glacier guiding concessions per glacier (Rod, pers.comm., 2001.). There are currently two existing guiding companies at Ka Roimata o Hine Hukatere (Franz Josef Glacier) and one at Te Moeka o Tuawae (Fox Glacier). Some members of the runanga feel that they may be excluded from obtaining a concession as the allocated number of visitors may already be taken up by the existing guiding companies.

This is interpreted by some members of the runanga as not giving effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as stated in S.4 of the Conservation Act. It effectively excludes the runanga from Maori tourism opportunities. The key question is: do iwi have rights under S.4 of the Conservation Act to have a percentage of the visitor capacity? According to TRONT’s DoC liaison officer this is a valid question that has not been addressed (Puentener, pers.comm., 2001). This needs to be resolved and is beyond the jurisdiction of the West Coast Conservancy (Ibid). Therefore it is not strictly a ‘relationship issue’ between the local DoC agency and the runanga. In terms of increased tourist demand for cultural - eco-tourism it would appear that it is also an issue for the tourism industry.

#### Issue of relationship between runanga

A good relationship between runanga was seen by some interviewees as essential to tourism development. While it is difficult to ‘speak for them’ on this issue, a lack of a good working relationship could hinder the potential for any joint runanga tourism projects for the whole Westland region e.g. pounamu tourism. This may not be an issue as most tourism opportunities will be developed by the individual runanga and joint small scale tourism businesses were seen possible, for example, a pounamu studio at Hokitika. However, it may effectively restrict a joint regional tourism organisation and marketing strategy for Poutini Ngai Tahu as a whole from occurring. This may disadvantage tourism development for the two runanga.

Similarities between the runanga were also evident. All runanga interviewees except one, perceived that they did not have control over tourism development in Westland. They all stated that they would like to have more control over tourism development. The runanga was consistently mentioned as the group through which to support and initiate tourism development. Cultural - eco-tourism was the main type of tourism development envisaged by both runanga.

#### Summary of barriers to developing Maori tourism

The examples of barriers to developing Maori tourism reflect how Maori are being defined as the “other” and not as a Treaty partner. In effect these barriers are structured by contemporary ethnic relations in New Zealand and the barriers present real limitations on the effectiveness of their ability to develop Maori tourism. In the report “Management of the Environmental Effect associated with the Tourism Sector” (PCE, 1997) a principal recommendation is that the development of a sustainable tourism strategy “should be in accordance with the principles of the Treaty Of Waitangi and should provide for the practical expression of kaitiakitanga by iwi and hapu” (p.128). This would provide for greater decision-making role in the development of Maori tourism. Overall, achieving sustainable cultural - tourism depends on greater Maori control of resources and culture or rangatiratanga, and an effective partnership between Maori and Pakeha

in the tourism sector. Furthermore, with greater control over resources and culture Maori would directly determine the most appropriate types of tourism development (Zeppel, 1998, p.74) and the authenticity of Maori products and practices used in tourism.

### **5.3 Inappropriate Use of Maori Culture in Pakeha Tourism and Maori Control of Authenticity**

The inappropriate use of taonga Maori in Pakeha tourism was identified as a key issue by the interviewees. The recognition of inappropriate use in recent years has changed their perception of Pakeha defined tourism and their assessment of its effects on Maori culture. It has become an issue requiring immediate action. Information regarding this issue is based on responses to the research questions about ‘Maori perception of tourism’ and ‘changes to the expression of Maori culture due to tourism’.

The inappropriate use of Maori culture in tourism was described in relation to Maori products and practices. These included “*plastic tiki and carved waka, Maori designed carvings made from imported jade rather than pounamu, some tacky white man’s crap, taiaha performed at all times for tourists instead of only at special times, crap Maori carvings at Haast, some tacky products, inauthentic products*”.

The inappropriate use of Maori culture was perceived as having a negative effect on the culture. The main views were:

- *tourism cheapens/ bastardises Maori culture*
- *some old Maori ways change for tourism because culture taken out of context, this becomes tokenism/misrepresentation.*
- there is a narrow interpretation of Maori culture (i.e., Maori culture restricted to traditional icons not seen as a living, contemporary culture). *Maori culture not exposed to the full.*
- there is incorrect information about Maori culture given to tourists this *makes a mockery of Maori culture.*
- authentic Maori products not culturally valued. *It hasn’t got a cultural focus only a dollar focus.* (e.g., Maori pounamu carvers need to compete with cheap imported jade products of Maori design).

Interestingly, these comments reflect those outlined in a report: “Position Paper: The Protection of Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Maori within the Tourism Industry”, which was concerned “that ethnic authenticity is put at risk by tourism” (AMTF, 1994, p.5). The main threats to taonga Maori were:

- Dilution of Tikanga  
Making allowances to cater for commercial demands of the tourism systems which alter

Maori concepts and roles of *ki te tangata*, *kaitiakitanga* and *tapu*- such as restrictive time frames, inappropriate use of *marae*, waiving of *marae* formalities etc.

- Misuse of Taonga and Information regarding Taonga  
Misuse of names and language...incorrect and inappropriate versions and communication of tribal lore and history, threats to biodiversity...
- Exploitation of Taonga through fake reproduction  
Mass produced machine carved souvenirs. Non-recognition of indigenous quality.  
Reproduction by outsiders of cultural manifestations and objects of religious importance.  
False representations. Contracts for commissioned art.
- Threat to Ownership and Control of Taonga  
Lack of respect or acknowledgment of ownership rights over Maori cultural and intellectual property. No enforcement by Maori.
- Depreciation of Taonga Maori  
Export of Taonga Maori- there are currently no controls to ensure indigenous product source is acknowledged and not disguised. Trade off between dollar value and cultural value.  
Commercial viability does not support the protection and care of the intrinsic Maori value of taonga (e.g., the manufacture of plastic *hei tiki* in Hong Kong) (Ibid, p.5 and 6).

In response to the problem of the inappropriate use of Maori culture, interviewees strongly advocated Maori determine the authenticity of the product, practice or information about Maori culture. This was seen as critical as reflected in the following comments:

Maori need to be determining authenticity...there's lots of misrepresentation. There needs to be some careful planning in relation to Maori tourism. Any information about Maori given to tourists needs to be correct. Don't make a mockery out of a culture. Need certification of genuine Maori product. Maori culture needs to be valued in tourism and not undermined by dollars.

One mechanism suggested by an interviewee to determine authenticity was that the use of Maori culture by the tourism industry should "*go through papatipu runanga for approval/comment*". This process is currently practiced by TRONT whereby DoC concessions that involve the interpretation of Ngai Tahu history/culture to tourists are subject to the condition of consulting with the relevant *papatipu runanga* for approval (Puentener, pers.comm., 2001). However, it is difficult for DoC to monitor the interpretations by the tourist operators. At this stage it is a more an educational process for the tourist operators.

Most interviewees advocated 'authenticity standards' of *pounamu* products be developed. This would help deal with the problem of tourist outlets selling inauthentic Maori design carvings made from imported Asian jade instead of the authentic *pounamu*.

According to the interviewees, Maori determining authenticity was a key factor for defining Maori tourism. If Maori did not determine the authenticity of the product/practice it was *not* considered Maori tourism. This is about controlling taonga Maori (i.e., Maori cultural and intellectual property rights). According to a United Nations paper (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1992/30 - 6 July 1992) intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples includes such things as:

- Folklore and Crafts - which includes various forms of oral literature, music, dance, artistic motifs and designs, crafts such as basketry, beading, quiltwork, carving, weaving and painting.
- Biodiversity -plant varieties which have been developed through experiment and cultivation for use of food, medicine or materials for houses or boats or crafts, and other kinds of construction or use.
- Indigenous knowledge - the knowledge held, evolved and passed on by the indigenous peoples about their environment, plants and animals, and the interaction of the two.

These U.N definitions support the views of local Maori. However, Maori culture involves determining authenticity by reference to whakapapa and tino rangatiratanga. For Maori, “whakapapa is integral to the right of ownership and control of taonga (Maori cultural and intellectual property)” (AMTF, 1994, p.3). Therefore whakapapa is integral to determining authenticity, as expressed by a Maori carver: “*Maori culture is whakapapa, Maori carvers know the whakapapa, they have the wairua ...this makes the product authentic*”. In other words, whakapapa gives Maori the right to define what is authentic. Tino rangatiratanga is also central to Maori determining authenticity. Tino rangatiratanga is the right to define yourself, who you are, what is important to you and therefore what is authentic (Matunga, pers.comm., 2001). The notion of what is authentic therefore has to be defined by Maori and not from external sources (Ibid).

Maori control over authenticity of their culture will also effectively ensure “new ways of ascribing authenticity to its Maori ‘product’ in tourism” (Taylor, 1998, p.19). This will address the above issue identified by the interviewees that there is a narrow interpretation of Maori culture promoted by the tourism sector. The ‘product’ is restricted to traditional icons and is not portrayed as a contemporary, living culture. Maori control over authenticity will help undermine this version of authenticity provided by Pakeha dominated tourism. In relation to this issue one interviewee summed it up as “*Unless you have a focus, and the will, and drive to do such things for tourism, the Pakeha will take over us and the true Maori culture may never be exposed to the full* “.

‘Maori preferences for future Maori tourism development’ in Chapter 4 positions Poutini Ngai Tahu as tourism owners and operators. As such they are in control of defining what is Maori culture rather than an external definition dominating. This allows for their own version of Maori as an authentic ‘culture’ within the tourism industry. Maori tourism ventures in other parts of New Zealand have demonstrated how this can work. Tourism ventures such as guided bush walks are based on the “traditional” and “the spiritual relationship to the natural environment” aspects of the culture. However, they tend to provide a cultural experience where “tourists and actors ‘meet half way’ “ (Taylor, 1998, p.42). Taylor coins this type of tourism as a “sincere cultural experience” where the boundary between the tourists and the ‘actors’ are blurred. In contrast to the portrayal of Maori culture as traditional icons of the past, these interactive tourism ventures are about experiencing Maori culture as a living, contemporary culture.

As mentioned in Chapter 2 it is critical to challenge the essentialist construction of Maori culture as static and as reflecting only the traditions of the past. The new versions of an authentic Maori tourism products tends to undermine the essentialist representation of Maori culture and there is

less danger of tourists interpreting authentic Maori culture in terms of a 'product' from the past. This 'new direction' for Maori tourism is also reflected in the wider topic of cultural tourism where new versions of the authentic are emerging (Taylor, 1998, p.32). The tendency is to no longer interpret cultural authenticity as simply a staged performance of past traditions, songs and dance (Ibid).

## **5.4 Lack of an Effective Partnership in the Management of the Natural Environment**

The interviewees expressed a strong connection to their natural environment. For Poutini Ngai Tahu it is their taonga. The following comments reflect this connection and the responsibility of kaitiakitanga:

The natural environment is what makes it (the Coast) unique. One of total respect It is part of who I am. Our natural environment is there for our benefit, for generations if it is dealt with the respect it deserves. Look after it and manage it. Wise use of our resources. My life, true conservation. Window to Tipuna. I consider myself as part of the environment.

Most interviewees perceived tourism as negatively effecting their relationship with the environment. The concerns included:

- their role of kaitiakitanga to protect the natural environment from pollution of waterways especially from campervan sewerage and other tourists and damage to the forest and glaciers from visitors
- the presentation to tourists of the correct interpretation of Ngai Tahu knowledge of the natural environment
- the protection of wahi tapu sites (e.g., midden areas at Bruce Bay).

Because of these concerns Maori ownership and an effective partnership in the management of the natural environment was seen as critical for sustainable tourism. This view is supported in the literature on sustainable tourism. Sustainable tourism is seen as "an activity that is generally consistent with indigenous values about the sanctity of the land and people's relationship to it" (Zeppel, 1998, p.65).

Experience has shown that in cases where tangata whenua are actively involved in developing tourism, the utilisation of traditional values in planning and developing helps minimise the adverse effects associated with the industry that are of particular concern for tangata whenua (Kahu 1999, in Dolheguy, 1999, p.58).

For Maori, environmental integrity is central for sustainable tourism development (Zeppel, 1998, p.74).

The issue of ownership is to some extent being resolved by Waitangi Tribunal claims. Under the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 the Crown has returned some land to the iwi along with economic redress. The 1997 Ngai Tahu (Pounamu Vesting) Act returned the ownership of pounamu. This allows for Ngai Tahu control over their taonga in terms of protection and the potential for tourism. However, 86 per cent of the land in Westland is under DoC control

(Westland District Proposed Plan, 1995, Part 3). This disempowers the runanga as it limits their access to the land. It limits Poutini Ngai Tahu's control over their taonga and economic development of Maori tourism. In this respect the local runanga share this limited access with local Westland communities.

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Conservation Act 1987 are the main statutes governing the management of the environmental effects associated with the tourism industry. Both these Acts provide for the recognition of tangata whenua interests in the management of the natural environment. The RMA must take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Conservation Act must give effect to the principles. Maori must be consulted on matters that affect them. Despite these requirements Maori are effectively still marginalised in the management of natural resources (PCE, 1997, p.110).

In sum, the lack of ownership and effective management into the natural environment has meant that Maori also lack effective control over the environmental effects of tourism. This is captured by an interviewee's observation that "*I do not think my relationship with the environment has changed from tourism activities (rather) it has by a number of legislative changes*". This also has implications for Maori tourism development. An effective management role of the natural environment along with "resource ownership, provides the main impetus for developing tourism" (Zeppel, 1998, p.65). Without this tourism development for Poutini Ngai Tahu is constrained.

Another issue in relation to the natural environment is the restricted definition of Maori as "conservationists". The politics of difference points out that one danger of essentialising Maori culture is that the culture is narrowly defined. This only allows one voice and does not provide for different views and ways of participating in tourism by Maori. Maori are increasingly looking to develop their own tourism opportunities (PCE, 1997, p.110). Interviewees mentioned using the native forest and natural landscapes in tourism ventures. However, the monolithic identity of Maori as 'conservationists' may "run counter to tangata whenua opportunities to develop their lands" (PCE, 1997, p.111). This does not allow for the socio-economic reasons for Maori to assert their rights to participate in the market economy. There needs to be a greater understanding of the complexity and diversity of Maori society. For example, to meet market demand and expectation Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation's policy on tourism is to focus on a diversified portfolio of tourism attractions (Tau, pers.comm., 2001).

Thus while Maori relationship with their environment is given a positive valence in the RMA and the Conservation Act, and their wholistic spirituality to the land is generally promoted by tourism agencies, this fails to acknowledge and address the structural inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. This is seen in the lack of effective management of the environmental effects of tourism and the lack of ownership of the natural environment. The reconstruction of Maori identity as the "conservationist" can restrict Maori to develop resources to participate in the tourism industry.

## **5.5 Summary**

Data on Maori responses and perceptions of tourism showed some critical issues. These are barriers to developing Maori tourism, inappropriate use of Maori culture in tourism and the lack of effective partnership in the management of the natural environment in relation to tourism.

Barriers to developing Maori tourism include a number of factors ranging from lack of representation, lack of skills/education, lack of financial resources, lack of Maori tourism agencies and marketing opportunities to relationship issues with DoC and also between runanga.

The inappropriate use of Maori culture in Pakeha tourism was perceived as having a negative effect on the culture. In response to the problem interviewees suggested that authenticity standards were necessary to protect their taonga. This relates to the issue of Maori cultural and intellectual property rights. Maori determining authenticity of Maori culture in tourism is inextricably linked to whakapapa and tino rangatiratanga over their taonga. With this greater control Maori can provide culturally appropriate forms of tourism and hence new versions of authenticity.

Interviewees expressed a strong connection to their natural environment reflecting their responsibility of kaitiakitanga. Most perceived tourism as negatively affecting this relationship. The concerns included: their role of kaitiakitanga to protect the natural environment, the correct interpretation of Maturanga Ngai Tahu to tourists, the protection of wahi tapu sites. This was examined in the wider context of the marginalisation of Maori in ownership and management of the natural environment. This was seen as the key issue. There also needs to be an understanding by Maori and Pakeha that Maori need to develop the natural environment to participate in the tourist industry.



## **Chapter 6**

### **Conclusion And Recommendations**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides an overall summary of the report. The aim and objectives are discussed in relation to the summaries of the chapters. Based on the summary of results, recommendations are suggested.

#### **6.2 Overall Summary**

The main aim of this report was to provide an understanding of the interactions of Maori and tourism in Westland. This was to enhance the ability of both new and established tourist operators to develop Maori tourism in ways that sustain the integrity of Maori culture. The objectives to achieve this aim were to accurately document the current state of Maori involvement in tourism including current use of Maori culture, analyse Maori perceptions of tourism and the relationship between Maori and the natural environment and to identify barriers to Maori tourism development.

A Kaupapa Maori Research approach was used in the report. It included framing the research according to aspects of Maori philosophy, values and practices and Western theoretical frameworks. The main sources of data were interviews with members of the local runanga, local Maori from other iwi (matawaka), key people from TRONT, tourism literature and Maori tourism publications.

To provide a deeper understanding of the issues a historical outline described how Maori identity in tourism was shaped by colonialism, the 1960s 'notion of integration' and the Maori renaissance. It also described how Maori since the 1980s voiced their disapproval at the portrayal of Maori identity in negative stereotypes, the inappropriate use of Maori culture, the homogenising of Maori culture and the lack of Maori tourism development. A theoretical framework, borrowed from the feminist politics of difference helped understand these concerns by identifying underlying problems. These included that the complex diversity/difference within Maori culture in tourism is not acknowledged, that Maori culture in tourism is promoted as static and not a contemporary culture, and that the construction of Maori identity in tourism does not address the structural inequalities between Maori and Pakeha. This analysis helped understand and address the issues of tourism for Maori.

A historical account of the development of Maori involvement in tourism showed that there had been very little Maori tourism in Westland. Pounamu carving and glacier guiding were the first forms of Maori tourism. The current state of Maori tourism is also noted for its lack of Maori participation. Several Maori tourist owner/operators include a pounamu tourist outlet, a glass studio, accommodation and helicopter tours. Most Maori participation in the tourism industry appeared to be in the service and interpretation roles such as guiding. Pounamu carving was identified as the main use of Maori culture as a tourist attraction in Westland. Apart from this, there is a lack of use of Maori culture. However, for some runanga members the natural environment, which is a significant part of their culture, was seen as a major use of taonga Maori as a tourist attraction.

There was a positive overall response to tourism and a strong indication of wanting to develop Maori tourism. A conceptual model based on Kaupapa Maori structured the interviewees responses to tourism to capture what Maori tourism might mean for Poutini Ngai Tahu in Westland. The key components of the model were Kaitiaki, Tikanga and Taonga. A mode of delivery whereby existing eco-tourism practices could be significantly enhanced by Maori cultural elements was advocated. Key general factors were identified as characterising Maori preferences for future tourism development. These are: runanga owned and managed, runanga participation in delivery, runanga determination of an authentic Maori tourism products and experiences, according to tikanga Maori, runanga-based development and an expression of Maori culture.

Data on Maori responses and perceptions of tourism and how tourism has changed the expression of Maori culture revealed a number of critical issues. These are barriers to Maori tourism development, inappropriate use of Maori culture in tourism and the lack of effective management of the natural environment in relation to tourism. Barriers to Maori tourism development were identified as:

- lack of effective representation on mainstream tourism organisations (meant a lack of access to information and to decision-making).
- lack of Maori tourism agencies.
- lack of education/training.
- lack of capital.
- lack of control over land.
- psychological reasons (e.g., low self esteem).
- lack of opportunities to market Maori culture.
- issue of relationship with DoC.
- issue of relationship between runanga.

Some of the structural barriers such as Maori representation will potentially be addressed with the recent “New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (TSG, 2001) and hopefully with “Closing the Gaps in Maori Tourism” (2000) report.

The inappropriate use of Maori culture in Pakeha tourism was perceived as having a negative effect on the culture, namely: it cheapens Maori culture, some old Maori ways change as they get truncated to suit tourist timetables, narrow interpretation of Maori culture to traditional icons, that do not represent a contemporary view of life and culture, incorrect information given to tourists, and authentic Maori products not culturally valued. In response to the problem interviewees suggested that authenticity standards were necessary to protect their taonga. This relates to the issue of Maori cultural and intellectual property rights. Maori determining authenticity of Maori culture in tourism is inextricably linked to reclaiming tino rangatiratanga over their taonga. With this greater control Maori can provide culturally appropriate forms of tourism and hence new versions of authenticity.

Most interviewees expressed a strong connection to their natural environment reflecting their responsibility of kaitiakitanga. Most perceived tourism as negatively affecting this relationship. The concerns included: their role of kaitiakitanga to protect the natural environment, the correct interpretation of Matauranga Ngai Tahu to tourists, the protection of wahi tapu sites. This was examined in the wider context of the marginalisation of Maori in

ownership and lack of an effective partnership in the management of the natural environment. This was seen as the key issue. There also needs to be an understanding of Maori to need to develop the natural environment to enhance their ability for Maori tourism development in culturally appropriate ways.

### **6.3 Recommendations**

Based on the conclusions of the report, the following recommendations are suggested to provide for more effective Maori participation in the tourism industry in a way that ensures the integrity of their culture. We recommend that:

#### Research

- A research programme be established and maintained on Maori and tourism, particularly Maori employment in tourism and tourist demand for cultural tourism in Aotearoa.

This reflects the lack of reliable quantitative information on Maori and tourism. Accurate data would give a clear picture of the situation to help the planning and development of Maori tourism.

#### Authenticity Standards

- National authenticity standards for Maori cultural products and practices in tourism need to be determined by Maori with the support of the government.
- Authenticity standards for pounamu carving need to be developed and implemented by Poutini Ngai Tahu with the support of TRONT and the government.

The inappropriate use of Maori culture in tourism is of major concern to Maori. To protect Maori culture/taonga and identity in tourism authenticity standards need to be developed. These standards need to be determined by Maori. This needs to take place at a national and local level as each iwi/hapu have their own specific taonga. While there have been attempts to achieve a Maori mark of authenticity, for example, the Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation's paper – "An Investigation into a Mark Authenticity for Maori Tourism Products and Services" (AMTF, 1997) there haven't been any concrete results. It appears that any national standards require the support of the government and constant reinforcement by its tourism agencies. It is responsibility of the Treaty partners to protect taonga Maori in the tourism sector.

### Training/Education

- Tourism agencies and TRONT fund specific education/training for Maori in areas such as business development and marketing, interpretation and tourism management
- The local runanga and/or TRONT run courses in te reo, tikanga Maori and knowledge of their local histories for runanga members
- Local Maori tourism operators establish a mentoring scheme for Maori to learn skills such as pounamu carving and business management.

Maori are under-represented in professional and decision making roles in the tourism sector. Education is a key area that needs addressing. Local Maori knowledge and skills also need to be passed onto their members to give them the knowledge and confidence in presenting this knowledge and/or skills in a Maori tourism business.

### Funding

- Increased capital funding be available for Maori tourism development to enable a greater role of Maori in the tourism industry. Funding could be part of the role of the proposed Maori regional organisations.

There is a lack of funding or access to capital for Maori tourism initiatives. This represents a major structural barrier to opportunities of Maori tourism.

### Organisations

- A national Maori Tourism organisation be established
- Effective Maori representation in TNZ be established
- A regional Maori tourism agency for Te Wai Pounamu (South Island) be established
- The decision-making and operational role of TPK in tourism be strengthened

The lack of Maori representation in the tourism sector needs addressing. This requires both effective representation in mainstream tourism agencies and the establishment of Maori tourism organisations at the national and regional level.

### Relationships

- Good working relationships between various Maori organisations (i.e., iwi, runanga, and matawaka) involved in the tourism sector be developed by establishing steps such as a memorandum of understanding or establishment of a joint committee.

Good relationships need to be established in order that a joint Maori regional tourism organisation and marketing strategy is developed.

- DoC Head Office clarify whether Section 4 under the Conservation Act 1987 gives iwi rights to a percentage of the capacity of limited concessions

The specific issue of iwi rights to limited concessions needs to be resolved at the wider issue of implementing the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and hence partnership under the Conservation Act.

- Treaty partnership in the management of the natural environment under the RMA be strengthened between iwi and the district and regional councils. This could be achieved by the development of iwi tourism management plans that identify Maori tourism opportunities within the natural environment (including the Conservation Estate) and that address Maori concerns on the effects of tourism on the environment generally.

While the RMA provides for the recognition of tangata whenua interests in the management of the natural environment, an effective Treaty partnership between Maori and the councils is still far from been developed. This means that Maori lack effective control over the environmental effects of tourism.

### Market Opportunities

- Market opportunities for Maori tourism be developed

There is a lack of opportunities to market Maori culture in tourism. This reflects a lack of research on tourist demand for Maori culture. Marketing Maori tourism could be promoted through tourism organisations such as TNZ and the proposed Maori regional organisations.

### Maori Tourism Planning

- Maori tourism planning approach be developed and implemented at the national and regional level
- Mechanisms be developed for linking and integrating Maori tourism planning in mainstream approaches

Maori tourism planning enables Maori to define tourism development for themselves. Furthermore, complex issues need to be addressed such as linking Maori tourism development strategies with iwi development and also defining and clarifying the relationship between runanga and between matawaka and mana whenua in terms of tourism. The opportunity to integrate Maori tourism planning into mainstream tourism sector then needs to be developed.

Finally, it should be noted that the recommendations of the recent “New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010” (TSG, 2001) developed concurrently with this report also highlight the need for Maori representation at the national and regional level, a Maori mark of authenticity, increased systematic research and funding.



## References

- AMTF (Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation). (1994). *Position paper: The Protection of Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Maori within the Tourism Industry*. Rotorua: AMTF.
- AMTF (Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation). (1996). *A Report on the Current Market Position of Maori Tourism Product*. Rotorua: AMTF.
- AMTF (Aotearoa Maori Tourism Federation). (1997). *AMA Project: An Investigation into A Mark of Authenticity for Maori Tourism Products & Services*. Rotorua: AMTF.
- Blackford, C., and Matunga, H. (1993). *Social, cultural and spiritual effects of hazardous substances and new organisms*. Unpublished report for the Ministry for the Environment (Incomplete). Centre for Resource Management, Lincoln University.
- DoC (Department of Conservation). (2001). *West Coast Conservancy*. Retrieved 2/23/01 from the World Wide Web: [www.doc.govt.nz/local/west](http://www.doc.govt.nz/local/west).
- Dolheguy, A. (1999). *Maori Involvement in Managing the Environmental Effects Associated with the Tourism Industry*. Unpublished dissertation thesis, Environmental Management and Design Division, Lincoln University.
- Genew, S. (1990). *Feminist Knowledge - Critique and Construct*. London: Routledge.
- Hinch, T., McIntosh, A., and Ingram, T. (1999). *Maori Attractions in Aotearoa; Setting a context for Sustainable Tourism. Research Paper number 6*. Dunedin, NZ: Centre for Tourism, University of Otago.
- Hulme, K. (1987). *Te Whenua Whai - Taoka*. In G. Hutching and C. Potton (Eds.), *Forests, Fiords and Glaciers: New Zealand's World Heritage: the case for a South-Westland New Zealand World Heritage site*. Wellington, NZ: Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of NZ.
- Larner, W. (1993). *Changing Contexts: Globalisation, Migration and Feminism in New Zealand*. In S.M. Genew and A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Feminism and the Politics of Difference*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- McKinnon, M. (Ed.). *New Zealand Historical Atlas -Ko Papatuanuku Takoto Nei*. Auckland: Bateman and Department of Internal Affairs.
- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. (1997). *Management of the Environmental Effects Associated with the Tourism Sector*. Wellington: Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.

- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. (1998). *Kaitiakitanga and Local Government: Tangata Whenua Participation in Environmental Management*. Wellington: Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.
- Poharama, A., Henley, M., Smith, A., Fairweather, J.R., and Simmons, D.G. (1998). *Impact of Tourism on the Maori Community in Kaikoura. Report No.7*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University.
- Roberts, M., Norman, W., Minhinnick, N., Wihongi, D., and Kirkwood, C. (1995). Kaitiakitanga: Maori Perspectives on Conservation. *Pacific Conservation Biology. Vol.2 No.1*, 7-20.
- Ryan, P. M. (2001). *The Reed Dictionary of Modern Maori*. Auckland: Reed Books.
- Sharp, A. (1990). *Justice and the Maori - Maori Claims in New Zealand Political Argument in the 1980s*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Tahana, N., Grant, K.T.O.K, Simmons, D.G., and Fairweather, J.R. (2000). *Tourism and Maori Development in Rotorua. Report No.15*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University.
- Taylor, J. (1998). *Consuming Identity: Modernity and Tourism in New Zealand*. Research in Anthropology & Linguistics, no.2. Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- Te Karaka. (1998). *Crown Settlement Offer: Consultation Document from the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group (Special Edition, 2nd Edition)*. Christchurch: Ngai Tahu Publications Ltd.
- Te Tari Tatau/Statistics New Zealand. (1996). *Census 1996*. Wellington: Government Press.
- Te Puni Kokini (TPK). (1998). *Maori Tourism Directory*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Te Puni Kokini (TPK). (1999). *A Strategic Plan for Maori Tourism Development for the Ministry of Maori Development, 1999 - 2002*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Tourism Strategy Group (TSG). (2001). *New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010*. Unpublished report.
- United Nations. (1992). E/CN.4/Sub.2/1992/30- 6 July 1992.
- Wall, M. (1995). Social Justice and Conceptualising Difference in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In P. C. Forer and P.J. Perry (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 18th Conference- NZ Geographical Society. University of Canterbury: 27-30 August, 1995*. New Zealand Geographical Society.

White, B. (1994). *Sites of Contestation: Perceptions of Wilderness in the Contest of Treaty Claim Settlements*. Unpublished dissertation thesis, Centre for Resource Management, Lincoln University.

Women and Geography Study Group. (1997). *Feminist Geographies: Explorations in Diversity and Difference*. England: Longman Ltd.

Veijola and Jokinen. (1994). The body in tourism. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 11, 125-151.

Zeppel, H. (1998). Land Culture: sustainable tourism and indigenous peoples. In C. M. Hall and A.A. Lew (Eds.), *Sustainable Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. Harlow [England]: Longman.

### **Personal Communications**

Lowe, K. Senior Policy Analyst, Te Puni Kokiri, Wellington.

Matunga, H. Associate Professor, Centre for Maori and Indigenous Planning and Development, Lincoln University.

Puentener, R. DoC Liaison Officer for TRONT, Christchurch.

Rod, M. Team Leader, Planning. West Coast Conservancy, Hokitika.

Tau, R. Investment Analyst, Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation, Christchurch.

Tourism West Coast West Coast Regional Tourism Organisation, Greymouth.



# Appendix 1





***TOURISM AND MĀORI DEVELOPMENT***

**Objective Statement**

To provide an understanding of Māori tourism interactions in order to enhance the ability of both new and established Māori tourist operators, their organisations and the wider Māori community to develop Māori tourism in ways that sustain Māori culture in a manner acceptable to Māori.

The purpose of this survey is to

- Provide an understanding of the history of Māori tourism on the West Coast
- Provide an understanding of the impacts of tourism on Māori
- Show levels of Māori participation in tourism
- Show Māori view of tourism on the West Coast

**QUESTION 1:**

**a) *What do you think Māori tourism is?***

---

---

---

---

**b) *What do you understand by the phrase “Māori culture”***

---

---

---

---

**OBJECTIVE 1:**

**A) PRODUCE AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF MĀORI PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT, *and***

**Q2. *Are you involved in Māori tourism?***

YES (go to Q3)

NO (go to Q4)

**Q3. *How long have you been involved in Māori tourism?***

---

---

---

---

**Q4. *What is your first memory of Māori tourism on the West Coast?***

---

---

---

**B) ACCURATELY DOCUMENT THE CURRENT STATE OF MĀORI INVOLVEMENT IN THE TOURISM INDUSTRY.**

**Q5. How involved do you think Māori are in tourism on the West Coast?**

- QUITE INVOLVED (go to Q6)
- NOT INVOLVED (go to Q7)
- DON'T KNOW (go to Q8)

**Q6. Can you give some examples of Māori involvement?**

---

---

---

---

**Q7. Do you have any thoughts on why Māori are not involved?**

---

---

---

---

**OBJECTIVE 2:**

**A) DESCRIBE AND INTERPRET THE PERCEPTIONS THAT MĀORI HAVE OF TOURISM and**

**Q8. What do you think about tourism in general?**

---

---

---

---

**Q9. How do you think tourism affects you?**

---

---

---

---

**B) HOW THESE (PERCEPTIONS) HAVE CHANGED OVER TIME.**

**Q10. Do you think tourism and its effects on Māori have changed over the years?**

- YES (go to Q11)
- NO (go to Q12)
- DON'T KNOW (go to Q12)

**Q11. In what ways?**

---

---

---

---

**OBJECTIVE 3:**

**A) RECORD AND ANALYSE MĀORI RESPONSES AND COPING STRATEGIES TO TOURISM DEVELOPMENT.**

**Q12. Do you feel you/Māori have control over tourism development on the West Coast?**

- YES (go to Q13)
- NO (go to Q15)
- DON'T KNOW (go to Q15)

**Q13. Can you give examples of your involvement in tourism development?**

---

---

---

**Q14. What problems have you encountered in this involvement and how have you coped with these?**

---

---

---

---

**Q15. Would you like to have more control over tourism development** (especially in cases that involve Māori-issues/culture/identity)?

- YES (go to question 16)
- NO (go to question 17)

**Q16. Do you have any ideas on how this could happen?**

---

---

---

**Q17. Are there specific reasons for this?**

---

---

---

**Q17. Can you outline areas in tourism on the West Coast that should have more Māori involvement?**

- YES (go to question 18)
- NO (go to question 19)

**Q18. How could this be achieved?**

---

---

---

---

---

**OBJECTIVE 4:**

**A) IDENTIFY THE CURRENT USE OF MĀORI CULTURE AS ATTRACTIONS.**

**Q18. *Is Māori culture used as a tourist attraction on the West Coast?***

YES (go to Q18 and Q19)

NO (go to Q20)

**Q19. *Can you give some examples?***

---

---

---

**Q20. *What are your thoughts on these attractions?***

---

---

---

**Q20. *Do you have any thoughts on why Māori culture is not used?***

---

---

---

**OBJECTIVE 5:**

**A) DESCRIBE AND INTERPRET THE CHANGES IN THE EXPRESSION OF MĀORI CULTURE.**

**Q21. *Do you think that Māori culture has changed due to tourism?***

YES (go to Q22)

NO (go to Q24)

DON'T KNOW (go to Q24)

**Q22. *Can you give some positive changes?***

---

---

---

**Q23. *Can you give some negative changes?***

---

---

---

